OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

FIRST SESSION—TWELFTH PARLIAMENT

---

2 GEORGE V., 1911-12

VOL. CV.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWENTY-NINTH DAY OF FEBRUARY TO THE NINETEENTH DAY OF MARCH, INCLUSIVE.



UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

OTTAWA

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

1911-12

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
Leeds, ...rta

House of Commons Debates

FIRST SESSION—TWELFTH PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, February 29, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

REPORT PRESENTED.

First Part of the Report of the Fifth Census of Canada.—Hon. Mr. Burrell.

BIOLOGICAL BOARD OF CANADA.

Hon. J. D. HAZEN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 118) to create 'The Biological Board of Canada.'

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. HAZEN. This Bill has reference to the work carried on in connection with the biological service. The members of the Biological Board serve without pay and they have been hampered in their work to a considerable extent owing to the system under which the work is now carried on. All supplies and everything of that kind in connection with the different stations have to be ordered by the Department of Marine and Fisheries in the first instance, and these gentleman who are now serving feel that their work is considerably delayed, the season during which the work is carried on being very short. They have not been able to give as good results as they think they could if the system proposed in this Bill were adopted. I took the matter up with the Auditor General and this Bill is the result of a consultation with him. The Bill creates a board to be called 'The Biological Board of Canada' which shall be under the control of the minister. The board shall consist of two members appointed by the minister, one appointed by each of the universities of Dalhousie, Laval, McGill, New Brunswick, Queen's and Toronto, and one to be appointed by each of such other universities (to be named by the minister) as may engage in the work of biological research.

The board shall have charge of all biological stations in Canada, and shall have the conduct and control of investigations of practical and economic problems connected with marine and fresh water fisheries, flora and fauna, and such other work as may be assigned to it by the minister. The board shall meet annually at the city of Ottawa and at such meetings shall elect one member to be chairman and another to be secretary treasurer, who shall hold office until the next annual meeting.

Other meetings of the board shall be held at such places and at such times as are necessary for the work of the board. The board may make by-laws for the conduct of its business, but no by-law shall be in force until it has been approved of by the minister. No member of the board shall receive any payment or emolument for his services, but he shall be repaid all actual, reasonable travelling or other expenses in connection with the work of the board. From the moneys appropriated by parliament for the work of the board which in the present year will amount to $15,000 or which the board may receive through bequest, donation or the sale of specimens of natural history, the secretary treasurer under direction of the board shall expend such sums as are necessary for the work of the board. A detailed statement of the expenses of the board up to the close of the preceding fiscal year shall be prepared annually by the secretary treasurer, and such statement shall be submitted to and be examined by the Auditor General. A report upon the work done by the board shall be made to the minister as soon as possible after the close of each fiscal year.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

MR. F. P. GUTELIUS.

Mr. CARVELL:

1. Has Mr. Frederick Passmore Gutelius been recently appointed to the National Transcontinental Commission?
2. Is Mr. Gutelius a British subject?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. No.
2. Mr. F. P. Gutelius is a British subject.

DISMISSALS, &c.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Have any complaints been made against the postmaster of St. Angele de Laval, county of Nicolet?
If so, has an inquiry been ordered in his case?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.

Mr. BOYER:

Is it true that the dismissal of Isidore Chevrier, postmaster at Mount Oscar, M. Daoust, postmaster at Isle Perrot, Sud, and Ophir Legault, postmaster at Isle Perrot, Nord, have been determined on?
2. If so, for what reasons, and by whose request?
3. Will the postmaster have the benefit of an inquiry?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Answered by No. 1.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has Albert Dunn been dismissed from the Public Works Department?
2. Was his case investigated by commissioner Chauvin?
3. What is the report of the commissioner concerning this case?

Mr. MONK:

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. The commissioner reports that proof adduced establishes that Albert Dunn was selected as a delegate to the Liberal convention of Ottawa in 1910, for a by-election, and that he participated, as such delegate in the choice of Mr. Auguste Lemieux as a Liberal candidate; that Albert Dunn was again selected as a delegate to the Liberal convention of Ottawa in 1911, but refused to act as such.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax):

1. Was Mr. F. S. Hefferman, of the Customs Service, Springhill, N.S., dismissed from office?
2 If so, for what reason was said dismissal made, and upon whose recommendation?

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. Yes.
2. Mr. F. S. Hefferman, sub-collector of customs at Spring Hill, was dismissed on account of political partisanship, upon the recommendation of the Minister of Customs, based on the statement of the member for the constituency.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax):

1. Has the preventive officer at Ship Harbour, Halifax county, been removed from office?

Mr. COCHRANE.

2. If so, upon what grounds, and by whose request?

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1 and 2. Mr. G. A. Mosher, acting preventive officer of customs at Ship Harbour, Nova Scotia, has not been dismissed.

Mr. CARVELL:

Has any member of the House of Commons applied for the position of superintendent of the Intercolonial railway, vice Mr. Dubé, dismissed? If so, what is his name?

Mr. COCHRANE:

The department has no information.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Have any dismissals been made lately at the Montreal Customs House?
2. If so, what are the names of officials so dismissed, and the causes of their dismissal?

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1 and 2. Several officials at the Montreal Customs House have lately been granted leave of absence, with pay, until July 1, next, when their services are to be dispensed with, on account of their age and inability to perform the work required of them. Their names are:—Edmond Beauvais, Ferdinand Carbonneau, Flavien N. Cauchon, A. Constant, Louis H. Lafleur, S. Z. Leboeuf, H. Lusignan, H. Renaud, Michael M. Scleater, John Stinson, F. A. St. Laurent, Louis St. Martin, Ludger Ste. Marie, T. H. Turton, Joseph H. Therrien.

MILITIA TOURING CARS.

* Mr. MURPHY:

1. Has the Department of Militia and Defence given an order for twelve touring cars to the Ford Motor Company?
2. If so, what will be the total cost of the twelve cars?
3. Were tenders invited for the said cars? If so, who were the tenderers, and what was the total amount of each tender?
4. For what purpose are the said touring cars to be used, and by whom?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria):

1. Yes.
2. $11,419.20.
3. No. The department bought the cheapest and most suitable car on the market.
4. By officers commanding and staff of divisions and districts, for inspection duties of local armouries, regiments, and cadet corps organization, thus reducing the cost of these inspections by half and increasing the efficiency doubly.

MONTREAL MILITARY SCHOOL.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Does the government intend to build a military school on the island of Montreal?
2. If so, on what part of the island of Montreal will it be built?

3. Is the site purchased, and at what price?
4. Who was the owner of it?
5. Who was the agent who would be employed to purchase the site?
6. Were the military authorities of Montreal consulted?
7. What commission has been or will be paid to the agent?
8. Has the agent who sold the site acted in the name of the owner or of a person who lent his name for the purpose??

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria):

This matter is under consideration.

CONTRACT FOR TIES.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has the Minister of Railways and Canals given any contract for ties at Sayabec, county of Rimouski? If so, what is the name of the contractor?
2. What is the amount of said contract, if any?
3. Have tenders been called for?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes. Edouard Smith and Hedwidge Boulay.
2. Edouard Smith, 10,000 cedar ties at 35 cents each. Hedwidge Boulay, 10,000 cedar ties at 35 cents each.
3. Yes. Tenders were called on August 5, 1911, by newspaper and poster advertisement.

COMMERCIAL AGENT IN FRANCE.

Mr. LEMIEUX

Is it the intention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to appoint a commercial agent in France to succeed to Mr. Anatole Poindron?

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto North). To the question of the hon. member the answer of the Minister of Trade and Commerce is: no.

MAGDALEN ISLANDS NEWS SERVICE.

Mr. HAZEN. The day before yesterday my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) asked a question with regard to a wireless news service for the Magdalen Islands, and I promised to obtain some information regarding it. I have now the information, and, if in order, I may say that the Department of Naval Service last year erected a wireless station on the Magdalen Islands, so as to establish communication with Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia, and also to put these Islands in communication with passing ships and with the various stations in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. This station is being operated for the department by the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company of Canada under the same agreement which regulates the operation of other wireless stations in that district. The hon. Postmaster General lately made arrangements to have a weekly news letter officially prepared for transmission to the Magdalen Islands, and this letter, which will be composed of about 1,000 words, will be forwarded each week via wireless station at Pictou and at the Magdalen Islands, so as to be available for communication at the Islands on each Sunday. The first message sent last week, consisting of 1,738 words, was received at Pictou at 3 p.m. on Friday, February 23, and had been transmitted to the Magdalen Islands station at 6.30 p.m. of the same day. The hon. the Postmaster General could, no doubt, furnish further details of this service.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Perhaps my hon. friend the Postmaster General will state who prepares the letter, and what is the nature of it.

Mr. PELLETIER. The letter is not going to be a political letter, if that is what my hon. friend fears. A newspaper man in Quebec will prepare it. It will consist of a summary of the most important events which have taken place during the week, political and otherwise, but will contain nothing from a party point of view. It will be a simple news service for the public at large. The Islands have been for years, as my hon. friend knows, without any means of communication with the outside world for five or six months of the year, and this service is considered to be a boon to them. The news letter will be read to them from the pulpits of the Catholic churches every Sunday.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. PELLETIER moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Civil Service Act by providing that assistant postmasters in post offices in which the postage collections exceed $1,000,000 may be paid a minimum salary of $2,800, with annual increases of $100 up to a maximum salary of $3,500, and that, if the Governor in Council so determines, such provision may be made applicable to assistant postmasters appointed prior to the first day of April, 1912?

Motion agreed to.

THE GRAIN ACT.

House in committee on Bill (No. 32) respecting grain.—Mr. Foster (North Toronto).

On sec. 123.—Terminal, Public and Hospital elevators.

Mr. FOSTER. (North Toronto) We had some discussion in the committee with reference to clause 123, and several amendments and suggestions were made. As a consequence I have redrafted the clause,

and I will read it to the House as I propose to substitute it for the one in the Bill. The first subsection reads as follows in the old clause:

No person owning, managing, operating or otherwise interested in any terminal elevator shall buy or sell grain at any point in the eastern or western inspection division.

2. Subsection 1 hereof shall not apply to any person who owns, manages, operates or is otherwise interested in any terminal elevator.

That is the same as it is in the old section.

(a) Which, with the approval of the Governor in Council, has been leased to the board for operation, or has been leased to any person for operation with the approval of the board, or is managed and operated by persons approved of by the board;—or

That is in substance the same as the subsection in the old clause.

(b) Which is used or operated in connection with any flour mill situate at the same terminal point as such elevator, provided, however, that such elevator shall be subject to such restrictions and regulations as are imposed by the board with the approval of the Governor in Council.

That is the same as in the old clause.

3. Subsection 1 of this section shall not apply to any person by reason only of the fact that he is an owner or holder of stock or shares in a railway company which owns or operates a terminal elevator which does not as a business buy or sell grain.

4. If the person mentioned in subsection 2 hereof owns, manages, operates, or is otherwise interested, in any terminal elevator other than a terminal elevator or elevators coming under the provisions of subsection 2 hereof, he shall not be exempt from the provisions of subsection 1 hereof.

That I think meets the suggestion which was made, and some of the objections which were made, and seems to be a reasonable arrangement as far as I can see.

Mr. McCRANEY. Does the section, as it is now framed, meet the objections which were raised by the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) and which impressed some of us on this side of the House?

Mr. FOSTER. (North Toronto) I do not just remember at the present time what the objection raised by the member for Portage la Prairie was, but I have had the good offices of that hon. gentleman, in conjunction with the member for Brandon, (Mr. Aikins) in framing this clause. I think I may say that it does meet his views.

Mr. OLIVER. I think we may take it for granted that subsection 4 as suggested, covers the point that was intended to be covered by a part of the amendment that was offered by this side of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. (North Toronto) Yes, that is the intention.

Mr. OLIVER. We may also assume that subsection 3 covers the point that was intended to be covered by a suggestion from this side of the House?

Mr. FOSTER. (North Toronto) That is correct.

Mr. OLIVER. There still remains the fact that there is a part of subsection 1 that is the last provision in the subsection 2, that was not included in the amendment offered from this side of the House, and is considered objectionable by some hon. gentlemen around me.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). What is that?

Mr. OLIVER. The words, 'or which is managed and operated by persons approved by the board.' That is considered to be leaving a measure of responsibility on the board that is not in accordance with the intent of the section. I am quite aware that these words were introduced in the Senate last session, and are embodied in Bill 'Q' but they were added to an amendment that was placed before the Senate, and in my judgment, and in the judgment of some of our friends here, they nullify the effect of the previous part of subsection 1. We would therefore, object to the insertion of those words, and we would desire the insertion of the word 'public' in the first part of the section, so that the prohibition would apply to public as well as to terminal elevators, and the exception would not apply to persons owning and operating elevators, who might be approved by the board. I would be willing to accept my hon. friends view that the operators of public elevators in the eastern inspection division need not be included, but I would very strongly urge that public elevators in the western inspection division, should be under the same restrictions as terminal elevators.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). My hon. friend discussed both those points in the committee before.

Mr. OLIVER. The one in regard to public elevators, but not the other provision.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I think we debated the question pro, and con, and I do not see that it is possible to embody the views of my hon. friend in this clause. I think that this section, taken as a whole, makes as drastic legislation as is necessary for the attainment of the object in view, and as is advisable for this parliament to enact.

Mr. KNOWLES. There are certain amendments we would like to move, but it is

impossible to frame the necessary amendments at such short notice. Therefore, I would ask that the Bill again be allowed to stand.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I do not want hon. gentlemen opposite to ask that the Bill again stand. We can pass the measure now, and these amendments can be moved formally just as well, and I think better on the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. KNOWLES. I would be quite willing to concur in the minister's suggestion if I could, but there are certain facilities granted to us in committee which we would not enjoy when the third reading of the Bill was moved, and we propose to take advantage of them. I submit that at this moment, we cannot be reasonably asked in so short a time, to study matters out now and frame the amendments which we think are necessary. If the amendments proposed by the minister had been placed in the hands of the member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) a few hours ahead, it would have been different.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Although the hon. gentleman says this is new matter, it does not seem to me so. Three-quarters of it is exactly the same as was in section 123, and what remains of it is chiefly suggestions made by my hon. friend himself. I went carefully over the verbiage, and it seems all that is necessary to carry out the idea. The clause as a whole does not carry out the idea of hon. gentlemen opposite, I quite agree. But it seems to me that, when we have been nearly three weeks on this Bill, and as we are anxious to get it before the Senate as soon as possible—it will probably take some time there—the views of hon. gentlemen might well be submitted on the third reading, supported by their speeches, if they wish.

Mr. OLIVER. I think it fair to say, following what was said by my hon. friend from Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles), that, even if this were merely a question of re-adjustment of such an important clause as this, an intricate and difficult clause, had the hon. minister intended to push the discussion through to-day, it would seem only fair that hon. members on this side should have had previous notice, so that we could have framed our amendments. However, we are willing to waive that if a little delay is granted. Some other clause might be taken up, and in the meantime we will frame amendments, so that our views may be placed before the committee.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Then, we will let that section stand. That is reasonable.

Mr. McCRANEY. I see my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen), in his place, I understand from the Minister of Trade and Commerce that his new amendment has been submitted to my hon. friend. I was impressed with his (Mr. Meighen's), argument the other night, that neither the section in the Bill, nor the amendment proposed at that time by my hon. friend from Moosejaw would be sufficient to prevent individuals as holders of stock in companies, from being interested in the terminal elevators, and also in the country elevators. As he has been through this Bill, I would like to ask him if he is satisfied that the amendment of the minister gets over the objection that he then raised?

Mr. MEIGHEN. The minister has not discussed that phase with me at all. Answering the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney), frankly I think this amendment does not get over the difficulty but that the objection still remains. This much can be said, that the section as is is now proposed, places obstacles in the way of evading the intention of the section. But these obstacles can be overcome.

Mr. McCRANEY. I think the hon. gentleman is correct in his view. It is clear then, that there is only one way of getting over the difficulty which section 123 is intended to meet, and that is by carrying out the announced policy of the government to take over the terminal elevators. If the government did this terminal elevator business, there would be no danger of the same parties being interested in terminal elevators and in country elevators.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. This clause stands.

On section 133—delivery of grain on return of receipt,

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). This is a section that we discussed and decided to divide into two subsections. Subsection 1 has been passed already. It refers to the loading out at the terminals into vessels. Subsection 2 refers to loading out from the terminals into cars. Hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, I suppose, are fairly familiar with the situation at Fort William and Port Arthur and with the questions that arise there regarding the speedy and reasonable transport to the east after the season of navigation closes. The intention of the subsection will best be explained by reading it:

Subsection 1 shall apply to the delivery of grain to cars upon the return of any terminal warehouse receipt, provided, however, that the owner of such receipt of the terminal elevator warehouseman shall make demand in writing upon the company to place the necessary number of cars upon the elevator track. Should such demand not be complied with within the said twenty four hours, the owner or warehouseman may apply to the board——

That is the Board of Grain Commissioners

—who shall thereupon investigate the case. If upon investigation it is found that the railway company is not using due diligence in providing such number of cars as can be reasonably transported, the board shall thereupon so notify the company. Should the company fail to comply forthwith, the board may make application to the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada who shall investigate the complaint and may order the company to forthwith provide the cars deemed reasonable by the board. In case the number of cars ordered by the board of Railway Commissioners is not so furnished, the company shall be responsible for the charges for such extra storage as are fixed by the Railway Board and shall upon demand pay such charges to the board which shall thereupon pay them to the owners of the terminal elevator receipt. The board shall make such regulations for application for and delivery of cars as seem necessary.

The modus operandi intended to be laid down in that subsection is this: If at Fort William demands are made for the transport of grain and the receipts surrendered, the railway company is to comply with these demands, or say whether it will not. If it does not comply with these demands within twenty-four hours, the owners of the receipt can apply to the Board of Grain Commissioners, who will investigate the complaint and decide whether in their opinion there is reasonable ground for complaint or not, then they shall notify the railway authorities. If the railway authorities will not comply with the notification of the board, then the board is to submit the matter to the Board of Railway Commissioners.

The Board of Railway Commissioners then takes up the question and investigates it, and if it considers that the railway company has not done its duty, it makes an order as to what the railway company is to do and notifies the railway company of that order. Then if the railway company does not carry out the order, it is responsible for the storage on all grain in the warehouses which could have been moved if the reasonable number of cars for transport had been provided. Provision is made by which these charges shall be collected and paid over to the parties who own the receipts. Then the Board of Grain Commissioners is to make regulations as to the orderly and proportional application for cars and their just distribution. I think this is as plain as I can make it.

Now that does not go so far as a section of those interested in the grain trade would like to have it go. The situation is peculiar in this respect, that some elevators are owned by the Canadian Pacific railway itself, and others are connected with the Canadian Pacific railway directly and are run in connection with it. Others are in part belonging to other railway companies, and to elevator companies, or to parties who have no railways and no connection with railways. The situation is complicated by these different conditions. It is therefore, a rather difficult position to handle to the satisfaction of all. If you made the law such that whenever a warehouse certificate was surrendered, and demands were made on the railway for cars, or for haulage power to take them out, then it is easily seen that, with millions of bushels in store, demands could be made on the one railway which was to do the hauling out, which would be absolutely impossible to fulfil; and if the storage were then to cease, that would be a definite and easy method of escaping storage charges on the part of the owners of the grain. As the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has its own great system of railway, from Fort William east, owns the trackage, has millions of bushels of grain in its elevators and on its transit lines, naturally enough it wishes to carry its own peculiar traffic first. It is not, we will say, able even to carry that; it is, therefore, considered to be, and I think reasonably, an injustice to make the Canadian Pacific railway chargeable with the storage of all grain in the elevators, the receipts of which in the terminals have been surrendered, and for which transit has been demanded. Naturally enough they would like to carry their own first. The demand that this shall apply equally to all the elevators, and that the storage charges shall be placed upon the one railway if they are not all carried out after a certain time, would result I think in an injustice under the conditions as they at present exist. If each railway had its independent line of trackage towards the east, then each could take care of the grain freights which particularly belong to its line or to the elevators in connection with its lines. Trouble arises because there are three railways which come down to that point, and then only one which leads out from that point towards the east. So these things have to be taken into consideration.

On the other hand, we have a Railway Act and a Board of Railway Commissioners acting in consonance with that Act and under its provisions, and there is provision made in that for the acceptance of traffic and for the acceptance of interchangeable traffic from one road to another which is being administered by the Railway Board. This section, if made into law, will facilitate the action of the Railway Board, while not assuming to this Act and to the Board under this Act, any of the authority which belongs to the Railway Commissioners under the Railway Act. They are the commissioners whose busi-

ness it is to regulate, and in order to regulate fairly, they must have the best knowledge of all the conditions. They are the ones to whom the matter is in this section ultimately referred. But it becomes a quick and easy way, in the first place, of avoiding disputes, and in the second place, if there be disputes, of carrying them to a quick fulfillment. If the Grain Board intervenes and has to make an examination, then it will convey its views to the railway company, and if its views are not met, it will carry it at once to the Railway Commission and ask the Railway Commission to act. That is the most reasonable way of settling the difficulty partially, for it will never be settled wholly until we have more lines of exit out. It is at least a reasonable method, and without over drastic or too arbitrary legislation.

Mr. OLIVER. Do I understand the minister's statement is an explanation of the amendment as he moved it the other day, without change, or is he moving an amendment to that amendment which he moved the other day?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I am moving an amendment to subsection 2 of section 133.

Mr. OLIVER. As it appears in 'Hansard'?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I think there are some slight changes.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to have a note of those changes before we leave consideration of the amendment.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The first part of it is even with the first part of subsection 2. The first amendment is to change the expression in the old clause:

If upon investigation it is found that the railway company is not using due diligence in providing a reasonable number of cars.

to

If upon investigation it is found that the railway company is not using due diligence in providing such number of cars as can be reasonably transported.

The first amendment seemed faulty in that it dealt only with the providing of cars. The purpose of the ordering of cars is not simply to have them loaded and lie there as storehouses, but to have them loaded and transported, and so I include the transporting of the cars as well as the providing. Then it proceeds:

Should the company fail to comply forthwith the board may make application to the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada——

That is the same as in the old. Then directly after that:

—who shall investigate the complaint and may order the company to forthwith provide the cars deemed reasonable by the board.

That is by the Board of Railway Commissioners. In the last sentence no change is made, except that in the former amendment the extra storage charge was to be fixed by the Board of Grain Commissioners. In this one, it is to be fixed by the Railway Board, that is the Railway Board has the whole investigation and the final authorizing of the instructions. It was thought to be better to leave this matter of the storage compensation or refund, with that same board.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I think I have grasped the prinicple by which the minister hopes to regulate the question of storage at terminals. With what study I have been able to give it, I am disposed to disagree with the method adopted. It appears to me, that it will lay the burden of proof on those who are least able to carry it, that is those who will have to prove that there has not been a due provision of cars will not be in a position to prove their cases, for the reason that to secure evidence they would have to go into the camp of the enemy, which they cannot do. I know the difficulty is complicated by the two sets of operators concerned, that is to say, the Canadian Pacific railway company, which alone has an outlet from Fort William and Port Arthur, and the other companies which have no connection with the east. The terminal elevator companies who are simply storing grain, and who have no control in any way over the railways, are in a somewhat different position from the railway companies, who, themselves, operate elevators. If the amendment is carried then, as I understand, if a shipper of grain desires that the whole, or any part of his lot of grain shall be sent east, he immediately surrenders his warehouse receipts and hands the bill of lading to the owner of the terminal elevator. Under the proposed amendments, the storage charge will not then cease, but it will cease only when the cars necessary to carry out the order of the shipper, are actually provided which may be a week or may be a longer time, after the bill of lading is placed in the hands of the terminal elevator owner. If the owner of the grain considers that his demand for cars has not been reasonably complied with he has an appeal to the Board of Elevator Commissioners, who make an order if they deem the evidence produced is satisfactory. That order practically passes into the hands of the Railway Commission for enforcement, unless it is immediately obeyed by the railway company. The position will then be, that an owner of grain wishing to ship it out of a terminal elevator who deems himself unjustly dealt with, (and

these cases will be and have been very numerous), is compelled to go into the offices of the railway company to get his evidence in order to prove to the Board of Railway Commissioners that the railway company has not reasonably complied with his demand. It appears to me it would be better to commence the other way, and to shift the burden of proof to the other foot, to say to the railway company owning an elevator: Until you show to the Board of Railway Commissioners that you have reasonably satisfied the demand for cars under the circumstances, you shall be entitled to no storage, beyond the time of actual instructions, that is beyond the 24 hours after the bill of lading is placed in your hands. No doubt, as the minister has said, the parties interested will raise the objection that this puts into the hands of the shipper an opportunity to be unreasonable, and always throws the burden of proof on the company, that shipper who desires to avoid paying storage for a large amount of grain can make an unreasonable and sudden demand on the railway company and insist that cars be provided for shipment. But in proportion as such a demand might be unreasonable and sudden, so would it be easy for the railway company to prove its case, before the Board of Railway Commissioners, and in the meantime they would lose nothing; it is not as if they were losing a lien and the probable cost of recovery, because the consignees and owners of these large storages of grain are responsible parties in every case.

The grain will not be far, and the shippers will be at hand and can be recovered from long after they can have made their appeal to the board, and prove their case. My point briefly is: That I think it would be better to put the burden on the company, because the company is in a better position from the nature of the case to discharge that burden and they can more quickly and more easily discharge it if the right is on their side. And if the burden is there, what is going to be the result as far as the public is concerned? It is going to make the railway company, by reason of the fact that the obstacles were in their way, and they had to prove the case, it is going to make them pay more attention to the quick despatch of the grain. I know that the argument I have advanced has not quite as much application to the case of companies who have no control whatever over railway transport, but it appears to me, that with an alteration it can be made to apply there, and still place the burden on the railway company in case these companies place the instructions in the bill of lading, to prove, before they can charge storage on the twenty-four hours after the instructions, that they have not been negligent, that they have under all the circumstances complied reasonably with the demand. It appears to me we are fast reaching a point when the application of the principle I argue for shall be further applied than even to the case of railway terminals. Out in western Canada, as we have heard almost ad nauseam in this House, the congestion is such, and the railways are so far failing to meet the demand for shipment, that it appears to me we are going to get better results if a heavier burden is put on the companies than at present exists, and that they will be compelled under reasonable conditions, to show—after the farmer proved that he was in a position to load a car and was in a position to live up to his end of the transaction—that they did all that could reasonably be asked of them to meet his demand, and that until they discharge that burden they shall be compelled to pay him a demurrage after a reasonable time has elapsed. I do not make any pretence of stating how that principle should be applied or to what extent, but I merely say that in addition to its application at the terminals, where I think it should be applied now, we are approaching the time when something of the same kind of method must be adopted in the actual loading and shipment of cars from western Canada. To come back again to the case of the terminal elevators, it must be remembered that the terminal elevator charges to-day are on a very remunerative basis, so far as an outsider can judge, relatively to the charges at transfer and public elevators. They charge three-quarters of a cent, no matter how long the grain is in the elevator, and if we take it by the month their average charges are about four times the charges in the eastern elevators. I understand, although I am not in a position to state it authoritatively, that at the eastern elevators the principle I have been arguing for to be applied here, does obtain, and that storage does cease twenty-four hours after the bill of lading is in the hands of the company. However, whether it does or not, I maintain it should, and that in the long run we will get better results and will add greatly to the facility with which grain is handled, and to the quickness of its despatch by the companies, if we put the burden of proof where it should be and where it can, if right is on their side, be most equitably discharged.

Mr. OLIVER. The amendment as first proposed by the minister was somewhat complicated but still I think it is possible to follow it through. The amendments presented to-day, while I do not suppose they make very serious changes in the purport, make it still more difficult for the ordinary member to follow the sections. I have been very much impressed by the argu-

ment of my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen). If the section, as amended has the effect that he understands it to have, I would be strongly inclined to support his proposal to amend it on the lines he suggests. But I think it would be in order for my hon. friend himself to prepare some form of words that would convey the idea that he has expressed in such manner as we may have it before us and see just how far it reaches.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I did not know that this section was coming up and I think it makes quite a reversal of the amendment as proposed. I would be very glad to do what my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) asks, especially if it should meet the approval of the minister, but in any case, if I had time, I would do so in order that the two subsections could be placed at issue clearly.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not wish to commit myself either for or against the suggestions my hon. friend has made, but there seems to be such importance in them that I think it would be fair if they were put before us so that we could realize what their effect would be. I was under the impression that the amendment, as printed in 'Hansard', while it arrived at it by a circuitous method, really had the ultimate effect that the storage ceased either at the time or at twenty-four hours after the grain was ordered out.

Mr. FOSTER. (North Toronto) That is not correct.

Mr. OLIVER. In the amendment as first introduced was there not a fixed time at which storage would cease after the order was given ?

Mr. FOSTER. (North Toronto) Both amendments are alike in that the matter was ultimately referred, unless the views of the Grain Commission prevailed. The Grain Commission looked into the whole matter, and if they had judged that the railway company was in default of a reasonable provision, the Board of Grain Commissioners could fix the reasonable rate of storage at their own discretion, after taking all the circumstances into consideration. There was no fixed limit. In this, the only change made is to put that duty upon the Board of Railway Commissioners or rather than upon the Board of Grain Commissioners. With reference to what my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie has said, I want to state that this question is a very difficult question from more points than one, and it is especially made difficult because of the peculiar conditions which to-day and for some time to come must prevail at Fort William. I think that the question of storage is involved in what will become the final settlement of the whole question and for some reasons I would rather approach it from that side than from the other or from both sides combined.

But that is a matter which I cannot undertake at the present session, and which depends upon other things before we can fairly undertake it. The question of storage rates is one which would be within the discretion of the Grain Commission in conjunction with the Governor in Council. I do not possess the information, neither does the government nor I suppose any other person, which is necessary to an opinion on that question. After the most careful thought that I can give to the matter, and having regard to all the circumstances of the situation, this measure, while not a complete solution, seems to be the only step towards a solution which it is possible for me to take at the present time. It does not fulfil all the wishes of great interests in the grain trade. It may be that it does not fulfil the desires of the transport companies or of the warehousemen, but it is a step in the solution of the question which will, if there is a grievance, give relief, and which, if there is no grievance, will of course leave things as they are. With regard to the question of transport, in the conditions prevailing at Fort William, the Canadian Pacific railway is doing all that is physically possible. I think all reasonable men would say that it has done its share towards a solution of the question under present conditions. Things physically impossible cannot be done by the Canadian Pacific railway any more than by individuals or other corporations, and it is never considered reasonable to ask an individual or a corporation to do what it is physically impossible for it to do. The circumstances of the situation have to be taken into account. With reference to the storage conditions and the storage charges, these concern a question by itself, but at terminal points this question is clearly connected with the question of transportation and may be an important factor in arriving at the final solution.

Mr. OLIVER. Unless we can have the advantage of the assistance of my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) in drafting an amendment which would convey the ideas he has expressed for the consideration of the committee, I would not feel like delaying the clause on my own account, as I do not feel competent to frame such an amendment. I judge from the remarks of the minister that he is impressed with this question of the grain trade as a matter of transportation and storage; but I would like to impress upon his mind that it is not a question of transportation and storage except as leading up to sale and consumption, and that, in

order that the sale may take place as negotiated, it is necessary that the goods shall be forwarded in accordance with the arrangement made. So that it is in the last degree important for the carrying on of the trade that when a dealer makes a sale for delivery within a certain time—and the buyer must always buy expecting delivery within a certain time—that delivery shall be made within that time; in other words, when a car is ordered out it is essential to the carrying on of business, assuming the car to have been ordered in good faith, as the result of a sale having been made by the owner and shipper of the grain, that the car shall be furnished, so that the grain may go forward and the transaction be closed out. Admitting difficulties on the part of the railway companies, and the impossibility, under certain conditions, of their supplying cars, the suggestion of my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie seemed to me to be absolutely fair. He said: From the fact that we wish the cars to go forward, it does not follow that the railway company will necessarily have to lose the storage; but it does follow that it will be for the railway company to show cause why the cars do not go forward. It seems to me that is a contention which it is very difficult to overcome, for the reason he gives, that the shipper is not in a position to bring evidence on his side of the case before the Railway Commission. I would like my hon. friend to frame an amendment that would convey the idea that he has in mind, so that at any rate, we would have it for full consideration and discussion. The principle is important, but the actual practice is also important. The amendment is difficult to follow, and it is made more difficult by the amendments of to-day. A new line of thought has been brought to bear on the question, and it is difficult for the ordinary member to appreciate the situation, unless he sees this new line of thought in black and white.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). My hon. friend said that there was something anterior to and in importance over and above storage charges and transport; that was, the sale in the first place, and the delivery in the second place. That is very true, and the seller, if he undertakes in a definite way to deliver at a definite time and under certain conditions to the purchaser, is in duty bound to do it, but between the seller at the other end and the other man, the consignee of the grain, there are uncertainties and contingencies. I do not know what kind of contract the seller makes with the purchaser, or the purchaser with the seller, when he buys the wheat and it is shipped out in his car en route to the ultimate market, we will say to Great Britain. Does he guarantee to the purchaser that it shall be delivered at a certain time?

Mr. MEIGHEN. On or before a certain time.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). On or before a certain time. Then he practically has to protect himself by taking into account all difficulties and contingencies on the road between the point of shipment and the ultimate point, and one of those contingencies, which is a contingency which is well known, is the situation of storage and transport at Fort William.

Mr. OLIVER. My point is not the interest of the shipper, it is the condition of the ultimate buyer who buys that grain expecting to receive it at a certain time. If he does not receive it as he expects to receive it, and if that condition becomes frequent, he goes to another market for his grain, and the consequence is injurious to our production all along the line.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). That is all very well as an argument for having the means of communication as direct, and as little liable to incident and contingency as possible; but under our conditions, as between the seller yonder and the ultimate purchaser, there can be no hard and fast contract, because a man in his senses would not make it. He thinks he will get it there at a certain time. He might contract to get it there at a certain time, and be under penalty if he does not get it there; but I do not think any purchaser makes a transaction in which he does not himself admit the contingencies which lie between him and the ultimate delivery of the grain. With reference to what my hon. friend (Mr. Meighen), said, I think his position is somewhat mitigated by this consideration: Looking at it just in the light of a legal transaction, we will say that it puts a great burden upon the possessor of the warehouse receipt at Fort William to gather up the evidence to present to the commission, and so to prove his case. It would, if the case were carried into a court of law, and exact evidence was demanded over a long period and with reference to a large number of considerations. But we must remember that the Grain Commission is right there. The Grain Commission has the whole situation under its purview, so to speak, and it is not a difficult thing it seems to me—I do not know how the board would work it out, but it does not seem to me to be a difficult thing—for the would-be shipper to make a case before the Grain Commission, nor a very difficult or tedious thing for them to come to a conclusion in the premises. That, I think, mitigates somewhat the objection that the burden of

proof should be placed upon the company rather than upon the would-be shipper. The Grain Commission has this whole matter in charge and under purview, which I thought would make it comparatively easy to have a final judgment in reference to each case as it comes up. I do not imagine that very many cases will come up—they might or they might not—in which the final judgment would have to be made by the Board of Railway Commissioners. If you grant that the company wants to afford all that it possibly can, and that the Railway Board is there to see that a reasonable distribution is made, you have a condition of things which will work for the minimum of disputes, and for the maximum of fair carriage.

Mr. OLIVER. How would the fact that some of the elevators are not owned by the railroads and some of them are, work out in practice? Would there be a possibility of the railway company favouring their own elevators in the delivery of cars, assuming that the railway company is a human institution and subject to the frailties of human nature? How would the condition be affected, as between the outside warehouse and the railway company elevator, assuming the conditions of human frailty which, with all deference, I have suggested? Does not that make for strength in the suggestion of my hon. friend that the burden of proof should be on the railway? Does it not add strength to his suggestion as to the difficulty of producing that evidence before the railway company by the warehouseman?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). We have provided a piece of machinery for that, as my hon. friend will see if he looks at the last clause of the amendment:

> The board shall make such regulations for application for and furnishing of cars as may seem necessary.

The board being on the spot makes regulations which govern that matter.

Mr. OLIVER. But this is when the regulations are not being actually lived up to, or where the warehouseman believes they are not being lived up to, and it becomes a question of evidence before the Railway Commission. Then the railway company, as my hon. friend has suggested, has all the evidence, and the warehouse that is disconnected from the railway has none.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I think that in this case the Board of Grain Commissioners would have all the evidence as to the application for, and the distribution of, cars, because they make the regulations which shall govern the application.

Mr. OLIVER. But not as to the possibility of the railway company furnishing the cars, which, after all, is the final argument.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It is, but I imagine to men who understand railway conditions, when they get at about what is the condition of a road and what are the reasonable requirements that may be made, they get at it as all people get at evidence from long knowledge of, and great familiarity with, the situation. It is difficult with us. We have a thousand and one different things to do, and we put our minds on one thing for an hour and then we go to something else, therefore it becomes very difficult for us to deal in such a way. But constant familiarity with such things produces a capacity for forming judgment and getting at conclusions which, as my hon. friend knows, are sometimes really wonderful. We must not judge the difficulties in the way of the Railway Commission from our own more limited experience and acquaintanceship with these matters.

Mr. OLIVER. Might I interject one word here which is hardly connected with this clause. I want to point out that at the last discussion on this Bill, when we were considering the question of car distribution, the question arose, I think, about the power of the Grain Commissioners to order the railway companies to furnish cars. I then took the point that the Board of Grain Commissioners had not that power. I judge now from the terms of this amendment that, as a matter of fact, the Board of Grain Commissioners has not that power, but that it is vested in the Railway Commission.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I do not think we can mix up our executive power under the Grain Act with the executive power which is delegated to the Board of Railway Commissioners as a body of experts with advantage to both, and in the matter of the general distribution of cars it has to be governed, I think, by the Railway Board rather than by the Board of Grain Commissioners.

Section agreed to.

Mr. OLIVER. We are now ready to take up section 123, if the minister desires to do so.

On section 123, buying and selling of grain by owners, etc., of terminal elevators.

Mr. KNOWLES. I move to add the words 'public or' after the word 'any' This will make it read:

> No person owning, managing, operating or otherwise interested in any public or terminal elevator shall buy or sell grain at any point in the western division.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I do not know that my hon. friends wish me to undertake an argument against this. We had some talk about it, and in my imperfect way I placed before the committee the views of the government. While I would like to meet the wish of hon. gentlemen opposite, I am obliged to differ with them in this case. If hon. members have any new light or new arguments, I am still open to be convinced.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know that we should delay the committee on this question. We explained the matter to the hon. minister the other day, and if the truth did not convince him then, we can hardly expect that it will now.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. KNOWLES. I suppose it would be entered in the proceedings as 'Lost' on division and so save taking a vote.

Mr. FOSTER. (North Toronto). Yes, so far as you can take a vote in committee.

Mr. KNOWLES. I think we have a majority, anyway.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). But majorities should never be oppressive.

Mr. KNOWLES. We had some discussion, in which my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) took part, as to whether it was possible to amend this Bill in such a way as to prevent subsidiary companies or other means of evasion being employed. I would like to move to amend this section so as to read:

No person owning, managing, operating or in any way interested in a terminal elevator shall buy or sell or be in any way interested in the buying or selling of grain at any point in the western inspection division.

I think that in this way we cover, or at least come a great deal nearer to completely covering and providing against, all the means that the ordinary mind might invent of evading this clause. When we provide in the first line 'no person owning, managing, operating or in any way interested in a terminal elevator,' that would cover any person who was a shareholder in any company that owned, managed or operated such an elevator. Now, what we need is to make it equally tight and fast at the other end, and so I propose to add 'or in any way interested in the buying or selling of grain.' I think that would cover the holding of stock in any subsidiary company engaged in this business.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I regret that the energy of my hon. friend from Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) has been employed to so little effect. I cannot see that his amendment will go any further towards meeting the objection than does the section as it stands. And, as I stated when the subject was under discussion before, I do not think that difficulty can be overcome without creating a confusion that would be worse than the present state of affairs. The hon. member's amendment means that no person who deals in any way in grain, or is directly or indirectly interested in dealing in grain, shall be interested directly or indirectly in the handling of grain at a terminal elevator. That, to my mind, is already done by section 123 as it stands. But that does not stop the means of evasion. Take the same illustration that I used before. Five men, A, B, C, D and E, desire to deal in grain and also to act as operators of an elevator. They form two companies, a storage company and a grain company. Now, even under my hon. friend's amendment, these five men can through one company deal in grain and through the other deal in storage. None of these men could do both these things, but they can hold stock in two companies, one of which does one thing and the other of which does the other. Why? Because the grain company is not interested in the storage company, nor is the storage company interested in the grain company.

Mr. KNOWLES. But A, B, C, D and E would be interested, as shareholders in both companies, in carrying on both these things.

Mr. MEIGHEN. But A, B and C are stopped, and must sit quietly at home, while the grain company is not stopped.

Mr. KNOWLES. But you can penalize them for being interested in that company.

Mr. MEIGHEN. You cannot penalize them when there is no guilt. The grain company is not interested directly or indirectly in the storage company. Because the grain company has shareholders, who are also shareholders in the storage company, you can not say that the grain company is interested in the storage company. The storage company might go into liquidation, and the grain company would not be affected. They are utterly distinct corporations in the eyes of the law.

Mr. KNOWLES. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that if the law says a man shall not be interested in the two companies, that that law is not intra vires?

Mr. MEIGHEN. My hon. friend does not say that.

Mr. KNOWLES. That is exactly what I say.

Mr. MEIGHEN. If he is, he cannot deal in grain.

Mr. KNOWLES. He cannot be interested in buying or selling it.

Mr. MEIGHEN. He canot deal in grain, that is quite true. But would my hon. friend say that a man could not be interested in two such companies?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Then he is going much further than his amendment goes. I for one, would not be a party to such legislation, if I could help it. Look at the confusion it would land us in. But let me point out that the hon. gentleman's amendment does not go that far. His amendment says that no person who is interested in any sense whatever in the one shall be interested in any sense whatever in the other; that is to say, that no person if he is so interested, can deal in grain. But the company can do it. The company is a distinct entity in the eyes of the law, and unless one company holds shares in the other company, the two companies can go on doing business. Of course, if one company holds shares in the other, then they could not, under the clause as it stands, or under the amendment. Now the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) says: Go on and make it a penalty for a man to own a share in a storage company who also owns a share in an elevator company. He cannot seriously ask us to pass that legislation. He will search the records of any civilized country in vain for any law of that sort. A man can own stock in any company he wants to buy in. Take the case of an innocent party who holds some shares in an elevator company. He finds himself hard up, and desires to sell. He cannot go to John Smith and ask him to buy it, because he would have to look up John Smith's assets to make sure that he does not own shares in the storage company. Also, suppose I own stock in a storage company, and my son holds some stock in an elevator company. I die, and my son becomes the heir, and he at once becomes a criminal in the eyes of the law. It would be utterly absurd. I cannot now bring to my imagination a picture of all the embarrassing situations that would be created, and the confusion that would arise would be much greater than the calamity we are seeking to avert. It seems to me utterly absurd to say that a man could not have so much as one share in a million dollar elevator company, and at the same time have one share in a million dollar grain company. It might be reasonable, if you could do it without too much confusion, to say that no one person shall hold a majority of the shares in both. But that again would be impossible of enforcement. In the first place, the amendment proposed by the hon. member, does not, in any sense, eliminate the objections raised; and secondly, if he went further, as seems to be his intention, it would give rise to a state of affairs more intolerable than that which now exists.

Mr. KNOWLES. It is true that the legislation I suggest would be unusual, but I do not think it would have that absurd effect he thinks it would when he says that the heir of a shareholder in both companies would be automatically criminal. If men have shares in a storage company and also in a company dealing in grain, let them get out of the one or the other. That is the tenor of 123, and it is no more unreasonable than the legislation of the minister. The minister says that no man can be interested in an elevator and buy one bushel of grain without being criminal. The principle is the same and the philosophy is the same. The member for Portage la Prairie, I suppose, thinks that the minister's legislation would at least be harmless. But the minister's legislation is the same kind as my amendment, and with the same motive, only it does not go so far in making provision against clever evasions, which I am endeavouring to prevent. My amendment says that no person who is in any way interested in an elevator shall be in any way interested in buying or selling grain, and that means as a shareholder in either. I think this parliament has power to make it an offence to be interested in buying or selling grain under those circumstances.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Would my hon. friend tell the committee what would result supposing A was interested in both?

Mr. KNOWLES. I think he would be liable to the penalty under the law. If he becomes a shareholder in a company, it is his business to know what the business of that company is. The amendment says that no person who is in any way interested in an elevator should be in any way interested in the buying or selling of grain; it would, as a matter of law, of course, be that he would have to be aware of the fact that he was wrongfully so holding stock in two companies, as no man can unconsciously commit a crime.

Mr. MEIGHEN. There is no penalty provided in this clause.

Mr. KNOWLES. There is a penalty provided in the Bill for the infraction of any of the provisions of this Grain Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Will my hon. friend name the clause?

Mr. KNOWLES. 242 says:

> Every person is guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty... who, while owning, managing, operating or being otherwise interested in any terminal elevator, buys or sells grain at any point in the western inspection division contrary to the provisions of section 123 of this Act.

243 also says that every person guilty of an infraction of this Act is liable to a penalty. I think these two clauses fairly cover my hon. friend's question. My point is that the minister's suggested legislation is of the very kind and the very principle on which my amendment is based, except that my amendment goes to a logical conclusion, and makes it effective.

Mr. MACLEAN. (South York) Would not state ownership of the terminal elevator make evasion impossible ?

Mr. THOMSON. Qu'Appelle. Sure.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Then if the farmers are suffering under these disabilities, should not that be the underlying principle of this Bill ?

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). We are quite satisfied to do that.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The hon. member is surely hardly serious in asking the House to enact legislation that would have that effect. It would throw on the officers enforcing this law a burden greater than the whole burden of the Criminal Code in Canada to-day. How could they go over the 7,000,000 people in Canada, and find out if any one of them has a share in each of two companies? If John Brown wished to have stock in two companies he could have his stock in one in his own name, and in the other in his wife's name, and if he had not enough wives, he could have it in the name of any other citizen of Canada.

Mr. KNOWLES. Would that argument not apply as well to the legislation proposed by the minister?

Mr. MEIGHEN. The legislation of the minister, if it could be carried into effect, would be reasonably useful. I do not believe that it can be carried into effect.

Mr. KNOWLES. The wife business would work just as well in what the minister suggests as in my amendment.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Certainly, but the burden of enforcing it would not be so great. The amendment is absurd on its face, because there would be nothing in the way of an intent to violate the provisions of this law in a man having a share in each of two companies. To attempt to enforce such a regulation as the hon. gentleman has proposed would be too absurd for consideration.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). The argument of the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen), is against both of these proposals. He has not confidence in either. The only way to effectually stop this evil is by complete government control of the terminal elevators.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). One step at a time.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). I agree with what the last speaker has said in regard to public ownership, provided it is applied to all terminal elevators. Then we would not need this section. The only reason we need it now is that we are not sure we are to have public ownership or operation of all terminal elevators. I do not think the hon. member for Portage la Prairie has answered the objection to his argument raised by the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles). There would be no more difficulty in enforcing the hon. member's amendment than the section as proposed by the minister. If the principle laid down in the section is correct, then the amendment of my hon. friend is only bringing that principle to its legitimate conclusion, and unless you adopt some such amendment you might as well abandon the section. I cannot understand the hon. member (Mr. Meighen) being prepared to vote against the amendment suggested, and in favour of the section as proposed by the minister.

As to the point just raised that the suggested amendment would not be effective, I have tried to follow my hon. friend, but I must say I cannot see its force. I can hardly fancy him raising such an argument in court. Take the illustration he gives. A, B, and C are interested in a terminal elevator, and also in the purchasing business. Suppose that A, B and C are interested in the Saskatchewan Grain Company, buying in the interior, and in the Fort William Terminal Elevator Company. It is quite true that you would not be able to prosecute the Saskatchewan Grain Company under this, but why can you not prosecute A, B, and C who may be interested in both companies. They could be prosecuted, they come within the section as it is proposed to be amended.

As to the legislation being unusual, I think the legislation proposed by the minister is unusual, but I do not think that should condemn it. Why condemn legislation because it is unusual? Are we to be continually trailing behind other people? Have we not as much right to originate legislation as any one? In regard to the grain trade, I think we are best qualified and in the best position on earth to introduce new legislation. If my hon. friend is worrying about legacies I would have no objection to a clause excepting the recipient of a legacy of stock until he has had time to dispose of it. That is not a serious matter. I would like to see the whole section dropped as utterly useless or else to follow it to its legitimate and

reasonable conclusion, and make it effective.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Half a loaf is better than no bread.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). But when the half loaf crumbles to nothing in your hands, it is useless. You would not get the half loaf after all.

Mr. McCRANEY. Judging by what the minister said the other evening when we were considering this section, I was not at all sure that he considered there was a grievance. The operation of the terminal elevators appears to him to have been so satisfactory within the last year or two, at any rate he expressed his satisfaction with it, that I am not sure whether in his own mind he thought any legislation on this point necessary. However, it is in the Bill, and we must take it as it stands. I think my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) is right, that this section will be wholly ineffective to carry out the purpose for which it was intended. if the machinery of two companies may be put into operation, as the hon. member says it may be. I have no doubt that if evasion is intended, it will be accomplished by that method. We ought to decide as to whether we want an effective section or not. If we do we should pass some legislation such as my hon. friend from Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) suggests. If we are not going to pass effective legislation, then we should drop the clause altogether, and perhaps the minister will consider again taking up that policy which was laid down by his leader before the elections, to have the terminal elevators owned by the government, which will afford an effective remedy.

Mr. TURRIFF. If we are going to do anything to remedy the evil that has existed, and certainly in the minds of the growers of the wheat a very serious evil does exist, the one way to remedy it is to prevent the men who own the terminal elevators from buying and selling any wheat in the interior elevators. Apparently that has been brought home to the minister, because he presents a clause in this Bill ostensibly for the purpose of preventing that, but when we come to look into it we find that in the judgment of a great many members of the House who have given most attention to the matter, this clause will not accomplish what the farmers of the west want and what the minister started out to give them, namely, to prevent the owners of the terminal elevators owning and operating and dealing in wheat in the interior elevators. If that is really the intention of the minister, what possible objection can there be to making that clause mean what apparently it was intended to mean at first. Either make the clause accomplish what it is intended to accomplish, or don't try to deceive the farmers of the west by putting in a clause that apparently meets their case when it actually does not. If the government is determined not to give that protection to the wheat growers of the west; if the government is determined not to prevent the man who owns a terminal elevator from dealing in wheat in the interior, then drop the clause altogether because as it is now presented by the minister it will not prevent any single terminal elevator owner from being interested in the elevators in the interior and dealing in grain to whatever extent he likes. This is one of the difficulties the minister finds himself in on account of not carrying out the policy his leader advocated. Throughout the west during Mr. Borden's tour last summer, the right hon. gentleman promised definitely and without any reservation that if he came to power the government would own and operate the terminal elevators as a public utility. If he would carry out that policy now you would get over all the difficulties that arise in these clauses. And, while I must admit that I am not much in favour of government ownership of public utilities yet if there is one thing on the face of this earth that a government should be able to do well, it is to run terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur. It can be done without any loss whatever to the government. The fees charged at the present time for putting the grain through these elevators and storing it will pay the cost of operation, and will also pay interest on the investment, if they are bought or leased on any reasonable terms, as they can be. Here is an opportunity to do what the farmers of the west want and what the leader of the government said he would give them. But, instead of doing that the Minister of Trade and Commerce brings forward a clause that ostensibly is to prevent the owners of terminal elevators from dealing in wheat in the interior, but which does not accomplish that end at all. Either make the clause mean what it purports to mean or wipe it out altogether and not try to hoodwink the farmers of the west.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The purpose of the clause, as it stands, is to, if possible, obviate the possibility of collusion between the grain man and storage man to the detriment of the public. In seeking to achieve that object, the clause goes to the extent of placing obstacles in the way of such collusion. The amendment moved by the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) in an endeavour to meet the same end, creates a condition of affairs

that is worse than if we never attempted to remove the difficulty at all, because it places on the statutes, laws that bring about an absurdity. I must say that for my own part I very largely agree with the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean), and with other hon. gentlemen who have stated that if we are to obtain this object in its entirety the only way is by public ownership of the elevators. I am not so recent a convert to that principle as are hon. gentlemen opposite. I can remember when I urged this principle in this House and met with the determined antagonism of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), and the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely), and of many others of those gentlemen opposite, antagonism not only by their speeches but by their solid party vote. No one welcomes more than I do the step taken by the government in the matter; they have adopted the principle of government ownership; they have conceived it their duty to the people of Canada to move not hurriedly, but slowly in the matter, and as they go step by step in the principle of government ownership of elevators they learn as they go, and the advantage will accrue to the people of Canada. I believe that a great part of the object to be served by this clause can also be served by forcing the railway companies so far as possible to operate their own elevators, and I earnestly hope that the government will see its way to adopt that principle, and to push to the utmost extent it can, the necessity of these railway companies operating their own elevators instead of leasing them for operation.

But that means the adoption of the principle of government ownership, which they have done, and I am glad to see that they have done it, and, by forcing the railway companies to operate their own elevators, they will meet to a large extent, the object in view, under clause 123; and Sir, I will welcome, as everybody on this side of the House will welcome, the newly-found allegiance of hon. gentlemen opposite, now that they know what the sentiment of western Canada is, in this regard. I will welcome their assistance, and I only regret that we had not the eloquent voice of the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Thomson) in the last parliament, because I can see, from the manly stand that he has taken here, that he would not have yielded to the party whip in this House, session after session, but would have been one of the bolters, and would have gone the whole road that was so often threatened to be gone, by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff).

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). I do not wish to divert the debate from where it is at the present moment; but something of the widest national importance has come out in this debate. We have laws in this country creating corporations, and these laws are constantly resorted to for the purpose of evading the general law for the protection of the public welfare of this country. We are bound to continue the incorporation of companies by general Act or by special Act, but some day soon we must provide a general law that when an incorporation is used for the purpose of evading a law which is intended to protect the public welfare, or for the purpose of getting ahead of the public; the company doing so, will lose its charter. We shall have to deal with that question at an early day, both from a federal and a provincial point of view.

Mr. BURNHAM. How would the hon. member deal with that question?

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). If a number of men, in order to evade the public law, sought incorporation, when that fact was proved the Act of incorporation would be forfeited.

Mr. OLIVER. Section 123, now under discussion, was made a part of Bill (Q) of the Senate last session, for the purpose of separating absolutely the business of the storage of grain in terminal elevators from the business of buying grain at country points. The section was framed for this purpose, and the reason was, that it was admitted in the evidence that had been given, that there was no possibility of a government inspection of terminal elevators while they were in the hands of grain dealers, that would effectively prevent the mixing of grades. In the expectation that some provision would be made that would have this effect, section 123 as it was first introduced was framed. What my hon. friend from South York has said is absolutely true. It was recognized by the government at the time that section was framed that the condition which was said to exist must be remedied. It was expected that it could be remedied by a provision such as is contained in this section; but it was thoroughly understood that section 13 of this Bill, which was sections 16 and 17 of Bill Q, was the evident intent of the then government in that matter. The intent is clearly set out in these two sections, the one being party to the other. So that a certain purpose was intended to be achieved. If it could be achieved under section 123, well and good. There was less disturbance of then existing trade conditions than would occur if advantage were taken of the provisions of section 13. But if on experiment it was found that the provisions of section 123 were not sufficient, then the alternative was already embodied in the Act of government operation of terminal elevators. When the Bill came to the Commons, it was intended that section 123, as it is repeated in the Bill now before the

House, should be amended so as to make it conform more nearly to the principle that it was intended to express. My hon. friend from Portage la Prairie and his colleagues from the west will remember very distinctly that they took advantage of the conditions that existed at that time to prevent the Bill from either being amended or being passed in its unamended form.

Mr. LANCASTER. Did the government move the amendments which the hon. gentleman speaks of in the House ?

Mr. OLIVER. I did not say the government did.

Mr. LANCASTER. Did any one ?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. LANCASTER. Then how do we know anything about them ?

Mr. OLIVER. If the hon. member will do me the courtesy of listening to what I say, he will know.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman is telling this House that it was intended to make the amendment. Where was the intention manifested ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am stating a certain intent, and I expect the hon. gentleman to take my word. This section of the Bill comes before this House now in exactly the same form as it came in the previous session, and the House has to face the position now as it faced it then; and it is for those hon. members who at that time declared their opposition to the Bill, because they said that it did not provide for government ownership of elevators, either to secure the amendment of that section so that it will be effective or to declare here and now for government ownership of terminal elevators.

There is a purpose to be served which every member from the west is well aware of, and I am sure other members of the House as well are aware of. It makes no difference whether that purpose can be served under the principles laid down, or proposed to be laid down, in this section or not. If it cannot be served under the principles laid down, or proposed to be laid down, in this section—and my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) says it cannot— then it is for him, if he supports government ownership, to get up in this House and say so and back his statement with his vote.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) has stated what he meant to do, but he knows, and every member of the House who was here on the 19th of May last year knows, it would have been absolutely impossible to have carried out his intentions.

Mr. LANCASTER. He never manifested the intention.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I have not Bill Q. here, but it contained, I think, the same number of clauses that are to be found in the present measure. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) knows very well whether he acted purposely or not—I am not aware as to that—but this Bill was brought down on the 19th of May, the day upon which this House adjourned, and yet he tells us he expected this Bill, the criticism of which on his part at least a week has taken, to pass.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. The ex-Minister of the Interior would lead us to believe that his intention was to have the Bill properly criticised and then placed upon the statute books of the country so that a grain commission, or any other body of men, could work intelligently under it, all in one day. Certainly we objected to putting the Bill through in one day because it was an absolutely impossible thing to do, a fact which he certainly knew himself. The hon. gentleman therefore should not be so sensitive when his intentions, as he expressed them, are not taken at their full value.

Mr. KNOWLES. The debate has had reference to the question as to the stand of members on both sides of the House on the matter of public ownership of terminal elevators. As I take it our stand is not so much that we are committed at this moment to the theory, or the principle, of government control and operation of government elevators, as that we are committed to the theory and principle that when a gentleman advocates a certain measure before the people of Canada for their support, and makes solemn promises as did the Prime Minister, he should carry those promises into effect.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. When did you start to do that?

Mr. BLAIN. What about free trade?

Mr. KNOWLES. When did we start?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLES. Hon. gentlemen opposite have thrown the taunt across the floor of the House that we did not lower the tariff. The tariff was lowered degree by degree, and a good, substantial reduction in the duties was made. That taunt is used only for political effect by hon. gentlemen opposite, including the Conservative member from the prairie provinces.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Did my hon. friend vote for the reduction of the tariff on agricultural implements?

Mr. KNOWLES. Where ?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. In this House,

Mr. KNOWLES. Was there ever a vote on it ?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Certainly there was a vote on it.

Mr. KNOWLES. I question the truth of the hon. gentleman's statement. There never was a vote on it in this House.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I say most definitely that there was a vote taken in this House to reduce the tariff on agricultural implements from 17½ to 10 per cent, and the hon. gentleman himself spoke against it.

Mr. KNOWLES. It is the old circumstance of our Tory friends.

Mr. FOSTER. (North Toronto) Now when was the start made ?

Mr. KNOWLES. What my hon. friends lack in argument they make up in noise. I still make the statement that there was not a vote taken on that question in the House. The member for Portage la Prairie (Mr.Meighen) who wishes to interrupt cannot question the accuracy of my statement, because he was not here at that time.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I read your speech.

Mr. KNOWLES. Strange though it may be, we got along at that time without the magnificent and wonderful mind of my hon. friend (Mr. Meighen), and I think we can get along equally well to-day. I will not cross swords with that hon. gentleman, because his word will not be accepted as against mine when he was not a member of the House at the time. I say again that a vote was not taken.

Mr. MEIGHEN. If the hon. gentleman will say he did not speak against that motion I will accept his word for the present.

Mr. KNOWLES. I am not dealing with my hon. friend's acceptance of the matter.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. KNOWLES. Hon. gentlemen laugh. The weaker the case is the louder they laugh, and they will laugh a great deal louder before I am through. I make the statement that in this House since the hon. gentleman (Mr. Schaffner) came here —and he was here one year before me— there never has been a vote to reduce the duty on agricultural implements. What my hon. friend is referring to—and he must know it from the records—is this: A more or less politically cowardly move was made in committee—

Mr. SCHAFFNER.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. KNOWLES. I say politically cowardly. I do not accuse the hon. gentleman personally, I say it was cowardly politics to bring up a motion in committee of this House, where hon. members voted on it and did not have any record made as to how they voted. I make the statement still, that there never was in this House on the subject referred to, a vote such as the hon. gentleman speaks of. If he will state that there was a vote in the committee, I will say he is correct.

Mr. LENNOX. That is mere quibbling.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I still say a vote was taken in this House. Where else would the committee be ?

Mr. KNOWLES. My hon. friend means the building, I suppose ?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I mean in this par ticular chamber.

Mr. KNOWLES. Then if my hon. friend will say a vote taken in this chamber—

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Yes, a vote taken in this particular chamber.

Mr. KNOWLES. There is many a thing done in this chamber.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. In this chamber during a session of the House. What more do you want?

Mr. KNOWLES. What more do I want, nothing except to repeat what I just said that there has not been any vote in this House such as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Schaffner) stated. If my hon. friends opposite want to haggle over the point they can do so, but the question can be decided by the record. The record shows that the resolution was never voted on in this House, but in committee. And I say it shows political cowardice on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite that they did not dare to divide this House when the question came before it. Had that course been followed, the present Prime Minister and Minister of Trade and Commerce would have voted with us on that occasion, for in the committee they did on that occasion vote with the Liberal party, and practically all the Conservatives on the committee so voted. It was a political dodge to deceive the farmers in the prairie provinces. They were afraid to divide the House on the question, and since that, there has been no opportunity afforded for taking a vote by which hon. gentlemen could place themselves on record. More than that, I want to say, that if on any occasion hon. gentlemen opposite bring up the same cheap clap-trap in order to deceive the farmers, my stand will be with the party which sides with

the farmer and which has devoted its best efforts in the past to the lowering of the tariff.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Did not the hon. gentleman have a resolution on the order paper to the same effect which he purposely refrained from moving, and so blocked discussion for a year?

Mr. KNOWLES. No. I say that is not so.

Mr. LENNOX. That is on the record, too.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Perhaps my hon. friend will now come to the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLES. I have no objection to discussion with the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen), but I will not be detained by the hon. gentleman from Simcoe (Mr. Lennox). I draw the line at some things. I have a word or two to say in regard to whether this government is consistent in its course with respect to the matter of public control or operation of elevators. I have before me the Winnipeg 'Telegram' and, in its issue of June 20, 1911, at page 12, column 6, I read the following words spoken by the present right hon. Prime Minister:

I have arrived at the conclusion that the result can only be attained by state control and operation of the terminal elevators. We propose to carry out that policy without delay if returned to power.

The committee will especially mark the words:

Without delay if returned to power.

Now, permit me to read one or two more such utterances before I speak of the statement and the promise there made. I turn to the remarks of the right hon. the leader of the government, then leader of the opposition, made at Brandon on the 20th June last, and reported in the Winnipeg 'Telegram' of the 21st June, page 12, column 3:

I stated at Winnipeg, and I state here, that the government control and operation of them is the only effective method of putting an end to these grievances, and we are prepared to stand for that and for the moderate and reasonable statement put forward by my friend who assisted me on that question.

And later on in the same speech:

If it should be the will of the people of Canada to impose upon me the great responsibility of being called upon to form a government in Canada, and after that government has been formed the policy I have outlined will be carried out by the government as I have stated, or one man of the government will go out of public life.

Could you get a promise more exacting, one whereby a man more fully ties himself up to the words he has uttered? He makes the promise that government control and operation will be carried out without delay, declares that it is the only effective method of solving the problem, and says that if he is returned to power and the government he forms does not carry out this promise there will be one man less in public life. If that means anything, it means that government control and operation would be carried out at once or the right hon. gentleman himself would not only resign from the government but would leave public life. If it does not mean that, it does not mean anything.

Now, let me read also the report of the meeting at Estevan, reported in the Winnipeg 'Telegram' of June 22:

Mr. Borden told the grain growers as he did at Brandon, that he was heartily in sympathy with the agitation for speedy government construction and ownership of the Hudson Bay railway, the government ownership and control of the terminal elevators, and the inauguration of the chilled meat industry, and so on.

This was the promise, plainly and absolutely made in June last. The right hon. gentleman has had control of the affairs of this country for several months. We have asked, time after time, what is his policy on this question? The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) tells us that, apparently by way of experiment, a small experiment, there will be one or two elevators taken over by lease, and run and experimented with. Is that government ownership and control? Will that solve the problem? Will that remove the evils of faulty grading or prevent the manipulation of the product of the farmer's toil? No hon. member of this House will say that the Prime Minister is going to solve the problem in that way. The most that can be said is that he is going to experiment with it. Was it an experiment that he promised in June last? No, he was convinced then and declared that the policy would be carried out. Now he experiments, he plays with the question.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is the hon. gentleman objecting to a beginning being made?

Mr. KNOWLES. I object to the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden), coming to my constituency and telling my constituents one thing, and then coming here to Ottawa and doing another.

We have had a number of promises from these gentlemen who are now in power. I wish to refer to some of them to shew the general system of the present government. Many of their supporters elected in Ontario were elected be-

cause they promised that if the Conservative party got into power, a law should be passed to legalize the marriages —the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) can tell me the wording of it.

Mr. LENNOX. Who made the promise?

Mr. KNOWLES. The people of Ontario were promised that if they would vote for these hon. gentlemen——

Mr. LENNOX. Where was the promise made?

Mr. KNOWLES—they would insist on there being put through parliament at once an Act legalizing marriages in the province of Quebec. And when it came to voting on the matter, there were five—the famous five, the faltering but faithful five— who voted for it, and the rest voted to hoist the thing over to the old country. A second illustration is the Farmers' Bank; some promised the shareholders of the Farmers' Bank that they would get their money back for them. Vote for us, said the present Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers), and our government when it comes into power will give you poor farmers back the money that these thieves took from you. Is that promise being carried out? Take another: The double play on the navy question. The members on the other side from the province of Quebec told the people: Vote for us and at the very first session the Navy Bill will be repealed and this whole question settled forever. And we find that, only yesterday, in another place, the leader on the government side there announced that the matter would not be touched this year, and the whole Conservative party in that House, including a minister of the Crown, voted against the repeal of this Navy Act which some gentlemen supporting the government promised would be repealed this session if they came into power, and if not so repealed these gentlemen stated they would resign, but there is no repeal and the hon. members from Quebec remain with us. And we find this party that has come into power on the strength of promises with regard to Ne Temere, the navy, the Farmers' Bank——

Mr. LEMIEUX. The school question.

Mr. KNOWLES—yes, and the school question, and the control and operation of terminal elevators, is not carrying out one of these pladges. They have got the votes, they have fooled the people. What more care they? There is but one exception to their complete failure to carry out their promises. I see the Minister of Finance (Mr. White), is here and in good humour. He has carried out one promise that was made. But the promise was not made to the common people. This was not a promise to the thousands of Protestants in all the Ontario ridings like that other promise, that if they would put out of power the leader of the late government Ontario would have such an ascendancy that the marriage question would be dealt with in a way to please them. It was not a promise made to the poor habitant of Quebec like the one that the Navy Act should be repealed. It was not a promise such as that made to the poor farmer of the northwest, that there should be government ownership and operation of terminal elevators, nor is it their promise to the trusting farmers with worthless bank stock in his hands. No, this was a promise made to their masters, the manufacturers, that if the party now in power should succeed a Tariff Commission would be established. That is the one and only promise that they have kept.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. KNOWLES. I have another amendment which I will explain before I read it. so that hon. members may understand it better. The main section—an amended section—which the Minister of Trade and Commerce has placed in your hands, Mr. Chairman, provides that 'subsection 1 of this section shall not apply to any person who owns, manages, operates or is otherwise interested in any terminal elevator' which has been leased to the board or with the aprpoval of the board. I think that is too wide. I spoke on this subject the other day, and need not repeat my points. I hold that only the person who owns the elevator, but has divested himself from control and operation, should be protected. The section makes it apply as well to one who manages or operates or is otherwise interested in the terminal elevator thus leased. This defeats the principle of the section itself, and is merely anomalous. If a man owns an elevator and operates it, as a man who prefers straight-forward dealing may well be inclined to do, he is forbidden by this section to buy or sell grain. But if he leases that elevator from its owner, then he can buy and sell grain. Surely, that was not the purpose of the section. We do not want to put the lessee on a better basis than the owning proprietor; so I propose to amend that by restricting it to the person who owns the elevator. Therefore, I propose that section 123 be amended by striking out the words:

Manages, purchases or is otherwise interested in any terminal elevator.

And substituting therefor:

Or is in any way interested in the ownership of any terminal elevator.

Amendment negatived on division.

Mr. KNOWLES. I move that section 123 be amended by striking out the words 'or is managed or operated by persons appointed by the board,' wherever they occur at the end of clause (a) in subsection 2, and thereafter.

Amendment negatived on division, and section 123 adopted.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). We had some conversation about section 169. After looking into it carefully, I propose that section 169 be dropped.

Motion agreed to.

On section 185,—time allowed for loading,

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I move to add at the end of subsection 3:

Nothing in this part shall be construed as requiring the owner of a flat warehouse to insure the grain while in his warehouse.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 208,—conditions respecting carloads to eastern points,

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). We passed this section, but since then we have passed a clause by which a sample market may be established in Calgary and Winnipeg. I wish to add the words 'and Fort William.' This is to bring Fort William in line with Calgary and Winnipeg as order points.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I have no objection to that amendment, but I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), to the fact that when the western route is established and it has been practically recognized by the location of a sample market and the inspection division at Calgary, there will be three spouts, so to speak, by which wheat will be carried from the prairies to the Pacific coast. There are two in existence at the present time, the main line of the Canadian Pacific railway, through Calgary and Crowsnest Pass route through southern Alberta. Later on, when the Transcontinental lines are finished, Edmonton will become a point of entrance for wheat going to the Pacific coast. I would suggest to the minister that he locate an inspector in southern Alberta, to inspect grain that might be shipped by way of the Crowsnest Pass railway to the Pacific coast. As most western members are aware at the present time, the Kootenay Central line of the Canadian Pacific railway is under construction, and when it is completed it will be possible for grain from the prairie to be carried along the route of the Crowsnest Pass and the Kootenay Central to Golden on the main line and then by way of the main line to Vancouver, cutting out the heavy grade between Calgary and Field on the main line. A good deal of the grain, I understand from men who are engaged in the transportation business, is certain to be shipped along the Crowsnest Pass route instead of along the main line of the Canadian Pacific railway. I think, therefore, it would be well for the minister to consider the location of an inspector at the city of Lethbridge. Lethbridge is located in the centre of what is known as southern Alberta, it is the centre also of the great wheat district of that province, and it would be a great convenience to the farmers and shippers if they had an inspector at Lethbridge. If the minister would appoint one there he would greatly please the people in that part of the country. Later on, it will no doubt be necessary to appoint an inspector at Edmonton, for the reason that grain will be shipped from the northern part of the province by other routes than by Calgary.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I have heard what my hon. friend has said in support of this proposition. These things may come to be necessary from time to time, and we have met that possibility by taking power in the Act itself for the erection of a subdivision in any part of the western division.

Mr. OLIVER. Before that section passes I think it would be desirable if the minister would give some explanation of the reason for establishing Fort William on the same footing as Calgary and Winnipeg.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Fort William is included as an order point to meet the necessity and convenience of working a sample market at Fort William. Before long large numbers of cars of grain, instead of passing through Winnipeg on the present routes, will go by northern and southern cut offs, and samples will be taken at those points and brought down to Winnipeg. These cars will go straight through to Fort William. It is necessary to have Fort William as an order point in order that in the interval between those cars having been sampled on these north and south cuts and their arrival at Fort William the samples may arrive there and the operations of the sample market may be carried on.

Mr. OLIVER. My information is that the reason why there is not now a sample market in Winnipeg is not any lack in the the law, for provision is made for constituting Winnipeg an order point for the purpose of having a sample market there, but the fact that there has not yet been tributary to Winnipeg a sufficient trade of the class that is necessary for the carrying on of a sample market, and I would think that the attempt to establish a sample market at Fort William will detract from the advantage of a sample market at Winnipeg possibly to such a degree as to

render the establishment of such a market there ineffective or impossible as a practical matter. The minister should consider that, before providing for the establishment of a sample market at Fort William. He may do more harm than good to the principle of the sample market by unduly multiplying such markets.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I have not lost sight of that, but I do not look for any bad results from this proposal. As to the possibility of a successful sample market at Fort William, it may be realized at once, or it may be realized later, but we have made provision for it in this section.

I have two other amendments, one to section 247, which provides for the repeal of portions of former Acts included in or superseded by this Act. It is also provided that this Act shall come into force on a day to be fixed by proclamation of the Governor in Council published in the 'Canada Gazette.'

Bill reported.

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

APPOINTMENT OF A TARIFF COMMISSION.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 88) to provide for the appointment of a Tariff Commission.—Mr. White (Leeds).

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). When the House was last in committee, I promised to give attention to certain amendments which were proposed by some hon. gentlemen. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) suggested that there should be an amendment providing for the payment of the fees of witnesses summoned before the commission, and that I think desirable. I shall move, following a similar clause of the Railway Act, that in the discretion of the commission or commissioners the like fees or allowances may be paid to witnesses as if they were summoned to attend before the Exchequer Court. Then, my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean) suggested that no person should be compellable to give evidence outside of the province in which he is served with a summons, and I think that suggestion is a good one. I have prepared an amendment following the lines of a similar section in the Railway Act, which I shall ask to have inserted. I may say that my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) is, I think, satisfied with the wording of the amendment which I have drafted. The other amendment, which was more important than either of these, came as a suggestion from the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair). The only objection I have to his suggestion, after having given it consideration, is that it does not go far enough to carry out the intention of the government respecting the giving of information to parliament. My hon. friend from Guysborough, in the course of the discussion, submitted the following amendment:

All evidence and information taken by the commissioners, not held to be confidential under the provisions of subsection 6 of this section, shall be laid on the table of the House within ten days after the opening of parliament.

I have enlarged on the idea of the hon. member (Mr. Sinclair) and I submit the following as an amendment:

Whenever a report has been made under this Act, a copy thereof and a copy of the evidence, if any, taken, and all the information obtained, except such evidence and information as is of a confidential character under subsection 8 of the next preceding section, in connection therewith, shall be laid before parliament by the minister, within fifteen days, after the opening of the session thereafter, or within fifteen days after the making of this report, if parliament is then in session.

I believe the hon. member (Mr. Sinclair) will be quite content with that. My amendment embraces not only the report received during recess between sessions, but the reports received during a session of parliament. Then, subsection 5 of section 4 seems to be limited to the evidence taken, and I think it desirable that information which may be claimed by the commission and which might not be technically considered evidence, if they act on it in any way, should also be submitted with the report. I move to amend the Bill in that direction.

Mr. NESBITT. What does the clause mean by 'summary manner?'

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I explained that the other night. It would mean without the formality of procedure that characterizes proceedings in a court of record.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Without pleadings?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I am thankful to my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) for the suggestion; I think that describes the meaning. I think these are all the amendments that I was asked to consider.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is it proposed that the report with the evidence, shall be printed and distributed like other blue-books?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). That would be a matter entirely within the control of the House.

Mr. McKENZIE. If the report is merely laid on the table, it is not available to all the members, unless it is printed like any other blue-book.

Mr. BORDEN. The moment it is laid on the table of the House, the rule can be dispensed with, and printing can be ordered forthwith. I think it would hardly be advisable to lay down any hard and fast rule in the first instance.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think the amendments substantially follow the lines of the suggestions made on this side of the House.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I may say that the intention of the government always has been, that this information should be laid before the House. My hon. friend from Guysborough suggested an amendment providing in specific terms, that the information and evidence should be laid before the House, within ten days after the opening of the session. The objection we had to that amendment was, that it did not go far enough or as far as we intended to go. Consequently, I am inserting a specific provision to the effect that the report and the findings, with the evidence on which they are based, shall be laid before parliament within 15 days after the opening of the session, or, if received during the session, within 15 days after they have been received.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The amendments, I think, are quite an improvement to the Bill. They do not go as far as we would like to see them go, our contention being that all information, and all the evidence on which the government might act, should be deemed to be of a public character and should be laid before parliament. Of course, if my hon. friend proposes to treat certain evidence as confidential, I do not suppose he could go much further in the matter than he has gone.

Mr. BORDEN. The idea is to leave that subject to the discretion of the commission.

Bill reported with amendments and amendments concurred in.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT—AUDITOR GENERAL'S OFFICE.

Bill (No. 113) to amend the Civil Service Act—Mr. White (Leeds)—read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). When introducing this Bill, I explained to the House that it was made necessary by reason of the provisions of the amended Civil Service Act under which temporary clerks could only be employed for a period of six months during any fiscal year. A great deal of work devolves upon the Auditor General in the auditing and paying of accounts in connection with the Dominion elections. He has engaged a staff of about twenty temporary clerks, but, having trained them, will find it necessary under the present law to dispense with their services. The Auditor General informs me that he spoke to the leader of the former government concerning the expediency of bringing in a Bill of this kind, and that the right hon. gentleman consented thereto. I have spoken to the right hon. gentleman on the subject. I think it is obvious that this is an amendment which should be made to the Civil Service Act. The Auditor General informs me that of the twenty extra clerks employed, two had reached the limit of their engagement, and were discharged. He will require fifteen for the next six months, and a comparatively small number after that until the work is completed. I believe the Bill is entirely non-contentious.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

SUPPLY—PUBLIC MEANS OF COMMUNICATION.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds) moved that the House go again into Committee of Supply.

Mr. JOSEPH E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I wish to deal with a matter which I brought up for the consideration of the House a few weeks ago. On that occasion I offered a resolution of which I had given notice, in favour of the appointment of a commission to gather information for the use of parliament with regard to telegraphs and telephones. I had reached the consideration of the subject of parcels post. I have only one suggestion on this subject to give the Postmaster General, and it is that, in my opinion, it would not be wise in the extension of the parcel post system to go beyond establishing it on rural mail and stage routes, and I believe also that the parcels carried should have their origin at the beginning or on the rural mail or stage routes.

I desire to make a suggestion also with regard to rural free mail delivery. I understand the Postmaster General is about to extend this system to the thickly settled districts. I would urge upon him to take into consideration this fact: That while the late government had under consideration the giving of rural free mail delivery to the people in the thickly settled portion of the country, yet just previous to the last election, they were able, for some reason or other to give to the Liberal candidates in the different ridings perfect freedom in establishing free rural mail routes in any part of their ridings. Many of these routes were established some of them in districts that had formerly been accustomed to tri-weekly mail delivered at the post office and under the change the people of these districts found themselves with a daily mail delivered at their doors.

I hope the Postmaster General will examine into the manner in which these routes were established and will see to it that we have some kind of uniform service in the rural districts. I can well understand that a daily mail service to all the people living in the thickly settled rural portions of our country would saddle the post office with greater expense than it could bear. So I would suggest to the Postmaster General that, for the present at least, in districts where there is only a triweekly mail, if they get that mail delivered at their houses instead of at the post office that would be sufficient in most cases without the expense of a daily mail.

Now, a few words with regard to telegraphs. As I said in my previous remarks the present position of the telegraph companies in Canada is that they are receiving the lion's share of the profits that accrue from handling telegraph messages. I gave facts in regard to the charges they are making in different parts of the country. At an early day we should establish government ownership in telegraph lines and have this service made a part of the postal service. And not only should this be done with the telegraphs but with the telephones as well. It would be quite possible to organize a system under which the municipalities would be able to own, control and operate their telephone systems, while the main lines of telegraph, telephone and cable would be carried on as part of the post office service.

At present, go into the small towns and you will see a telegraph office under a separate organization, in a separate building, a telephone office in another building under a different organization, and the post office in still another. These ought all to be combined under government control. All our wire systems, whether spoken or written, should be under control and operation by the government. There will be enormous savings in this regard in the matter of efficiency which can be brought about by co-operation. We must remember that the telegraph is a by product of the telephone. There is no doubt in my mind that in the near future a great portion of the correspondence from one end of this country to the other will be done by wire instead of by mail. But the greatest improvement we may expect in the near future will be brought about by the extension of our telephone system. To my mind there is no public utility that is proving of greater service in Canada today, not only in the cities but in the rural districts. It is well organized in the cities, and is capable of being wonderfully extended in the rural districts, it is also the duty of this parliament to assist its extension in every possible way. We ought to combine the telephone, telegraph and cable systems, that is, if you want to do the work thoroughly and economically. Take the large trunk lines to the cities and towns, and allow the municipalities to own, control, and operate their own municipal systems and you will then be in a position to give to the people the transmission of their messages at cost. There is no question in my mind that in the near future we will be able to satisfactorily telephone from one side of this continent to the other. I have shown in previous remarks how, on the other side, they are sending telephone messages over a distance of 2,000 miles on the same wire with comparative ease.

This matter is one of vital importance to the rural districts. At the present time it is practically impossible to get the Bell Telephone Company to extend its system into the rural districts, consequently the farmers are compelled to organize companies themselves. There are to-day in the province of Ontario 460 different telephone companies provincially organized, which are chiefly operating in the rural districts. I made some investigation, and I find that ninety per cent of these companies are operating in rural districts, and eighty-five per cent of them are organized by the farmers and men living in rural Ontario, so that they may have the telephone system at their doors. The local government of the province of Ontario, under their Railway and Municipal Board, have issued statistics to show that without a doubt it is a saving to every farmer who has a telephone in his house of at least $50 a year, and with the 50,000 phones that are in operation, it means $2,500,000. Five years age there were only 5,000 telephones in the farm houses in the province of Ontario, while to-day we have over 50,000. So you will see that it is a live question in the rural districts. Let me tell you that only twenty per cent of the agricultural lands in our fair province are under cultivation, and the population in the rural Ontario, instead of increasing, is actually decreasing. Only last night we heard some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House saying that in county after county the population in the rural districts is rapidly decreasing. According to statistics, there are only 21 counties in the province of Ontario. which have increased in population during the last ten years, while 27 counties have decreased. It is therefore our duty to put forth every effort to keep the people on the farms by offering them every possible advantage and assistance in the development of their respective districts.

I wish to say that the Hydro-Electric Commission which has been doing such splendid work in our province, is a proposition very much along the line of the one I am trying to put before this House

to-night. Only a few years ago twelve municipalities offered the Hydro-Electric Commission 23,000 horse power, while to-day there are over 30 municipalities in the province of Ontario which have offered to that commission 44,000 horse power that they may come in and develop. The Hydro-Electric Power Commission bring the wires to the municipalities, and this proposition will bring the telephone system to the municipalties as they bring the trunk wires to the municipalities. The municipalties would then own, control and operate their own telephone systems. I may say that I have received assurances from different cities in the Dominion as well as from different organizations supporting the cause I am now placing before parliament. I might add that the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario distinctly state that it would be an advantage for municipalities of our province to own, control and operate their telephone systems, because in that way they would be able to distribute electric power to the farmers in a manner that they cannot possibly do at present on account of the expense of building pole lines. In the province of Ontario 15 of the 460 companies I have referred to are municipally owned telephone systems, run by the municipalities. The clerk of the municipality becomes the secretary of the telephone company, and all charges are collected with the annual tax. I have under my hand a report from one of these municipalities, the municipality of Rochester, in the county of Essex. It is the lowest assessment of any municipality regarding telephone systems that I know of. It places the actual cost of each phone at only $7 per annum. The system has been in operation four years, and in six years more they expect to have the lines all paid for, and that the actual cost of the system after that date will not exceed $1 per annum. This may seem incredible. But remember that we have a municipal Act which allows any municipality to borrow money at a low rate of interest in order to establish a telephone company. The municipality assesses the subscribers a small amount on capital account each year until in ten years' time they own the whole plant. You can readily see that a large number of cities and towns are taking advantage of that municipal Act.

They can obtain from the municipal government power to issue debentures in order to establish a telephone system in their city, town or rural district, and I am convinced that many cities of Ontario will be only too glad to do this. In the city of Ottawa, I am sure you could find prominent officials ready and willing to undertake the establishment of municipally-owned telephones, if we had public control of the trunk lines of telephones of Canada. Then Ottawa would be able to do away with these unsightly poles on the main streets that are so offensive in this beautiful city. In Australia, power has already been granted to the government to issue debentures and thus raise $10,000,000 for the purchase and extension of the telephone and telegraph systems. Apart from the United States and Honduras we are the only country that does not own, control and operate telegraph systems, and to a great extent the telephone. We had the other night the spectacle of the Minister of Public Works asking this House to vote $23,000 for the payment of rental of telephones used in the government buildings in Ottawa. This amount would go a long way towards defraying the expenses of the central exchange in Ottawa. I was glad to learn that the Minister of Public Works had under consideration the establishment of an exchange by which the different government offices could be connected with one another without resorting to the public telephone system.

May I say a word with reference to cables connecting Canada and the motherland? I was able to show you a few days ago that we had some 17 trans-Atlantic lines between the mother country and Canada and that all these trans-Atlantic lines are owned, controlled and operated by a company whose head offices are in the city of New York, and the bulk of whose stock is owned in that city. It would be a patriotic thing for this government to establish at an early date a Canadian owned line, or even two lines, between Canada and the motherland. I am informed that the expense of building two cable lines would not exceed $5,000,000, and that we would have business for said lines the very day they were opened; it would not be a game of chance, it would be a business proposition from the very start. The company in the city of New York who made the last purchase of cable lines undertook to pay for the four lines that crossed the Atlantic 3½ per cent on $35,000,000 for 99 years, while the actual cost of these four lines could not have exceeded $8,000,000. Thus, it is clear that for many years to come, unless we take some action, we cannot expect to have cheap trans-Atlantic cables. With the present rates, only one per cent of the people on this continent use the cable for any purpose whatever. The small trader or the ordinary citizen of Canada does not make use of the cable, simply because of the expense. If we owned, controlled and operated two cables between Canada and the motherland, the cable tolls would easily be cut in two. Surely it is our duty to secure this great boon. Credit is due

to Sir Sandford Fleming for his splendid work in reference to cables between Canada and Australia-New Zealand, and also his advocacy of cables between Canada and the motherland. A cable can carry 600 messages in one hour, or 1,900 messages in four hours. Most of the cable business is done between ten o'clock in the morning in this country and three o'clock in the afternoon in England. For the balance of the day 37½ per cent of the cable plant is idle. Thus it is a wonder to me that the cable companies have not materially reduced the cost of cables during these idle hours. England spends $1,250,000 per annum in cabling to her consuls and ambassadors. Under competition in 1885 and 1886 the present cable rate was reduced to 12 cents a word and cable traffic doubled during those two years which merely goes to show that the cable rates might well be materially reduced.

A word with reference to wireless telegraphy. Wonderful strides have been made in wireless telegraphy, not only on this continent but on others. I am satisfied the day is not far distant when wireless telegraphy will be used to send messages from this parliament to practically every daily newspaper in Canada at a very small cost. I am also satisfied that wireless telegraphy is going to be of great service in the Hudson Bay district. We have heard a great deal about the ice and the winds of that route and we are told that these will interfere with the handling of grain to the motherland but if we have established on either side of the channel wireless telegraph stations we will be able to obtain exact information as to the winds and the drift ice, and so will be able to guide vessels through the channel and navigation will be kept open for months longer than it otherwise would. It is our bounden duty to develop that system not only for the purpose of giving information of this character but for the protection of life and property at sea. We have had striking examples even within the last few weeks of the saving of life at sea through vessels equipped with wireless apparatus being able to send calls for assistance to other vessels.

It is the duty of Canada to undertake the control and operation of our own wireless telegraph stations, and keep from turning over the productive end of all these systems to companies, while we own and operate the lean end. I quote the following from the Montreal 'Star' of Saturday, February 3, last, which is instructive:

> Canadian Marconi shares sold as high as $4.75 (Montreal equivalent) in London to-day. It startles even the insiders who for months past have considered they were not worth more than $2.00 at the outside. The company has a capital of five million dollars largely water, and some time ago when the shares rose over $3.00, several people were said to have sold out and considered themselves lucky to get as much as they did.

Imagine a capitalization of five million dollars, mostly water, and yet we will be asked in the near future to purchase back at an enormous figure from these people a number of the stations they have erected in Canada. It is up to the parliament of Canada to proceed at once to gather information in order that we may have data to go upon in order to purchase or build great lines of communication in our own land which may ultimately become connected with lines in other countries. The total cost of this would not exceed twenty-five million dollars, or just one year's surplus. Then, in five years, when you have completed your trunk system of wire transmission, our post office would be the centre of that great system and incalculable benefits would be conferred upon the Dominion. I sincerely hope the government will grant this commission because I feel confident that if they do so, sufficient statistics will be placed before parliament to convince every member on this side at all events that this great utility should be taken over by the people, and I feel confident that even members on the opposite side of the House would not then dare to oppose such a project.

Mr. NESBITT. Does the hon. gentleman know if it is a fact, as reported, that the price of telephones has been raised materially in Winnipeg, since the provincial government took over the system in that province?

Mr. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). I have no desire to be driven into a controversy with reference to what the province of Manitoba has done in this respect. I understand that the price of messages has been increased in the city of Winnipeg, but when you take into consideration the fact that they have extended their lines in the rural districts at an enormous expense and granted to the people living in these districts a low-priced telephone service, you cannot wonder that the people in the city who make large use of the telephones should be called upon to contribute.

Mr. NESBITT. I was only asking for information as to whether it was true or not.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). I understand they have increased the cost of messages in the cities to those who are making use of the telephone over a certain given number of messages per day.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I agree in some respects in the remarks of the hon. gentleman about

telephones and telegraphs, but I think the Railway Commission has at present sufficient power to cope with the difficulties we are experiencing as to the cost of these services. A question which, in my judgment, is more urgent, is the question of cheap cable rates. On this matter I wish to quote from one of the world leaders of public opinion on this question, Mr. Henniker Heaton, for twenty-five years a member of the British House of Commons, and recently created a baronet on account of his great services to the postal system of Great Britain and the colonies, and also in connection with cheap telegrams. In a speech delivered twenty years ago, Sir Henniker Heaton said:

> Cheap cabling is the key to all the really momentous problems that confront our statesmen and merchants. It annihilates distance, abolishes delay, bridges the ocean, laughs at the storm, creates trade, nourishes individual and racial sympathies, multiplies our strength, and enables us to mass our collective resources at the threatened point. I shall not be suspected of depreciating postal advantages. The post office is the machinery of thought. But electricity is thought itself displayed in action; the living fire that makes the massive wheels to turn. At this period of the world's history, in face of the refined and perfected strategy employed to appropriate trade, the nation which makes the best use of electric agencies, according to its special needs and circumstances, will be supreme.

At the same time Sir Henniker Heaton draws this sad picture of the condition in which the cable business of the world is still kept. He says:

> Electricity has been appropriated by a long-headed 'trust' just as whisky, beer and other good things have been appropriated. The poor man knows that this subtle force pervades all nature, even to his own body, and that it was intended to be the common heritage of humanity. He hears the long roll of thunder among the hills; he shrinks from the lightning flash; he is exposed to the storm which follows. But if he would avail himself of the marvellous powers of the ubiquitous fluid to send a message of life and death, he is promptly reminded that such luxuries are not for the like of him. He may wish to tell his old father that he is one of the few saved from the wreck—let the old man wait until he can receive the good news by post.

You have in these two extracts, the very kernel of the question before us, and it is a question which has agitated the minds of Canadian and British statesmen for years past. I might remind the Postmaster General who in virtue of his portfolio, is called upon to superintend the cable business in its present limited capacity in Canada, that the Imperial Conference last year and the Press Conference three years ago, urged on the home authorities to use their influence with the cable companies to give the long suffering public a much needed reduction in the cost of cable messages.

The Post Office Department of Canada, for the last five years at least, and I might say during the time it was under the control of my predecessor, Sir William Mulock, on many occasions brought to the attention of the home government the necessity of co-operating with Canada in obtaining reductions in cable rates. At least, during the month of December last, we received a cable from the present Postmaster General of Great Britain, addressed to the Postmaster General of Canada, which read as follows:

> For messages handed in any time up to midnight to-night (Thursday), for delivery Saturday morning, the rate for 20 words, $1.50 and 30 cents for each additional five words or fraction of five words. Week-end letters, messages handed in up to midnight any Saturday for delivery the following Tuesday morning, the rate for 30 words is $1.50, and 25 cents for each additional five words, or fraction of five words.

When my hon. friend brought this message to the House, I sincerely congratulated him on the success which the Post Office Department of Canada had achieved, inasmuch as I before him, and Sir William Mulock before my time, had pressed for such reductions. But, as I stated the other day, this is only the first instalment, and we must expect better treatment from the cable companies, or else there is another remedy which we must apply, that is, a state-owned cable.

My hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong), has given the House some facts in regard to the monopoly of the cable companies. It might perhaps be interesting for the House to know how many lines are operating in Canada. There are at present five companies doing a cable business between Great Britain, Canada, and the United States—the Anglo-American, the Direct United States, La Compagnie Francaise, the Western Union, and the Commercial Cable. The two first are British companies, the third is French, and the last two belong to the United States. The number of cables operated by the five companies is 17. Something very strange happened lately, at the very time my hon. friend received that message from the Postmaster General of Great Britain, stating that reductions would be given; that was, the falling into the American cable pool of the two remaining British companies, the Anglo-American and the Direct United States. After repeated remonstrances had been made by the Postmaster General of Canada—probably by my hon. friend and certainly by myself—that steps should be taken to obtain a reduction of rates from the cable com-

panies the Postmaster General of England did not feel that he would be justified in granting to the two English companies the right to merge with other companies without previously giving reductions to the Canadian public. But, Sir, I repeat that the reductions are not sufficient. They are only a first instalment, and we must have further reductions, or else Canada and Great Britain, or if not Great Britain, Canada must have a state-owned cable between this country and Great Britain.

Mr. Speaker, the history of the cable companies is rather a sad history for the consumer in Canada, and in America generally. The first cable was laid in the Atlantic ocean in 1866. The line was the property of the Anglo-American Cable Company, which had an entire monopoly of the business until 1869, when the French Atlantic Cable Company laid a line from Brest to St. Pierre, and thence to Sydney, Cape Breton. After two months competition, the French company was absorbed by the Anglo-American Company, and thus sole control was obtained by that company. The charges in the early days of the ocean telegraph were simply enormous. They began with a minimum tariff of £20 for 20 words, or £1 for each word, and £1 for each additional word. This rate was reduced to a minimum of £10 for 20 words, and shortly afterwards to £5 for 10 words. It was again brought down to 30s. ($7.50) for ten words of five letters each. In 1867 the practice of making a minimum charge was abolished, and thereafter the tariff was simply so much for each word transmitted. In 1872, the Direct United States Company went into operation. It was a British company. There was a reduction, but the American company at once declared war on the new company, and after two years of unequal struggle, the latter company was obliged to capitulate. The result of the struggle, however, was so far beneficial to the public that the rate was reduced from 4s. to 3s. a word. In 1879, another French company came in. It was the company headed by Mr. Pouyer-Quertier of France. What was the result of the operation of this new concern? The Anglo-American Company and the allied companies made the usual onslaught on the new comer, bringing the rate down to sixpence a word. It started at £1 a word, and competition brought it down to sixpence a word in 1879. This lasted until 1881, when, after a year and a half of rivalry, the Western Union, which controlled the land service in Canada and the United States, resolved to take a hand in trans-Atlantic telegraphing.

Rates were reduced to one shilling a word, and after some months Mr. Gould, who was controlling the Western Union, joined himself to a combine, and immediately up went the rates from one shillng to two shillings a word, In 1884 the Commercial Cable Company appeared on the scene with two cables, and offered a one shilling and eight penny rate for business. The allied companies—that is to say the Anglo-American and other companies— at once dropped their tariff to the same figure which ruled until the 15th of May 1886, when the allied companies after a fruitless effort to come to terms with the Commercial Cable Company suddenly lowered the rate to sixpence a word. This lasted until 1887, but in 1888 the American Cable merger, or the American Cable Pool as it is called to-day, was formed and the rates were all made uniform and put at the fixed figure of one shilling a word. It has remained at that figure until this very day. Now, Sir, we have in this, two facts outstanding: First that when there are companies operating, all this competition will bring necessarily a reduction in the rates, and secondly when the companies merged into one pool, as they did in the present instance, we have the existence of a monopoly. So much so that one of the general managers of the Anglo-American Company discussing in his annual report in 1902 the socalled urgency, as he stated, of reducing the rates defined what he termed a reasonable rate. He said it was a rate which the companies could get out of the public without too much complaint. Now that rate of one shilling has been imposed on the public since 1888 whereas previously the companies had been satisfied to do business with a rate of sixpence a word. Now let us see, from the report of the companies, what the effect was of that sixpenny rate from 1886 until 1888. The Anglo-American Company reported to its shareholders at its annual meeting in January 1888, that as a result of the reduction to sixpence the traffic of the allied companies had increased 162 per cent, notwithstanding the serious inroads made by the Commercial Cable Company. Think what this means, Mr. Speaker. That 162 per cent increase means that if the companies were sending 10,000,000 words a year before the reduction to sixpence, within eighteen months after that period they were sending 26,200,000 words. Therefore this reduction in the rates has been most beneficial not only to the public but equally to the companies interested. Now I claim that the Cable companies with the enlarged business they have enjoyed for several years, now that the public are using more freely the cables across the Atlantic, could to-day at least revert to the old rate of sixpence a word, and I claim that for press messages the companies could very well reduce their rate to threepence a word. It is very important not only for the manufacturer, and the broker but for the merchant, the

immigrant and even the man on the street that we should have reasonable rates between Canada and Great Britain. I hold no brief for the press, although I pride myself on having been a member of the newspaper fraternity many years ago, but I say—

Mr. PELLETIER. Under what name did you write ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I was a Liberal pressman and I have been a Liberal ever since.

Mr. PELLETIER. What signature did you append to the articles you wrote ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I had none, I would have been paid too highly for that signature. But coming back to the advantage that would accrue to the Canadian press and to the Canadian public through low cable rates I say this: At present the cable despatches that we read in the Canadian morning and evening newspapers are more or less tainted. The press agencies are in the hands of American concerns, and I repeat that the news which we receive from England, the news which we consume daily, is more or less coloured. So much so that when a general election takes place in England, I take this as a case in point—the most important newspapers in Canada—the Toronto 'Globe,' the Toronto 'Mail,' the Montreal 'Star,' the Montreal 'Herald,' the Ottawa 'Citizen,' the Ottawa 'Journal,' the Ottawa 'Free Press,' and let me not forget to mention in that array of brilliant newspapers, the Toronto 'World'—are obliged to send special correspondents to England in order to get genuine news from the mother country. I say it is most important, not only from the Canadian point of view but from the imperial point of view also, that our newspapers should be supplied directly from the mother country and get the benefit of low cable rates. Some years ago I happened to attend at the Mansion House in London a very important meeting, convened by the advocates of cheap telegraphic communications. It was presided over by a former Governor General, the Duke of Argyle, and there were present some of the highest authorities in the empire. Members of the Imperial Government, Ex-Governors General, men of the standing of Lord Milner and Lord Strathcona. Lord Curzon was not present but he wrote a letter to the Chairman in which he stated:

> Cheap fares, cheap postal rates, and a cheap and well served press have all played their part in the remarkable growth of Imperial feeling in recent years, but in my opinion a cheap telegraphic service will do more than all these combined.

The Imperial Press Conference was held in London three or four years ago with great eclat, and produced a great impression throughout the whole British Empire. Must I remind the Postmaster General of the following resolution which was then unanimously adopted:

> That for the achievement of better and cheaper electrical communication within the empire, it is one of the essentials that there should be state-owned electric communication between the British islands and Canada across the Atlantic ocean, and also state-control of electric communication across Canada between the Atlantic and Pacific cable service.

Mr. Asquith, who was introduced at that conference by some of our journalists showed himself to be in full sympathy with the aims of the Press Conference as regards the cable situation. As a result of the conference and of the efforts made by the journalists to obtain lower rates, the Pacific cable rates were immediately lowered. The Pacific cable is owned, as we all know, jointly by the Mother Country, Canada, Australia and New Zealand, and is under a board that sits in London, the representative of Canada on that board being no less a personage than Lord Strathcona himself. I have not the figures before me, but the reduction on press rates made by the Pacific cable was substantial. It was reduced to nine pence. And, as a result the Eastern Telegraph Company, which is the great rival of the Pacific cable in that portion of the British Empire, immediately reduced its rates, thus bringing about a result which for many years had been sought by the public of Australia.

When I was in England some years ago advocating, not a state-owned cable but a reduction in the cable rates, after some pourparlers with the cable companies, I was given to understand that we could obtain, after a certain period of time, a substantial reduction. I always assumed that for the urgent cables the present rate might remain—one shilling a word. But I expected that for the social messages, the non-urgent messages, a clear reduction of sixpence a word would be obtained. I hold that the reduction obtained through the good offices of the Postmaster General of England in his interviews with the cable compagnies is absolutely insufficient and will be of little advantage to the Canadian consumer. My hon. friend (Mr. Pelletier) should therefore strive to obtain further reductions, and I would advise him after the session to go to Great Britain and interview the postal authorities and assert the rights of the Canadian consumer. It is not practical—I will say more, it is not patriotic—that the Canadian and the British people should be, as regards cables across the Atlantic, in the hands of an American monopoly.

Now, if my hon. friend cannot obtain the reduction which we advocated, and

which I expected we would obtain, there is only one solution of the difficulty—we must have a state-owned cable across the Atlantic between Canada and Great Britain, just as we have the Pacific cable from Australia to Vancouver. I may be told that this would mean an extravagant expenditure for Canada. Before the last Imperial Conference I prepared for the use of the Prime Minster (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who was then leaving Canada, a memorandum on this question. That is, the memorandum was prepared under my direction by one of the ablest officers of the Post Office Department, Mr. Wm. Smith, who has had great experience in such matters and who was even the adviser of the Newfoundland government some years ago on the question of cable and post office. Now, here is the proposition laid before the Prime Minister of that day before he left for the Imperial Conference:

The cost of a first class cable laid between Canada and Great Britain is placed at $2,000,000,—

Not $5,000,000 as stated by my hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong).

, Mr. Baxendale, the general manager of the Pacific cable, thinks the amount might be reduced with safety, but it is better to be overprudent.

Stations fully equipped for work must be provided at each end of line. For the cost of these we look to the Pacific cable accounts. This we may do with confidence that the figures will be high enough, as some of the stations are in remote and lonely places, and have to be fitted up with a degree of comfort and luxury which would be unnecessary in places in which the circumstances are more favourable. There are six stations in connection with the Pacific cable, and the cost of their construction was £114,512. On this basis the cost of these two stations would be £38,171, or rather less than $190,000. The cost of the cable ship for the Pacific cable was $365,355. We shall adopt these figures for a cable ship on the Atlantic. The total capital expenditure would, therefore, be $2,555,355. There will be an annual charge for interest and sinking fund for the repayment of the capital expenditure at the end of fifty years. I had the actuary of the Annuities Branch calculate the amount of this annual charge, which would be $76,661 for interest and $22,654 for the sinking fund, the rate being 3 per cent.

Proceeding on this basis, the annual charges for the Atlantic cable would be as follows:—

Expenditure.	
Interest on capital outlay..	$ 76,661
Sinking fund..	22,654
Head office expenses..	30,727
Cable stations (salaries and expenses)..	71,360
Cable ship (salaries and expenses)..	57,571
Reserve and general renewal fund....	3,500
Total..	$292,472

Now Sir this is the expenditure, what about the anticipated revenue?

Mr. LEMIEUX.

The actual business passing between Great Britain and Australia by the Pacific cable last year was 960,000 words. All this business went over one or other of the Atlantic cables last year. The Canadian business with Great Britain is not exactly known, but the British post office, in a confidential memorandum written in 1908, placed the business at 2,500,000 words a year. If the rate were made 12½ cents per word between Great Britain and eastern Canada, 1 cent a word would be required for the land lines in Great Britain and 2½ cents per word for lines in Canada. This would leave 9 cents for the Atlantic cable. At 9 cents a word, the present business would yield a revenue of $311,400. This amount would pay all expenses, which are put on a most liberal scale, and yield a surplus of $18,928. There would at once be a vast increase in the business consequent on the 50 per cent reduction in the charges, and before the first year was over the surplus could not fail to be from $100,000 to $150,000.

Now, I had this very conservative report prepared by one of the experts of Canada, and I may say one of the experts in the cable world, Mr. Smith, of the Post Office Department in Canada. We must not minimize the ability of our public servants. I consider Mr. Smith as a decided authority on the cable question. The figures which I quote this evening have been revised by Sir Sandford Fleming, who is also one of the great authorities in the world on the cable question, and I consider these figures are very conservative. Therefore, if the British Postmaster General and the cable companies cannot come to an agreement whereby a substantial reduction will be given to consumers in Canada, and if the British government declines to be a party to joint state-owned cables, then the clear duty of His Majesty's government in Canada is to establish a state-owned cable across the Atlantic. $2,200,000 is a very small capital indeed for a country so rich, so prosperous, so intensely Imperial as Canada is, with no loss in perspective, with a large and buoyant revenue indeed, and with a surplus, a thing which I am sure will receive favour by my very conservative friend, the Minister of Finance.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I have shown clearly the advantage of having cheap cable rates. From an Imperial point of view, from a purely Canadian point of view, from a business point of view, we should have cheap telegraphic communication with the mother country. In order to educate properly the Canadian public, in order that the wells of information may not be tainted or poisoned, we should have a cheap press rate between Canada and the mother country. The cable companies are in some degree at the mercy of the British Postmaster General, because, before operating in England, they must have from the British Postmaster General what we call the landing privilege. He holds a big stick in his hands, and it is probably because of that

stick that the other day he forced the cable monopoly to reduce, but in a very small degree, the rates between Canada and the mother country. Failing a further reduction, I say that we must have a state-owned cable. Mr. Speaker, I wish to conclude by moving the following motion.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Lambton). Might I ask the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) to be good enough to listen to the position which I was placed in. While I referred several times to the motion I intended to move, yet I sat down without moving it. If the hon. gentleman would be good enough—it is the same—

Mr. LEMIEUX. Before my hon. friend proceeds, I wish to say that I listened with pleasure to him the other day for a whole afternoon, and he gave certainly most interesting information to the House, not only on cable rates, but on telegraphic, telephone and postal rates. I think, however, that he neglected the cables in favour of the other subjects he had discussed. I had taken it upon myself to proffer these few remarks, and at the same time, to give notice to the Postmaster General of the motion which I intended to move. Now my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) knew that this evening; he preceded me, he made his remarks, I listened to his remarks, and I hope now that he will listen to my motion and vote for it. I move:

That in the opinion of this House steps should be taken by the Postmaster General with a view to obtaining a further reduction in cable rates between Canada and Great Britain.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). I have listened to both speeches to-night with a great deal of interest. I sympathise with both speakers, but I go further. I am in favour of immediate action by the Canadian government in the direction of state ownership and state operation of telegraphs, telephones and cables in this country. There is an old Greek proverb that says: 'If you wish to play upon the harp, you must play upon the harp.' If you wish to get a reduction in tolls of this kind, the only way to get them, is to get them, and the way to get them is by state operation and competition with the various companies. They are monopolists, they are in the position of dividing great profits among themselves; and as long as you say, We ask you, as a favour, to come down in your rates, they will never do it. But if you go after them with competition by the state, you will effect your purpose. As I have stated in this House before, the monopoly that control cables has its centre in London. It was the most powerful monopoly that was known in London, it was able to reach by its enormous influence, more members of parliament and more members of the cabinet in England than any other monopoly. To-day it is that powerful in England that it is in a position to check, to control the action even of the Postmaster General of Canada. But something worse than that has happened. The control of the Atlantic cables has passed to the Americans, to the very same Americans who control the telegraph companies in the United States, who control the Bell Telephone company in the United States, and the Bell Telephone in Canada, and who have to-day the Canadian Pacific railway and the Great Northwestern Telegraph companies also in their pool and in alliance with them.

The cable, telegraph and telephone business in Canada and the United States is all under this American control which is in alliance with financial interests in London, it is a great interest with connections in every country and so has been able to influence even the Postmaster General and have him hold his hand. So there is no hope of the reductions we would like to see unless we resort to state competition. As the late Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) has said, it would cost only $2,200,000 to equip a first class cable between Canada and Great Britain. A sinking fund would provide that amount, we would secure immediate reduction in tolls and public control in British hands. It is absurd and shows a lack of national and imperial policy to allow capitalists in another country to control the cable and telegraph system of the British Empire. The Germans would not stand such a thing for a day. The time has come in Canada and in the motherland and in other sister states of the empire, for government control, ownership and operation, of all cables, telegraphs and telephones. If we inaugurated a state-owned cable we would have to control the land lines in the interest of that cable. In England they control the cable companies in a way, they have the whip hand there over the cable companies, but it is not effective. If we had a state-owned cable to England and a state-owned telegraph system in connection with a telephone service, every country in the empire and the motherland itself would be able to give these services for one-third the present rates. This would give the press of the empire a first-class news service. I agree with the quotation that has been read from the Duke of Argyle that the greatest boon would be free telegraph and cable service in the interests of the empire. The only way to create a world-wide public opinion is to have the freest interchange by the press of the expressions of public opinion in the different countries. That to-day is impossible. The cable despatches to-day are condensed. they should be much longer and fuller and the only possible means of

securing an improved news service is a state-owned cable.

I have pointed out that this principle of state competition with private owned monopoly is the key to the situation in every one of the great public franchises. In Ontario we have found how effective it is in connection with the distribution of electrical energy, in fact it has been found effective wherever it has been tried. I would like to see it tried, I do not want any commission to gather information for me, all I want is to see the thing put in operation. If a state-owned cable were put in operation between Canada and Great Britain to-day I venture to say that all the companies would reduce their prices and be prepared to sell out to the state at a reasonable rate. Let us have immediately a state-owned Canadian and British cable. If we say we want it the mother country cannot refuse to assume one-half the cost, so important would it be in the interests of the empire, of commerce and journalism. As yet we have not come to that view of the situation and that aggressive enterprise which says: In the interest of our country and of the empire we want a state-owned cable between here and the motherland. The Pacific cable which is a state-owned proposition is proving a great success, it is binding Australia to Canada and to the mother country and has proved that a state-owned cable for a long distance and in a zone where there is less business than on the Atlantic can be made to pay its way. The Atlantic zone has such an immense business and is so profitable that if we had one cable to-morrow, we would have to install another before three months.

Mr. PUGSLEY. How do the rates on the Pacific compare with those on the Atlantic?

Mr MACLEAN (South York). Comparatively, they are cheaper.

Mr. LEMIEUX. They are actually higher, but in proportion to the distance they are lower.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). For the distance and they are taxed the big end of the earnings for the Atlantic section.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is a question of average. They are cheaper when you compare the distance.

Mr. PUGSLEY. You could not take the proportion of distance because when a cable is once laid under the ocean, the only charge is the interest on the capital expenditure.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). The business is not to be compared with the Atlantic zone. There is so much business there, that if we started one cable we would have to have half-a-dozen in a short time and the result would be, that the undertaking would be an immense success. There is no state that does not control its own cables, except Canada, the United States, and one or two others. All the progressive countries of Europe, and they are away ahead of us in progressiveness, own their telephone and telegraph services and some of them have their cable services under the ocean, and they would not depart from that principle, it would be treason to propose in Germany that the land lines or cables should pass out of state control. So with other countries in Europe the efficacy of state ownership has been proved. They talk about cheap telephones in Ontario, but look at the services in Denmark, in Germany, even in Russia. In all European countries there is a good service which is allied with the post office, the centre of communications of all kinds. In that way, the public are saved, they control the whole thing, and the secrecy of the telegraph is maintained. That is an important feature. It is risky for the Empire of Great Britain to be subject to the United States in cabling, to have their messages come under the control of Americans.

If they are told: if you do not do it, Canada will do it, then we will have a state-owned cable and we will get control of our own lines. Two Canadian telegraph lines are in alliance against the Canadian people with this great American monopoly, and the telegraph rates in this country to-day are enormous, and unnecessary, and will be continued as long as we submit to them. The Canadian Pacific railway telegraph charges are twice what they should be, and they are twice in the west what they are in the east and yet the wires are loaded with business. The Railway Commission may bring about some reform, but the only way to bring about a radical cure is to go into competition with them. Let me tell hon. gentlemen what the force of good example does. Immediately after the discussion we had in this House on the parcel post system, the 'New York Tribune' and other papers said: Here, you legislators at Washington, what are you doing; you are making no headway with the parcel post, Canada has declared in her parliament in favour of a parcel post system connected with the postal department and you had better wake up. Well, since that motion was carried in this parliament, they have become active in the United States; fright has seized the express companies and they are offering to reduce their rates or to sell out. The United States despatches to-day say that a measure has been introduced into Congress to buy out all the express companies in the United States for their actual valuation of thirty-nine million dollars. And, in addition to these physical assets of thirty-nine mil-

lion dollars, the American express companies to-day have in their coffers one hundred and fifty million dollars worth of securities that they have saved after paying enormous dividends to their shareholders.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What is the capitalization of the American companies?

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Oh, it is very small actually. It has been enlarged several times in the way of water, but the companies are controlled by the railway companies over which they operate. I may tell the Postmaster General that if he does not hurry up and get his parcel post system going—and I know he is going to give his energy to it—we will see a splendid parcel post system in the United States before we have it in Canada. In the United States the Interstate Commerce Commission has turned its attention to express rates, and the express companies have been discovered to be guilty of the worst kind of petty larceny from their patrons. It has been found that they have collected double rates time after time. After the rate has been prepaid along comes the driver representing these express monopolies in the United States and he collects a second rate in many cases. The Americans see that to-day they are carrying the parcel post of foreign countries through their own country for one-third the price they have to pay on parcels shipped by the express monopolies and the people of the United States will not long stand that kind of thing. I do not disagree with the suggestion of the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) that this should be made the subject of inquiry by commission, nor do I disagree with the late Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) that further conferences should take place, but I do say that nothing of that kind will be effective; the only way to get at these companies is for us to get into the business ourselves. The new principle of this twentieth century in connection with these great monopolies owned and controlled by private companies is that, if you cannot buy them out at a fair price you should go into competition with them. They got their franchises giving them the right to operate in the country and that imposed upon them the duty of dealing out fair treatment to the public and of giving the public a reasonable toll. These companies have failed in their obligation to the people and, having failed, the state is justified in going into competition with them. If we cannot have state ownership, let us have state competition. The cost of stringing telegraph wires across this country is comparatively small, the right of way is easily obtained; we have better poles than are to be found in any other country in the world; we can make the copper wire here if necessary out of our own copper, and indeed telegraph construction in Canada is so cheap that the companies are ashamed to show what it actually costs in comparison with their capitalization. I declare for state competition, and I declare we should start it now. Start it and watch the coon come down and see how quick he will come down when you announce that you are going into the business. As long as they can put us off with promises of concessions, they will do nothing serious. Recently, the public did get a concession, and, strange to say, that concession came one week after the discussion I raised in this House. The coon came down to that extent. It did not happen accidentally; I do not claim the credit for it myself, but I claim that the discussion in this House is entitled to that credit. You will get nothing from those monopolies if you merely say you will negotiate with them. Go into the telephone business and give our farmers cheap phones. I heard reference to-night to the case of Manitoba, and no doubt there have been increases there, and that should be so, but I do believe that the people of Manitoba and Saskatchewan and Alberta would not part with their public owned telegraph system on any account.

Mr. LALOR. What are the telephone charges in Manitoba?

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). I can not give the exact figures, but I know that reductions were made when the province took them over, and we would have reductions in Ontario if we had state-owned telephones.

Mr. MACDONALD. Has not the price been raised in Manitoba?

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Suppose it has?

Mr. MACDONALD. That is not an answer.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). There has been some change in the rate, and the Manitoba government was taunted for not having quite realized what it promised to do.

Mr. OLIVER. That is a very mild statement of it.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Well, I will go so far as to admit, if you like, that public ownership in Manitoba has failed, but I will point the hon. gentleman fifty other instances where it has been a great success in other countries.

Mr. NESBITT. Name one.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Denmark is one; seven dollars a year for a telephone to every farmer in Denmark.

Mr. NESBITT. Why did you not go further for an example?

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Because that is the best example of public ownership. There is a gentleman who is ashamed of public ownership; he is ashamed of the people of Canada, and he thinks they are not competent to go into the business and be trusted with public affairs of that kind. I am prepared to trust the Canadian people in connection with public ownership; I am ready to say to the people of Canada, take over the terminal elevators. I am prepared to see the people of Canada handle their railways, and this government has its one opportunity to make good in regard to public ownership in connection with the Intercolonial railway. There is a great national asset we have. It is based on public ownership. It has not done as well as it could do, but it can be made to do well if it is administered in the public interest.

Mr. MACDONALD. What do you think they should do about the Intercolonial railway?

Mr. MACLEAN. (South York) I would propose to run it as an absolute public proposition, and to extend it to where the traffic is. Bring it into the province of Ontario, and we make it the greatest railway in Canada. Bring it to Toronto and on to the Detroit river. Put it into Winnipeg. I stood in this House 15 years ago, when the late Mr. Blair was Minister of Railways, and when the proposal was made to build the Rainy River railway in connection with the Canadian Northern, and said that the way to increase the railway accommodation of the west was to make that line a portion of the Intercolonial, to bring the Intercolonial immediately from Montreal to the Georgian bay, there connect it with boats, build a line around the lakes, carry it to Winnipeg, and from there spread it all over the northwest. If that had been done at that time, the Canadian west would have had a state-owned railway that would have solved all problems. The lines would have been laid out in a scientific way, so as to secure the greatest efficiency all over the country. There is not efficiency in any railway system of the west to-day, because too many of the lines parallel one another.

Mr. MACDONALD. Is not the Intercolonial all right as it is now?

Mr. MACLEAN. (South York) It could be much better. What is the one way out of the difficulty in connection with the coal strike in England to-day? There is very little hope of a settlement unless the state takes over the coal business. I do not know that I am such a state socialist as to advocate that, but the people of England are coming pretty close to it. At the beginning of this year all the telephone lines in England went into the British post office, and they are now being administered in connection with it. The people's experience of state-owned telegraphs was so good that they took over the telephones, and they must now go into the cable business. They cannot stop at telegraphs and telephones when the cables remain undealt with. To my mind there is nothing for us to do but to get into the business without delay, and to say that we are going to have a state-owned cable. We ought to pass a resolution to that effect this session, and then you would see how the rates would come down. There would be a three-penny rate for all messages between Canada and England.

Mr. CROTHERS. Is not free trade a remedy for all these things?

Mr. MACLEAN. (South York) Perhaps the hon. gentleman can tell us that. There should be a national policy in regard to other things as well as tariffs; but I will not go into that to-night. The more I study this matter in the light of the experience of other countries, the more convinced I am that if you cannot have state ownership, state competition is the one remedy that will bring down tolls. The solution of the northwest railway problem is to put an absolutely state-owned railway in the Canadian west.

Mr. SPEAKER. Might I remind the hon. member that the question is in regard to cables.

Mr. MACLEAN. (South York) The hon. gentleman questioned me in regard to state ownership.

Mr. LEMIEUX. May I be allowed to say that I quite agree with my hon. friend in his suggestion that we should advocate a state-owned cable, and I might have mentioned it in my amendment; but, as it would involve an expenditure of money, I had to avoid it.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). I apologize, Mr. Speaker, for trespassing on your good nature, and I will conclude by saying that the way to bring about the reform is to get into the business of state ownership.

Mr. F. R. LALOR (Haldimand). Mr. Speaker, I have heard the question of the nationalization of telephones, telegraphs and cable lines discussed in this House from time to time. This may be of advan-

tage, and probably is, to the great newspapers of this country which want to gather news cheaply from Great Britain and other countries of Europe, and also to our great manufacturing and commercial centres. But I want to say on behalf of the farmers of this country that there are other things of much greater importance to them than any of these fads. How many people in this country use a cable line? I venture to say not 5 per cent of the people of Canada.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Why?

Mr. LALOR. Because they have no use for it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Because the rates are too high.

Mr. LALOR. Even if the rates were low, they would not use it. I speak as a business man. Occasionally I send a cablegram, but it is of very little importance to me whether we have a state-owned cable line or not, because I use the cable so seldom; and as far as 95 per cent of the people of this country are concerned, I do not believe they are at all interested in cheap cable messages or in a state-owned cable. They would not use it and it would be of little or no value to them. The same thing applies to the nationalization of the telegraph lines. How many of the people of this country use the telegraph lines? I venture to say that 90 per cent of the people of this country do not send one telegram in 12 months. They are of no importance to the farmers of this country. Are the telegraph rates high? You can send a telegram from the town in which I live to Montreal for 25 cents, and you can send a night letter of I think 50 words for 25 cents.

Is there any general demand for anything cheaper than that? Would it be any great advantage to the people of this country that it should be any cheaper? It may be an advantage to a few people who are interested in telegraph lines to a very great extent, but the great majority of our people are not interested in the question whatever. I believe that private capital and enterprise should develop, not only the cable and telegraph lines, but the telephone lines as well. In the county which I represent, rural telephone companies have covered the entire district with telephones. They give the farmers a telephone for $12 per year, and I doubt very much, if in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta, where the province owns these lines, the telephone service is as cheap, or any cheaper at any rate, than it is throughout the province of Ontario, where local telephone companies have been formed, and are operating efficiently. I say, Mr. Speaker, that this question is of very little importance to the great majority of the people. It may be an advantage to the few, but it is not an advantage to the many. Gentlemen who come from the cities, from the commercial centres, may be interested and they do advocate these schemes in the House from time to time, but let me tell the Postmaster General that the farmers of Canada are interested in something of very much more importance to them than projects of this kind, which have been brought before the House. They are interested to-day in a rural mail delivery.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LALOR. If this government wants to do something in the interest of the farmers, that is a matter which they might properly undertake. The farmers are not even interested so much in the parcel post system concerning which we have heard a great deal. Is there any reason why parcels should be carried from Toronto to Vancouver for the same price as they would be carried for, from the town in which I live to Toronto? I do not believe the government should go into that business, and compete with the express companies at the same rate throughout the whole of Canada. The former Postmaster General gave the farmers a little taste of what rural mail delivery is like. He adopted a system of rural mail delivery upon the main mail routes, and I want to tell him that the farmers who received their newspapers and letters daily upon these routes are so interested in it, that in other parts of the province—and I can speak more particularly of Ontario than of any other province, because I am more familiar with it—are strongly asking for the benefits or rural mail delivery and they will never be satisfied until they get it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LALOR. I hope that the Postmaster General and the government will not delay any time in giving to the Ontario farmers a proper system of rural mail delivery. Why should they not have it? The farmers contribute to the revenues of Canada to a very great extent, as we all know. They produce the wealth of this country, and it is upon the farmers that we mainly depend in Canada.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would like to remind the hon. gentleman that he is wandering from the question, which is that of cable rates.

Mr. LALOR. Perhaps I am a little out of order in discussing the questions of rural mail delivery and telephone nationalization, but if I have trespassed it is because others have trespassed before me. I want to say in conclusion that the farmers want from this government rural mail delivery in preference to any of these fads

that we have heard discussed in this House from time to time this session.

Mr. NESBITT. I would not have said anything on the subject had not the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean), made the statement that I was opposed to public ownership, because I asked him a question. I did not say that I was opposed to public ownership, but I do say now that I am opposed to any hon. member taking up the time of the House in talking about some fad, talking in generalities and making a lot of statements in support of which he is not prepared to produce one tittle of evidence. I asked the hon. gentleman a question about Denmark, but I doubt whether he knows anything more about that country than he knows about Manitoba, and that is nothing. Even if they do have rural telephones and telegraphs in Denmark for seven dollars, it does not take very much of a telegraph line to cover the whole burg. Besides that, I doubt, as I said before, whether he knows anything about what they do in Denmark.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Thank you.

Mr. NESBITT. I am opposed to general statements being made without producing facts before a lot of business men such as we are supposed to be in this House.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Hear, hear.

Mr. NESBITT. The hon. gentleman talked about cable rates, but he wandered over many subjects, and it is surprising that he did not touch upon aviation before he concluded. He certainly talked a lot about building railways, and that has no connection with cables.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Hear, hear.

Mr. NESBITT. I would not have spoken if the hon. gentleman had not stated that I was opposed to public ownership. I am opposed to public ownership if it is not carried on in a business way. Talk about carrying a thing for nothing, the state cannot do business for nothing any more than can a private corporation. As a matter of fact in regard to telephones the Manitoba authorities had to arrange their rates.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). I did not say they had not done so. I said I admitted it.

Mr. NESBITT. You said you did not know anything about it, which I can quite believe. I would like to emphatically endorse what my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Lalor) said, as to what the farmers are interested in. The farmers of Ontario, in common with those of the other provinces, help to pay the taxes and they are making no grumble over it. They are paying their fair proportion and they would like to share in some of the benefits resulting from the progress of the country. I hope the Postmaster General will follow up the policy which was inaugurated by his predecessor and make a point of seeing that the farmers get rural mail delivery in a systematic way.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). I would like to say a few words with reference to the motion now before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member has exhausted his right to speak a second time.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). Surely, Mr. Speaker, I have not exhausted my right to speak with reference to the amendment which the member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) has presented to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The original motion is for the Speaker to leave the Chair in order that the House may go into Committee of Supply, to which the hon. gentleman has already spoken. An amendment has been moved now, and I think the hon. member having expressed himself on the original motion, it would not be in order for him to speak again.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). But this is supposed to be an amendment is it not? Do I understand, Mr. Speaker, that I have not the privilege of speaking to the amendment offered by the member for Rouville?

Mr. PELLETIER. Perhaps I may be allowed to make a suggestion. The motion to go into Committee of Supply was made by the Minister of Finance, and my hon. friend from East Lambton, (Mr. Armstrong) spoke to that without proposing any resolution. Then the member for Rouville presented an amendment to the main motion, and I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that by the rules of the House, a new question is before the House on the amendment. I should therefore, think that the hon. member for East Lambton would have the right to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER. Following the usual practice, the hon. member would have the right to speak, but, unless my memory is very much in fault, it has been ruled in this House that when a motion is made to go into Committee of Supply, and an hon. gentleman has once spoken, on it, he has not the right to speak again upon an amendment to that motion. Personally, I am not opposed to any hon. member speaking, but I would like as far as possible, to facilitate the work of the House, and keep members within the customary usages. Of course, if it is the pleasure of the House to allow the hon. gentleman to proceed, I have no objection whatever.

Mr. HENDERSON. With regard to what has been the practice, according to my recollection, in a case of this kind, the member for East Lambton would have a perfect right to speak, but I think he would be obliged to confine himself to the amendment. That is the view I take on the point, and I think it has been so ruled by former Speakers.

Mr. SPEAKER. No matter who speaks after the amendment is moved, the rule is, that he should confine himself to the amendment.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is quite correct, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). That is what I wish to do—to confine myself to the amendment now before the House, a copy of which I have before me. The ex-Postmaster General, the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), has presented an amendment asking for a reduction in the cable rates between Canada and Great Britain. He is well aware that the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) has taken steps in that direction. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman should take this means of preventing me from placing before the House the motion which he well knew, from the remarks I made this evening, that I intended to move. Taking advantage of the fact that I happened to sit down without making the motion and did not wish to interfere with his speech, he proceeded to bring in a motion to take away a portion of that which he knew full well I desired to place before the House. It was a very clever piece of business, no doubt. But he knows that the motion he has made is a mere academic motion and has no meaning worth speaking of. It is strange that the ex-Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) becomes so anxious to deal with this question. He was for a number of years the Postmaster General of this Dominion and was in a position to deal with these matters effectively. But instead of doing so, he waits until he is placed in opposition, and then tries to run away with a portion of a resolution which he knew was on the order paper. But we saw the hon. gentleman, when Postmaster General, forced to effect reforms in the public interest. We remember how year after year he condemned rural free mail delivery. Again and again in this House he has spoken of it as a luxury, and said it could not be thought of for Canada until we had twenty millions of people. He condemned it in every way, shape and form. But a few days previous to an election he stands on a platform in Niagara and tells the people of Canada what a wonderful boon he is going to give to them in rural free mail delivery. I believe that the time has come when we should take steps in this House to provide means by which we could protect at least the resolutions we place on the order paper so that they could not be made use of as we have seen them made use of here within the last few weeks. The hon. member himself (Mr. Lemieux), on the occasion a few weeks ago when I was talking on this important subject, rose during my remarks and made this statement, as will be found at page 2330 of the unrevised 'Hansard':

Mr. LEMIEUX. I understand many members of the House would like to speak on this question and, as I am afraid if the hon. gentleman speaks until six o'clock, the question will be automatically out of the order paper, therefore I would ask the hon. member to move the adjournment.

The hon. gentleman knows full well that that matter was left over and that the following day a portion of it was taken up by another member of this House and dealt with to a certain extent. A little later I withdrew it from the order paper for the purpose of bringing it up on going into supply and dealing with it definitely, according to the motion I had prepared.

Mr. LEMIEUX. On the occasion to which he refers the hon. gentleman himself spoke for three hours on the subject.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). Mr. Speaker, it was not two hours. And if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) could place on 'Hansard' more definite and useful material for the benefit of those discussing this question, than I did, I should be glad to give way to him. If, instead of bringing in an academic motion which on the face of it means nothing, the hon. gentleman had fallen in behind the motion which he knew I expected to place before the House, he would have been supporting something worthy of him. That motion would have declared:

That, in the opinion of this House, a commission should be appointed to investigate the systems of National telegraphs and telephones, wireless telegraphs and cables; also postal conditions, laws and regulations, parcel post, means of collecting and distributing mails, with a view to submitting such data and information to the Post Office Department as would help to improve existing conditions in all the above; and to further inquire into postal facilities in rural districts in other countries in order that a better system of rual free mail delivery may be inaugurated.

The labours of this commission would result in gathering such facts and figures that even the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) would be satisfied that the House could deal intelligently with these 'fads,' as the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Lalor) chooses to call them. It is not so many years ago since many of these hon. gentlemen looked upon free rural mail delivery as a fad. The day is not far distant when we, as a parliament,

will be compelled to take up these matters and deal with them definitely. Some hon. members seem to think that national organization of the telegraph and telephone is not in the interest of the people of the rural districts. In the figures I gave the House I showed that there were 460 independent telephone companies in the province of Ontario at the mercy of a public corporation that was all-powerful. And instead of our being able to control the trunk lines and connect up these independent companies, giving them long distance rates at cost, these hon. gentlemen are glad to have this concern make the amount of money out of this service that it is making at the present time.

However, I do not wish to take up more time. I have only to say that I am surprised at the ex-Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) not being generous enough to allow me to read the motion which I expected, and which he fully knew I expected and intended, to place before the House this evening.

Hon. Mr. PUGSLEY. I believe I express the opinion of the majority if not of all the members here present when I say that my hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) has no reason whatever to find fault with the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Armstrong) concluded his remarks and took his seat without presenting his motion to the House. My hon. friend from Rouville had every reason to believe that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Armstrong) did not intend to make a motion. So that it was quite in order for my hon. friend from Rouville to make his remarks and to submit his resolution to the House.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Did not I refer several times to the motion I intended to move? And in starting out did not I distinctly state that I was bringing forward the notice of motion to which I had referred some weeks ago in the form of a motion to be placed before the House?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was here during a portion of the time my hon. friend was speaking, and certainly I was not impressed with the idea, when he got through with his speech, that he had forgotten anything. I thought he had entirely concluded his speech and done all he intended to do in presenting his views to the House. Then it was quite in order for my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) to present his motion, after the conclusion of his speech; and it would have been entirely out of order for him to allow his motion to stand and a motion made by the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) to take its place. The hon. member for East Lambton no doubt unfortunately forgot to make his motion; but that is an accident which may happen to any of us. He may have been a little excited at the moment, his memory may have been overwhelmed by the importance of the subject he was dealing with, and consequently he forgot the important thing—in his own estimation—of submitting his motion to the House. He complains of the amendment of my hon. friend from Rouville as being academic. Well, it is not academic beyond what every private member of this House may say on a subject when he has no power of making a proposition which would involve the expenditure of public money. All my hon. friend could do was to move that in the opinion of this House it was desirable that the cable rates should be still further lowered, and urging the Postmaster General to take steps to that end. That is substantially the motion which I have great pleasure in seconding.

Now during the discussion, remarks have been made in favour of the government proceeding at once to establish a state-owned cable. I do not wish to be understood, in seconding this motion, as committing myself to the principle of a state-owned cable at the present time. The time may come, and may come sooner perhaps than most of us expect, when it may be in the public interest to establish a state-owned cable, but I do not think that time has yet arrived. The cable companies have responded I think very well to the public demand for a reduction, and they have made a considerable reduction. But if the reduction is not sufficient in the opinion of this government, they have the remedy in their own hands. There are two at least of the cable lines which have their Atlantic termini in Canada, I think more than two. As to those companies at all events having their Atlantic termini in Canada this parliament can legislate, this parliament has power to place their tolls and rates under the control of the Board of Railway Commissioners who can determine what should be fair and proper rates to allow, just the same as they are now able to control railway rates. It does seem to me that before this country plunges into a very large expense for the establishment of a new cable line, an effort ought to be made to bring these cable companies which have their Atlantic termini in Canada, under the control of the board of Railway Commissioners In 1910 an Act was passed which made provision that the Board of Railway Commissioners should have control of the rates of cable companies connected with land lines in Canada, and by section 6 of that Act it was provided that the Act should come into force upon similar provision being made by the proper authority in the

United Kingdom and upon proclamation by the Governor in Council. Now it would appear that the government of Great Britain has taken no action towards providing similar legislation. It seems to me that my hon. friend the Postmaster General should communicate with the Imperial authorities upon the subject, and if they decide that they will not take action along the lines taken by this parliament, then this parliament ought to strike out section 6 of the statute and act upon its own account, act on behalf of the people of Canada, and make provision that in respect of these cable companies their rates must be such as the Board of Railway Commissioners may think reasonable. I think in that way the people of Canada could be assured of reasonable and fair tolls. But before that experiment is tried, without trying the experiment of having these tolls submitted to the Board of Railway Commissioners, I for one would not be prepared to give any encouragement to the proposition to go to the very large expenditure which would be involved in the establishment and operation of a cable system to be owned by the state.

Reference has been made to a state-owned cable on the Pacific ocean. Now I asked the hon. member for Toronto, how the cable rates upon the Pacific compared with the rates established by the cable companies on the Atlantic, and he stated, I think correctly, that the cable rates from land to land are higher, but the distances are greater, and that it would not be fair to compare the rates arbitrarily without taking into account the distances. But it must be borne in mind that the ocean distance ought not to be a governing factor, because when a cable is once laid there are no stations to be maintained on the ocean, there are no expenses to be borne at all except the ordinary expenses of making repairs from time to time. Therefore, one could not expect that the cable rates upon the Pacific would be, in proportion to the distance, so much greater than the rates upon the Atlantic. Whether a cable is owned by a company or whether it is owned by the state, certain tolls must be charged. It cannot be expected that the government would operate a cable at a great loss to the people at large; because, as has been remarked by the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Lalor), it is only a small proportion of the public who use these cables. Reference has been made by the hon. member for Toronto to what he calls excessive telegraph rates. I agree with the hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the subject, that the public has reason, I think, not to be too severe upon the telegraph companies so far as their operations on the land are concerned. I think the reductions which they have made recently in rates have been reasonable and fair reductions. As he has stated, telegrams can be sent for long distances in Canada at 25 to 30 cents, and lately provision has been made for night lettergrams, which are very cheap indeed, and are found to be a great convenience. I do not wish to take up any more time of the House. I only desired to call attention to the statute we have on the subject, and to suggest to the Postmaster General, if he would allow me to do so, that it might not be inopportune to communicate with the Imperial authorities with a view of suggesting legislation along the same lines as this parliament legislated in 1910; and if the British government decline to take any action, then he should consider the repeal of section 6, and allow the Board of Railway Commissioners to deal with the regulation of the rates and tolls of the cable companies which have land lines in Canada.

Hon. L. P. PELLETIER (Postmaster General). I regret that my hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong), has not been able to put his motion in your hands.

My hon. friend has given to this matter such careful attention, he has gone into his subject so fully that I think the country is indebted to him for the numerous facts he has disclosed. I am of opinion that there is a great deal in what he has said which would turn out to be in the public interest. The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) has told him he spoke too long. I do not think he has spoken one minute too long. In the whole course of his remarks he has not repeated one thing, he has placed hard facts before us and every hon. member who has heard him has learned something. The rules of the House prevent me from going at any length into the different matters in his original motion except perhaps by way of comparison. I may say to my hon. friend that after hearing his speech of the other day I read it in 'Hansard' and that the 'Hansard' of that day has been put on file in the department as a most valuable piece of information. I might suggest that after his instructive speech the commission he wanted to have appointed becomes almost unnecessary because I do not think any commission could give us more information than he has given us in the speech he has made.

As the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) has said the motion of the hon. member for Rouville is an academic one. I shall not go so far as to say that the hon. member for Rouville has put this motion before the House just for the sake of having the glory of starting this debate; I think his motives are higher than that.

But there is not much in the motion. The steps which the hon. member speaks of in the motion have been taken and I would like the country to believe that my hon. friend has advanced nothing very new to-night. He has gone on the lines on which the Post Office Department has been working for months so I think everybody should keep what belongs to him. What we have we will hold.

I am glad this matter has been brought before the House because it has given the hon. members on both sides an opportunity of discussing this very important question. The matter of cable rates has engaged the attention of preceding governments. It has been the subject of discussion in Imperial Conferences and I am of opinion that it is most important for this country that we secure reasonable cable rates. I have already said and in that I concur with the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Lalor) that there are other things which are more pressing in this country than cheap cable rates. I have said that I was in hopes before long that we would be able to place before the House a system of rural mail delivery which to my mind was much more important than the other subjects mentioned to-night. I am happy to say that since I then spoke I have had occasion and opportunity of putting before my colleagues in the government this question of rural delivery with the intention of placing it on a more businesslike basis, with less duplication, in short of having something which will appeal to the people and will serve them better than the existing loose system. I will have occasion before many days to ask the concurrence of this House in the creation of a special branch in the department to attend to this rural mail delivery for which the people are asking. It will cost some little money but the government have come to the conclusion that it will be money well spent. I am bound to say that we shall not go by leaps and bounds in this new policy. We shall have the counties mapped out in a regular way, so as to spend as little money as possible and to have at the same time as complete a service as possible. We shall have to take this matter up carefully and our friends in this House will have to understand that we will not be able to go into all the counties, that we must proceed by degrees and look ahead of us, not look at a particular township or parish, but at what is going to be the route to be followed from the point where we cease work this year and will begin next year, so as to have the whole thing arranged on a businesslike plan.

We have been told that the rural free mail delivery is in great demand. I believe in it, the government believes in it, and we will do our best to give the people of this country this rural mail delivery. It will help the people to read more, to know more, to educate themselves, to communicate with one another more frequently, and I think on the whole it will be considered that this government has conferred a boon on the people of this country. This, in my humble opinion, was the first question we had to take up. We are going to do so this session. As to the other points, we will be unable to look into them sufficiently to be able to propose any policy during the course of the present session. During the recess I shall take all the time at my disposal to go very carefully into this question to give every one of these questions mature consideration, and whilst I agree with the hon. member for Haldimand that rural mail delivery is of far more importance than these other matters, because it will give benefits to more people, I do not entirely agree with him as to the cheapness of cable and telegraph rates.

I do not attribute the fault to any particular company, but I am sorry as a Canadian, that our friends in Winnipeg have to get their European news through St. Paul and Minneapolis, and that the citizens of Vancouver have to get their European news through Seattle. If there is any way by which the Canadian people can get news from the old country over telegraph lines on Canadian territory, and through British sources, we will endeavour to bring that condition about. If we succeed in that. I think we will have accomplished something to promote the best interests of all Canada. I believe the telegraph rates are too high; I go so far as to say, they are excessive. We have been told that the farmers do not use the cable and that is true, but the trade of the country uses the cable, and the trade of the country exists for the benefit of the farmers just as well as for any other class, and as the policy of this government is to trade with England, we should have a cheap means of quick communication with the mother country with which we desire to trade. A cheap cable system is one of the missing links in our trade relations with Britain, and we must, in my opinion, do our utmost to make some progress towards attaining it. On the 4th of March there will be a sitting of the Board of Railway Commissioners in Winnipeg to inquire into some of these important questions and I have appointed counsel to represent my department and to ascertain for us if the telegraph rates are actually excessive. It may be that there is a combine to keep up these rates, and although we are sometimes taunted with being a government of com-

bines, we have in this case, appointed counsel to attend this investigation in the interests of the public, and to place a report before the House. To the extent that if it is found that the telegraph rates are excessive, I can assure the House that we will come to the relief of the people. I very much regret to say that I have no very great encouragement to give the country to-night as to the reduction in cable rates. I do not wish to say anything in criticism of the Postmaster General of England, but I am bound to give the facts to this House. I am in almost constant correspondence with the right hon. Mr. Samuel, and I regret to say that he feels that we should not go any further at present in the direction indicated in the correspondence. I repeat my expression of regret at the attitude taken by Mr. Samuel. I have here an official letter, which I received from the right hon. gentleman lately, and the contents of which I shall communicate to the House. It is as follows:

General Post Office, London,
7th February, 1912.

Dear Mr. Pelletier,—In reply to your letter of the 8th ultimo, I need hardly say that I share your view as to the benefits of cheap cable rates.

While, however, I recognize in this connection the advantages which might be expected from a state-owned Atlantic cable, they are, in my opinion, outweighed by the fact that, under present conditions, such a cable would hardly be self-supporting, so that if one were laid any considerable reduction of rates could only be effected at the expense of the general taxpayers. As you are perhaps aware I spoke in some detail on this aspect of the matter during the discussion at the Imperial Conference in the last year.

Since the conference the position has changed in two ways—the projected combination of three of the Trans-Atlantic Cable Companies has become a fact and the reductions in cable rates I foreshadowed have been brought into operation. I do not think that we need regard these reductions as final. No doubt in due course further concessions may be expected without incurring the heavy expense of laying a government cable. This point was touched on in an answer by me in the House of Commons on the 12th of December last of which, as it deals also with the strategic argument for the cable, I inclose a copy.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) HERBERT SAMUEL.

Hon. L. P. Pelletier, M.P.

The following are the remarks made by Mr. Samuel in the Imperial House of Commons and which are referred to in his letter:

There are thirteen cables from the United Kingdom to North America and all of them land on Canadian or Newfoundland territory This fact should be borne in mind in connection with the strategic considerations raised by the hon. member's question.

The land lines both in Canada and the United States are in the hands, not of the governments, but of private companies, and there is no guarantee under existing conditions that a state-owned cable, if laid, would be able to establish connections with the land lines in those countries. On this side, the British Post Office would not be able to supply the cable with such traffic, as the Anglo-American Cable Company is entitled, under an old agreement, to receive all trans-Atlantic cablegrams which are not ordered by the senders to be transmitted by a specified route. The business of the Pacific Cable Board is at present far from sufficient to justify laying an additional cable across the Atlantic in order to carry its traffic alone.

The hon. member's question is inaccurate in that it suggests that all the trans-Atlantic cable system is now under the control of one corporation. The Commercial Cable Company with five cables is not a party to the combination recently formed.

I have established, as a condition of the renewal or transfer of landing licenses, government control of the rates charged by some of the cable companies, and shall extend this control as the licenses of others fail to be renewed. Where the control applies rates cannot be raised without the consent of the government, and may be reduced on the demand of the government. The companies have a right of appeal to the Railway and Canal Commissioners if the equity of any proposed reduction is disputed.

In view of all these circumstances and of the substantial reductions now being made in many of the trans-Atlantic rates, His Majesty's government has no present intention of embarking on the large capital expenditure and annual commitments which would be involved in laying a state-owned cable.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if the right hon. Mr. Samuel has the right, as he undoubtedly has, to practically control the rates, the self-governing colonies of the empire have the right to ask him that those rates shall be so controlled that Canada and the other self-governing colonies will not be forced to pay excessive charges. As Postmaster General of Canada I have answered Mr. Samuel, asking him to use his authority to promise easy and cheap communication between the mother country and Canada. I do not think it will be necessary to have a state-owned cable. There are many heavy demands on the public treasury of Canada and in this young country we have to expend a great deal of money to keep pace with the progress of the times, so that if we can dispense with the expenditure on a state-built cable, the money thus saved could very well be applied elsewhere. I trust that the Postmaster General of England will before long be able to see eye to eye with us on this matter. We desire, as I have said, to trade with the mother country and in order to carry on that trade with

facility we must have cable communication at the cheapest cost possible.

We do not object to have communication with other countries, but this country prefers to have communication in all forms with England. Of course, the day may come, and the day will come, when the mother country will have some kind of reciprocal relations with the colonies. It is not the business of my department to go into the question of reciprocal trade relations; but we want the government of England and its Postmaster General to help the trade of this country. The British preference has been put on the Statute-book in order that we may have more trade with England, and if we trade with England we have to communicate with England. Business men will not send pressing orders for what they want to buy in England, by means of letters. They have to use the cable, and it seems to me that it would be very much to the interest of both countries that this should be done. If it is not done, this government will have to look into the question. I am not going any further than that; I am not authorized to go any further; but I will go as far as to say that the government will look into the question seriously. There is one fact more to which I will briefly refer before resuming my seat. Most of these cable companies land in Canada or in Newfoundland. They are controlled by foreign capital. I see no reason why there should not be one cable, owned by a company of British subjects. I do not object to our neighbours to the south investing their money in this country; on the contrary, I am prepared to invite that; but I think that Canada and England will both desire to have a cable company, and a cable that would not be controlled by foreign capital. I am not prepared to-night to go into this matter at any great length; but the House will, I think, be of opinion that these questions may well engage the attention of hon. members. I would ask my hon. friend not to press his motion, which I think is too academic, and not practical enough.

Mr. LEMIEUX. In what sense?

Mr. PELLETIER. It is going to be published in the newspapers, and the people who read it will say: This gentleman does not seem to attach much importance to this matter, as he makes a motion of fine words, but no action.

Mr. LEMIEUX. On the contrary, I ask for action.

Mr. PELLETIER. The hon. gentleman says he hopes that steps will be taken, as if steps were not taken now.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Go further.

Mr. PELLETIER. Steps were taken before the hon. gentleman made his motion, so that I do not see that there is any occasion for it. I do not wish to divide the House on the motion; I would prefer to have the hon. gentleman withdraw it. Under the circumstances, it would have no good effect. The Post Office Department is giving its full attention to this matter, and I do not think there is any necessity of saying that we should take steps. We have done so and will do so, without being invited in any academic way to blow our trumpet.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Lemieux.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Béland,	Lafortune,
Bickerdike,	Lanctot,
Boivin,	Lapointe
Bourassa,	(Kamouraska),
Brouillard,	Lemieux,
Brown,	Loggie,
Buchanan,	MacNutt,
Bureau,	McKenzie,
Carvell,	McMillan,
Chisholm (Antigonish),	Marcile (Bagot),
Chisholm (Inverness),	Molloy,
Clark (Red Deer),	Nesbitt,
Delisle,	Neely,
Demers,	Oliver,
Devlin,	Pacaud,
Fortier,	Papineau,
Gauthier	Proulx,
(St. Hyacinthe),	Sinclair,
Gauvreau,	Verville,
Hughes (King's,	Warnock and
P.E.I.),	Wilson (Laval).—40.
Lachance,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Achim,	Lalor,
Alguire,	Lennox,
Armstrong (Lambton),	Lesperance,
Arthurs,	Lewis,
Barker,	McKay,
Beattie,	Marshall,
Bennett (Simcoe),	Middlebro,
Borden,	Munson,
Boulay,	Nantel,
Brabazon,	Nicholson,
Broder,	Paquet,
Burnham,	Paul,
Chabot,	Pelletier,
Clark (Bruce),	Porter,
Clarke (Wellington),	Reid (Grenville),
Clements,	Roche,
Cochrane,	Sevigny,
Cockshutt,	Sexsmith,
Cromwell,	Sharpe (Ontario),
Crothers,	Shepherd,
Davidson,	Smith,
Doherty,	Staples,
Donnelly,	Steel,
Edwards,	Stevens,
Elliot,	Stewart (Hamilton),
Elson,	Stewart (Lunenburg),
Fisher,	Sutherland,
Girard,	Taylor,

Goodeve,	Thomson (Yukon),
Gordon,	Thornton,
Guilbault,	Tremain,
Hazen,	Wallace,
Henderson,	Webster,
Hepburn,	Wilson
Jameson,	(Wentworth) and
Kidd,	Wright.—70.

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Messieurs	
White (Leeds),	Emmerson,
Burrell,	Turriff,
Perley,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Kemp,	Murphy,
Haggart,	Gordon,
Macdonell,	Guthrie,
Foster (Kings),	Carroll,
Boyce,	Richards,
Stanfield,	Pardee,
Rhodes,	Macdonald,
Ames,	Ross,
Fowler,	Pugsley,
Bristol,	Charlton,
McCurdy,	Maclean (Halifax),
Baker,	Kay,
Wilcox,	Clarke (Essex),
Thoburn,	Robb,
Bowman,	McCoig,
Aikins.	Douglas.

Amendment negatived and House went into Committee of Supply.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have a general pair with the hon. member for Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler). He is in the city, but not in the House to-night, and therefore I think my name ought to be erased from the division list.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am afraid the hon. member for Prince Edward County (Mr. Hepburn) has not been counted.

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE IN OTTAWA COUNTY.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if the statement made by Mr. Justice McDougall yesterday at Hull while presiding over the court was true, that he had interviewed the Minister of Justice and that a new judge was to be appointed at Hull.

Mr. DOHERTY. I have not seen the statement of Mr. Justice McDougall, but the Quebec Legislature has provided for a new judicial district to be called Montcalm, and that until there is a proper court house at the Chef-lieu of Montcalm district, the judge to be appointed shall reside at Hull. It is the intention when we introduce the Bill to provide for the additional judges which are asked for by the different provinces to make provision for the salary of the judge which the legisture has determined is required for the district of Montcalm, and who is to preside at Hull, and that was so stated to the Hon. Mr. Justice McDougall.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Mr. MACDONALD. What supply is to be taken up?

Mr. BORDEN. Railways and canals.

Mr. MACDONALD. The Premier knows it has always been the custom previous to going into Committee of Supply on the estimates of the Department of Railways and Canals for the minister to give to the House a statement with reference to the transportation problems of the country generally, and particularly with reference to the Intercolonial railway, and that course has facilitated the passage of Supply. In my recollection in parliament, this is the first time in which it has been proposed to take up Supply on railways and canals without having a statement of that kind. I am quite sure the minister will agree with me in that.

Mr. BORDEN. I do not agree that the practice has been invariable.

Mr. MACDONALD. Well, if not invariable, it has been the custom during the last eight years, ever since I have been in the House. The questions involved in regard to railway matters, of necessity, require that there should be some statement as to the position of the Intercolonial railway to begin with. It enables hon. members in considering Supply to have beforehand information in succinct form which otherwise could not be elicited except by prolonged questioning.

Mr SINCLAIR. I agree with my right hon. friend from Pictou that it will no doubt facilitate the business of the House if a general statement could be made by the minister, prior to taking up the railway estimates. For example, the financial condition of the Intercolonial railway is watched with a great deal of interest by the members of this House as well as by the people of the country. During the time that I have had the honour of a seat in this House it has been the invariable practice for the Minister of Railways to open the consideration of the railway estimates by making such a statement, which has been regarded as only second in importance to the budget speech of the Finance Minister. I think it would be a mistake to do away with that very laudable practice. Not only do we want to know what has happened in regard to the Intercolonial railway and what the prospects are for the future business year, but we would like to be favoured with some information in regard to the deepening of the Welland canal, the deep-

ening of the Georgian Bay canal, the construction of the Hudson Bay railway, and other matters. All these questions are looming up and it certainly would be important for the House to be in possession of a general statement setting forth the policy of the government in regard to these great transportation problems.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think also, Mr. Chairman,—I do not know whether it was justifiable or not—that there was a general opinion upon this side of the House that if we went into Supply to-night the estimates of the Minister of the Interior would be taken up. I trust the Prime Minister will, particularly as the hour is quite late, yield to the view that there should be a statement made by the Minister of Railways. Where such a practice has been resorted to year after year for a great many years, we come to look upon it almost as the law of parliament. I think that for some ten or twelve years past there never has been an occasion when the House has gone into consideration of the railway estimates without a statement having first been made by the Minister of Railways. But perhaps my hon. friend would even now give us that statement. If not, I am sure that we on this side would cheerfully allow him one day for further preparation in order to make that statement to-morrow. But, speaking seriously, I really do not think my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) would be wise in making so radical a departure from what has been the custom during the last ten, twelve, perhaps fifteen, years.

Mr. BORDEN. I can only say that since the House went into committee and up to the present time, my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) has not had much opportunity of making a statement. Further than that, hon. members on the other side seem to be so much impressed with the value of speech that they insist that we shall talk whether we want to or not. I suppose the Minister of Railways and Canals must be permitted to explain his estimates in the way that seems best to himself. It is true that it has been the practice, particularly under the late Minister of Railways and Canals to make a statement explaining the general condition of the Intercolonial railway. It may be that that course has its advantages in some respects, but I do not know that there is any absolutely inflexible rule that it shall be done on all occasions. As to the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers) he was here in the early part of the evening but has been obliged to leave. If the House had gone into Supply a little earlier his estimates would have been taken up. But we wish to make a little progress. I would suggest that we might go on and hon. gentlemen can get the information that is available in the way that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) who is in charge of the department prefers to give it.

Mr. MACDONALD. Hon members who are interested in the Intercolonial railway did not know that we were going into the Intercolonial railway estimates to-night, and a good many hon. members are not here who would like to be present when these estimates are taken up. Under the circumstances it seems hardly fair to ask us to go on.

Mr. BORDEN. What department would hon members like to take up?

Mr. MACDONALD. The House understood that we were going on with the estimates of the Interior Department until they were finished.

Mr. BORDEN. Perhaps we could take up canals.

Mr. MACDONALD. I do not know. Our friends from Ontario who are interested in canals are not here.

Mr. OLIVER. I was certainly under the impression that we were to go on with the Department of the Interior.

Mr. BORDEN. That would have been taken up but for the circumstance to which I have alluded.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If my hon. friend is determined to go into railway estimates to-night, I think this would be a very proper time to get some information with regard to one of the branch lines of the Intercolonial railway.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Barker). Better let me read the resolution first:

Railways and Canals—chargeable to capital Intercolonial railway air brakes to improved triple valves of $7,150.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I regret that the hon. member for Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) is not present——

Mr. MACDONALD. If my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) will pardon me for a moment —the vote of which this is one item amounts to $4,158,350. Surely, the Prime Minister and Minister of Railways and Canals can hardly expect to get that vote through to-night. The discussion will necessarily be long.

Mr. BORDEN. Is there any other item hon. gentlemen opposite would like to take up?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may explain to my hon. friend the Minister of Railways that, as he is no doubt aware from the papers on file in the department, an agreement was

made by the ex-Minister of Railways with the Salisbury and Harvey Railway Company some time during the past summer—the exact date will appear from the letter which the ex-Minister of Railways wrote to the president of that railway company. In that letter the ex-minister referred to certain negotiations which had taken place with regard to supplying a quantity of rails, bridge girders and other material for a portion of that railway with a view to its being re-opened and put in satisfactory operation. In that letter Mr. Graham, the ex-minister, referred to an offer which the company had made to either sell its railway for a sum of money which the company had stated and which is referred to in the letter, or else to lease the road upon terms which had been presented to the government by a committee of the different branch railways in the maritime provinces. In the letter the ex-minister states that if these terms are acceded to by the company, legislation will be introduced at the then coming session of parliament—that is, the present session—for the purpose of carrying out the arrangement. Now, as I have said, I regret that my hon. friend from Kings and Albert is not present. But he will read my remarks in 'Hansard' and will have an opportunity at a later date of making any comment on them that he may desire to make. That hon. gentleman is reported to have made a public statement not long ago in the province of New Brunswick with regard to the railway which certainly is of a very serious character, and reflects so severely not only upon the ex-Minister of Railways, but upon myself and every other member of the government who had anything to do with the arrangements as to require that the facts should be placed on 'Hansard,' so that they may go to the country and particularly to that part of New Brunswick the people of which are so intensely interested in this railway and who were for some months before the arrangements were completed, exceedingly anxious that steps should be taken for the opening up of the portion of the railway which had been closed. I find that the hon. member for Kings and Albert is reported in the St. John 'Standard' as having made a speech at a banquet given to him in the county of Albert. The date is the 14th of November, 1911. This is the report of his remarks:

'The people of Albert county were fooled about the railway. Promises were made by our opponents that were not intended to be fulfilled. Some car-loads of rails were sent to Salisbury a day or so before the elections and these were to be taken back again in case the government were defeated. There had been no authority for these rails to be loaded or removed from Moncton, and as soon as the elections were over and the government was defeated, arrangements were made to withdraw these rails. I found it necessary to go to Ottawa. I found out that there had been no contract signed or executed in regard to rails for the Salisbury and Albert railway. I made arrangements for those rails and got them forwarded. Then there was trouble about the bridges. I again went to Ottawa and got the bridges, and I have the authority for saying to you that one of these bridges is now on the line and on the 1st December the road will again be in operation its entire length.

Now, my hon. friend will, I am sure, do me the justice to look up the record, and he will find that a bona fide arrangement was made for the delivery of these rails to that railway company. I think you will agree with me, Mr. Chairman, that the charge which the hon. member for Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler), has made, that it was never intended bona fide to deliver these rails, and that after the government was defeated an order was given to take the rails back, as carrying out the intention which the government had to deceive the people—that is a charge of a very serious character, and before a member of the House should make a charge so serious, he ought to have all the facts fully in his possession, and to have the strongest possible justification to make such a charge. Now, I find on looking at the file which the Minister of Railways brought down in answer to my motion, that after that letter of the late Minister of Railways to the company agreeing to their terms, either for the purchase, at a price which was agreed upon, or for the leasing, and engaging to submit legislation at the present session, the matter was followed up by order in council, and an agreement was drawn up by the Department of Justice and submitted in due course to the railway company for signature. I happen to know personally, because I had some conferences with Mr. Raymond, who I think, was then the legal partner of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, upon the subject of this agreement. The company had by their telegram, or letters from the manager, agreed to execute a contract. There was, however, some delay, and Mr. Raymond went to the city of New York where he saw the president of the railway company; and as the matter was somewhat urgent by reason of people being deprived of railway facilities, it was understood that Mr. Raymond would wire to me, as the minister representing New Brunswick in the government, and who had taken an active part in endeavouring to get this line of railway opened—it was understood he would wire to me when the contract was signed. After he had gone to New York I received a telegram from him that the contract had been signed by the company, and it was understood that

when it was signed he would send it forward to the Deputy Minister of Railways at Ottawa. I took it for granted that that would be done, and I immediately wired either to the Minister of Railways or to the Deputy Minister of Railways, stating that the contract had been signed and forwarded to Ottawa, and asking him to give directions for the delivery of the rails. The department was acting in good faith upon my assurance which I received from Mr. Raymond that the contract had been executed by the company. The contract was dated some time in September, I think. Later on, and after a quantity of rails had been placed upon the cars at Moncton and sent forward for delivery to the railway company, it appeared that Mr. Raymond had neglected to have the contract sent to Ottawa. I remember being in Ottawa after the election, and my attention was called to the matter. I may say that the Minister of Railways made no change in the arrangement by reason of the result of the election, and everything was going forward just as it had been before the election took place, so far as the delivery of the rails was concerned. On the 5th of October I was informed by Mr. Pottinger, the general manager of the Intercolonial, that the contract had not been received. I find that on the file there is a letter from Mr. Pottinger to Mr. Burpee which I will read:

Moncton, October 5, 1911.

T. C. Burpee, Esq.,

Please stop at once the delivery of rails and other materials to the Salisbury and Albert railway, as the signed agreement has not yet been received at Ottawa. Please let me know quickly what materials and quantity of each have been delivered.

Yours truly,

D. POTTINGER.

Then upon the same day, when I had been informed by Mr. Pottinger that the agreement had not been received, I wired to Mr. Raymond calling his attention to his assurance that the contract would be at once forwarded to Ottawa, and I received this telegram, a very extraordinary telegram.

St. John, N.B., October 5, 1911.

Hon. Wm. Pugsley,
Minister of Public Works,
Ottawa, Ont.

Expect to make another arrangement with new government.

E. P. RAYMOND.

To which I replied as follows:

Ottawa, October 5, 1911.

E. P. Raymond,
St. John, N. B.

You must see it is not a question of making another arrangement with new government, but of carrying out in good faith arrangement made and under which some rails have been delivered. You distinctly agreed to send signed agreement to Ottawa, and wired me that it was signed by company. This was clearly for purpose of letting me know that the matter was complete so far as company was concerned.

(Sgd.) WM. PUGSLEY.

Then later, on the 10th of October, I wrote to the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals as follows:

Ottawa, October 10, 1911.

A. W. Campbell Esq.,
Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals,
Ottawa.

Some days ago, when I was informed by Mr. Pottinger and yourself that Mr. Raymond had not sent the agreement re Salisbury Harvey Railway, I wired him to do so, and received the reply hereto annexed. My answer is also annexed hereto. I am greatly surprised at the fact of Mr. Raymond not having sent you the agreement, but if the company accepted any of the rails, they could be compelled to carry out the agreement the same as if they had sent it to you.

I am, yours truly,

(Sgd.) WM. PUGSLEY.

Now, when my hon. friend, the present Minister of Railways, came into office he would see these letters on file, and would see that the delay in countermanding the order for delivery of rails was due entirely to the fact that the agreement had not been signed, and not, as the hon. member for Kings and Albert told the electors, that it was in pursuance of a design to make the people believe before the election that the rails would be delivered, and then to have them sent back to Moncton after the election. I am satisfied the Minister of Marine and Fisheries could not have known the condition of the agreement, could not have known what Mr. Raymond had promised; because I find that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries sent a telegram on the 12th of October to the Minister of Railways and Canals as follows:

St. John, N.B., October 2, 1911

Hon. Frank Cochrane,
Minister of Railways,
Chateau Frontenac, Que.

Agreement made with late government to supply rails and girders to Salisbury and Albert railway to repair their railway pending the agreement to take over railways by government. Since government resigned management refuses to give any further rails. Kindly instruct Pottinger at Moncton to continue supplying sufficient rails and girders so work can be completed. Will see you in Ottawa Tuesday.

(Sgd.) J. D. HAZEN.

I make no complaint of the telegram sent by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. It was a very proper request for him to make as the delivery had been stopped, but I take it for granted that my hon. friend did not know the circumstances under which delivery had been stopped.

On October 14, the Minister of Railways replied to the Minister of Marine as follows:

Ottawa, Oct. 14, 1911.

Hon. J. D. Hazen,
St. John, N.B.

Message received re Salisbury and Albert railway. I find upon inquiry that the company has not executed the agreement they promised to, and which it was said they had done. This is reason, I am informed, for non-delivery more rails and girders.

(Sgd.) F. COCHRANE.

It was only about October 26 that the present Minister of Railways was informed that the contract which I had been informed by Mr. Raymond, had been executed in New York in September, had been delivered to the department and thereupon orders were immediately given by the department to resume the delivery of rails in accordance with the original understanding. I think when my hon. friend the member for Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) reads these different telegrams, which are all on file in the department, he will come to the conclusion that he did the late Minister of Railways and Canals and myself a great wrong when he charged that the order for delivering these rails had been countermanded after the election simply because the election had gone as it did and that there was never any bona fide intention of delivering these rails. The circumstances are simply as the correspondence discloses. There was the bona fide agreement to deliver the rails. There was the telegram from the solicitor of the company to me that the contract had been signed and the understanding was that it was to be forwarded immediately to Ottawa. I was advised that the contract was signed, I so informed the department and acting upon that in good faith they gave instructions for the delivery of the material to the railway company. Afterwards, on October 5, they learned that the contract had not been delivered at Ottawa as they had been led to believe it was in course of delivery and for that reason the order for the delivery of the rails and girders was countermanded. Later on, on October 26, when the contract was signed as it had been agreed it should be, the present Minister of Railways gave the order for the continuation of the delivery of rails. The hon. member for Kings and Albert not only charges me with bad faith in the matter but he takes to himself all the credit for having obtained the order for the resuming of the delivery of these rails, whereas, as a matter of fact, the order was given when the agreement originally made with the company and which was understood would be executed and forwarded to Ottawa, was actually forwarded in order to protect the department and compel the company to carry out its arrangement.

My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals will see that by the agreement, legislation is to be obtained during the present session. Unless the legislation is so obtained or unless there is a waiver of that upon the part of the company, I would ask my hon. friend whether it is not worthy of consideration if the company might not say: Oh, the government has not carried out its part of the agreement, it has not obtained the legislation authorizing it either to acquire or to lease the road, and might not the company take a position with regard to payment for the rails which might be detrimental to the public interest? I think myself, that unless there is some waiver on the part of the company the obligation would be on the government to ask parliament to enact the legislation this session which is provided for in the agreement.

Mr. COCHRANE. In reply I would say that these rails were shipped before the elections, they were shipped before the contract was signed, but after the department found out that the rails had been shipped, and the contract not signed, they gave orders that the rails should not be unloaded, but should be kept there, and they were not returned to Moncton, they were held there until the contract was signed. I do not know anything about the speech made by the hon. member for Kings and Albert, but I think the hon. member from St. John, (Mr. Pugsley) is wrong in his interpretation of the agreement. As I remember it, they are to pay for these rails, if we do not take over the road, and if we do take over the road, it is to be deducted from the arrangement. So it is unnecessary for us to pass any legislation in reference to it this session.

It has been announced in this House that the promises about the branch lines will be gone into during the vacation, and all those that are in the interest of the Intercolonial railway and of the county will be taken over on a fair and equitable basis.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend does not mean to have the committee believe that the order stopping delivery of the rails was made after he came into office, it was made before he came into office.

Mr. COCHRANE. No, I did not say that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman's remarks might be open to that interpretation. The order was made some five days before the late government resigned, and because the arrangement which Mr. Raymond wired me, had been executed had not been delivered to the department.

Mr. MACDONALD. Would the minister state the surplus of the Intercolonial railway on the 31st January last?

Mr. COCHRANE. About $700,000. That is within $5,000 of the exact amount.

Mr. MACDONALD. What will be the surplus at the end of the financial year?

Mr. COCHRANE. That is a matter that would be purely guesswork. It depends largely on the cost of running trains or how many snowstorms we have, etc. The hon. member knows the weather conditions have a lot to do with the net profits, but we will not be far out when we say about $600,000 or $700,000.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend should have known before asking the committee to pass the estimates, exactly what the surplus was on January 31, and now at the beginning of the last month of the financial year, he could give us the probable financial results on the 31st of March. I would like the minister before we discuss this matter again, to give us the fullest explanation of what the financial position of the road is, and what it is expected it will be.

Mr. COCHRANE. The Auditor has just told me that the exact amount up to the 31st of January is $677,000.

Mr. MACDONALD. The minister can, without much trouble, tell us what the estimated surplus on the 31st of March will be. There are certain expenditures which can be estimated pretty accurately, the only uncertain element being as to the extent of snowstorms and the cost of removal of snow. Such information as that should be given us in order to discuss the future policy with regard to the Intercolonial railway. Without anticipating what I will say at a future date, I have no hesitation in saying in this House now, as I have said before, that the Intercolonial has no business to have a surplus.

Mr. COCHRANE. Do you think it has?

Mr. MACDONALD. Well, we would like a statement from the minister in regard to that. I have said the same thing to other ministers who were friendly to me politically. I say that every dollar that is reported as a surplus on the Intercolonial railway means so much money taken out of the pockets of the people of the Maritime provinces, and for no good. When you come to deal with the Intercolonial, you are not dealing with a corporate entity such as a private railway company, which at the end of its financial year has so much money, and as to which the directors can consider whether it will be spent in betterments or whether it will be paid in dividends, because, at the end of the financial year if the Intercolonial has a surplus of eight or nine hundred thousand dollars, that money passes into the treasury of the Dominion,

away from the Intercolonial, and not a dollar of it is available for running expenses of the railway for the new year. And then, when the people interested in the line press on the minister for increased accommodation or for improved freight rates, the answer is that the surplus of the previous year has passed away from him and has gone into the general treasury, and there is no money left for these betterments. Before we discuss these estimates again I wish the minister would give us the result of the operations of the Intercolonial in the way of surpluses for the last three years, and a statement down to date, so far as he has it, and an estimate up to the 31st of March, in so far as it is possible to anticipate. In certain portions of Canada the feeling is that if a Minister of Railways is able to report a surplus on the Intercolonial he has achieved some distinguished feat, for which he is entitled to credit. I do not hesitate to say to the Minister of Railways at the inception of his career as minister, as I have said to my own political friends when they occupied the office, that if a Minister of Railways has a surplus on the Intercolonial, it is not to his credit but to his discredit, for the reason that he has discriminated against the people of the maritime provinces in making them pay more than they had necessity to pay.

Mr. COCHRANE. There will be no objection to bringing down the statement which the hon. gentleman asks for in reference to the surplus on the Intercolonial for the last three years, and also an estimate of the operations of the road up to the 31st of March. In some aspects of the remarks of the hon. member for Pictou I thoroughly agree. Of course, it is a question in my own mind whether this is really a surplus or not. It is a question in my mind whether the betterments on the rolling stock have been kept up from year to year in the manner I think they should have been before there is any surplus claimed. I am having a stocktaking made of the Intercolonial railway, especially with reference to the rolling stock, so as to get at some basis on which we can start anew. I also think that the Intercolonial can be so managed that it will not only pay its way but that it will pay for betterments as well, and that without raising the present rates. I think I can say, without fear of contradiction, that the rates on the Intercolonial are lower than on any other railroad of the same mileage.

Mr. MACDONALD. I do not know about that. Other Ministers of Railways have said that but it did not work out.

Mr. COCHRANE. I have made a few comparisons, but, as the hon. gentleman knows what I don't know about the Intercolonial railway would make a much bigger book than what I do know about it. I should think that if I undertook to tell this committee very much about the Intercolonial railway they would consider that I was rather bumptious. I have only been on the road once and then only on a part of the system, and the reason that I did not purpose making a general statement was that I would have to make it largely on what I have been told, not having had an opportunity, from personal experience, of studying the matter myself.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I represent one of the maritime provinces which is deeply interested in the operations of the Intercolonial railway and I fear I cannot agree either with the Minister of Railways or with the hon. member for Pictou.

Mr. COCHRANE. I would not expect you to.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think myself that if the Intercolonial railway in charging fair and reasonable rates to the people, which the people of the maritime provinces are quite willing to pay, earns a surplus, it is to the credit of the management of that railway. I think it is better for the lower provinces that such surplus should be shown, because when there is no surplus on the Intercolonial railway it has been the practice of persons coming from other parts of Canada to speak of the railway rather as a dead weight upon the people of Canada and to declare that it ought to be got rid of as soon as possible and handed over to some private company.

Mr. MACDONALD. That would not hurt very much.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Well I think it would. I am very strongly in favour of the Intercolonial railway being kept, owned, and operated as a government railway.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PUGSLEY. While there may be some objection to the principle, yet personally I would be very strongly in favour of the view put forward by the business men of Montreal and other parts of eastern Canada that the Intercolonial railway should be brought under the control of the Railway Commission, but I think it is well to keep it as a government owned and operated railway.

I think the gentlemen who have been managing the Intercolonial railway in the past few years deserve great credit for giving such a splendid service. I do not believe there is a better operated railway on the continent of America. The passenger trains are very comfortable, the dining car service is good, the trains make good time, and in all respects the road is managed as a first-class railway ought to be managed. I hope my hon. friend will not seek to put too large a share of the profits into what other companies would describe as capital account in order to do away with the surplus. There is a great deal in what my hon. friend from Pictou says, that it is wrong to take the surplus from the control of the management of the Intercolonial railway and put it into the general treasury. I do not see why it should not accumulate as a fund to pay for betterments.

Mr. COCHRANE. Do you not think it ought to go into rolling stock?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If you put all the surplus into betterments without treating it as a surplus, you do not give the government railway a fair show, and you add to the argument of those who say that it is run at a loss to the people of Canada and that the sooner we get rid of it the better. We ought to make up our minds firmly to hold on to the Intercolonial railway forever, to be operated in the interest of the people of Canada.

Mr. CARVELL. How much has been charged up to capital in the operation of the Intercolonial railway during the present fiscal year?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The hon. minister might at the same time answer another question. In the absence of the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Brouillard), I would like to call his attention to the fact that there are business men along the railway between Quebec and Ste. Rosalie who complain very bitterly about the lack of car accommodation. They say they have requested the management to provide them with cars, especially during the last month, and they have not been supplied. I have here a letter from J. A. Savoie, the son of the ex-member for Megantic, who is a large lumber merchant in the county of Nicolet. Under date of February 26 he writes to Mr. Brouillard a letter, in which he says:

We have been able to obtain no cars since the 6th of February. During the winter generally we have been in the habit of obtaining some cars, but never a sufficient number. Please ask the minister if he cannot give orders so that we may obtain justice in this matter.

On the 28th of February he writes another letter, in which he says:

I wrote on the 26th of February stating that we had no cars since the 6th of February We are at the 28th, and we have yet received no answer. We would be very much obliged if you would see the minister and ask him for what reason this section of the Intercolonial railway is so neglected.

The hon. minister is, I am sure, anxious to meet requests of this kind.

Mr. COCHRANE. We have not heard from him.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Will the hon. minister kindly communicate with Mr. Savoie, who is one of the largest manufacturers along the line?

Mr. COCHRANE. There has been a good deal of difficulty in getting the cars back from the United States, where the congestion is worse than it is in Canada. In November we had a number of complaints of the shortage of cars for the shipment of lumber and pulpwood, and Mr. Tiffin told me that an enormous number of our cars were in the United States, and that he was trying to get them back.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is there not a fine imposed for retaining these cars?

Mr. COCHRANE. There is a fine of 35 cents a day, which the railway companies would rather pay and keep the cars. In regard to the expenditure on capital account, the auditor tells me that during the past year to the 1st of September it amounted to $1,156,207.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) looks at this matter from an entirely different standpoint from those of us who come from the province of Nova Scotia. The province of New Brunswick is fortunate enough to have two transcontinental systems, the Canadian Pacific railway running into the city of St. John and the Grand Trunk Pacific, which is completed to the city of Moncton, as well as the Intercolonial. That province is therefore very fortunate in having plenty of railway accommodation which I do not begrudge it in the slightest degree. But in the province of Nova Scotia we have but one railway, giving us communication with the outside world, that is, the Intercolonial, and we have none of the transcontinental systems; and when we want additional railway accommodation we are compelled to come to the Minister of Railways and ask him to build a branch line. My hon. friend now tells us: You must show us that this is going to make money for the country or we will not talk about a branch line.

Mr. COCHRANE. I did not say make money, I said pay its way.

Mr. MACDONALD. The minister's expression is practically one which means what I said. I only want to point out—and I do not want to continue the discussion to-night, because it is now pretty late—that the member from St. John (Mr. Pugsley), certainly views this question from an entirely different standpoint to that from which I am compelled to view it. I would suggest to the minister that there is no desire on the part of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to do other than discuss these estimates fairly, and, in view of the absence of a number of our friends who wish to speak upon these items, he ought not, perhaps, to proceed further to-night

Mr. COCHRANE. I am perfectly willing and it will be certainly a pleasure to furnish all the information as we go along, but I think we ought to pass a few items before the committee rises.

Air-brakes—To improve triple values of $7,-150.

Mr. MACDONALD. Perhaps the minister would tell us what this vote for air-brakes is for?

Mr. COCHRANE. The object of these air-brakes is to improve the feature known as quick service. The K triple valve has additional features, known as quick service uniform rails, and uniform recharge to meet modern conditions of freight service, using less air and being far superior for controlling trains on heavy grades, and is being adopted by a large number of railways. I might say that there was spent last year for the same purpose $3,314.16. The work is done by the staff. These cost about $5.50 each, and the estimate this year was to put these brakes on 1,300 frieght cars. It is only following out the policy which has been adopted in the past.

Mr. SINCLAIR. There have been reports in the newspapers that the minister contemplated some radical changes in the board of management of the Intercolonial, I would like to know if he has any information to give the House as to his policy in that regard?

Mr. COCHRANE. I have not seen any of the newspapers which gave currency to such reports, and I have no information to give.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Will the minister say whether any changes are contemplated?

Mr. COCHRANE. I have no information in reference to the matter.

Mr. SINCLAIR. That is a very unsatisfactory answer to my question, for the minister to state that he has no information to give.

Mr. COCHRANE. I can only repeat that answer.

Mr. SINCLAIR. This railway board was constituted after a great deal of deliberation, and its maintenance became the settled policy of the late government. The board has done very good work, and has been of great service to the country. The minister surely knows whether he intends to continue that board or not, and I should

think ought to be in a position to give us some information.

Mr. COCHRANE. When the government has made up its mind to change the board it will be very glad to take the House into its confidence.

Mr. CARVELL. Does that mean that the government has not made up its mind at the present time to make any change?

Mr. COCHRANE. Hon. gentlemen draw their own conclusions anyway, no matter what I say and they are at liberty to do the same in this instance.

Bridges—to strengthen, $100,000.

Mr. MACDONALD. Where are these bridges to be strengthened?

Mr. COCHRANE. It is hoped by means of this vote to complete the strengthening of the bridges on the main line of the Intercolonial, and afterwards to proceed with the strengthening of the bridges on the Cape Breton branch.

Mr. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton). In the system of bookkeeping are the two items of betterments and maintenance kept separately, or are they under the heading of maintenance simply?

Mr. COCHRANE. I understand it is a capital and revenue account.

Mr. McKENZIE. Would the Minister be able to give the average expenditure on maintenance during say the last four years? I mean a comparison of the amounts expended on the road for maintenance per mile per year during that period?

Chatham—diversion of line and branch to wharf, $160,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It seemed to me when I was Minister of Public Works that in order to make the branch railways into the town of Chatham of real service to the business people of that place, it was necessary to build a wharf and I had an item of $100,000 placed in the estimates for the purpose of doing that. When the estimates for the Public Works Department were under consideration I called the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact that the item of $100,000 had been left out, and if I remember rightly he was not able to tell me what was the intention in regard to it. Has the Minister of Railways considered the matter, and does he intend to use any part of this amount of $160,000 for the terminals, including the wharf, or is it wholly apart from that, and if not what is my hon. friend's intention in regard to the construction of a railway wharf there?

Mr. COCHRANE. I may say there is not in the amount of $160,000 anything for the wharf. There has been a good deal of contention as between the towns that consider they should have the wharf. I received a deputation from both Newcastle and Chatham this last week, and the matter I considered should stand until the proper place was selected where the bridge would be most useful for the country and the railway as well.

Mr. LOGGIE. The minister refers to the question as to whether the wharf should be located at Chatham or Newcastle. For my own part I cannot see what in the world that would have to do with the vote in the estimates of last year. They are diverting the railway and taking it along the water front. The northwest wind blows very heavily on that side of the river and of course the boom must be filled in. The plans were to put riprap stone so as to protect the filling. My contention was that if riprap stone were used, it would be impossible to use that portion of the railway for shipping facilities. The location is between two wharfs. We have limited wharf accommodation at Chatham for ocean going shipments. It is expected that large steamers carrying a million or more of deals would load timber coming over the road at that wharf if it were constructed as I suggest.

Mr. HAZEN. I desire to ask a question for information. Where do the ocean steamers that now load deals at Chatham load?

Mr. LOGGIE. A large number of ocean steamers load at the wharfs of the timber merchants, but large quantities of deals arriving over the road at present are loaded at the wharf known as the Canada dock.

Mr. HAZEN. Is that a government wharf? Does it belong to the railway?

Mr. LOGGIE. Yes. At that dock there is room for only one steamer to load at a time, and often there are steamers with coal for the railway to be unloaded at the same wharf. So, it was considered very important that, when they were constructing this road across this boom, instead of making the front of it of riprap stone, it should be made of timber. At the time, I did not think it would cost much more to make it of timber than of stone. It is possible a wharf more cheaply constructed might serve the purpose as well as a wharf built according to the plans prepared. The very object of diverting the railway to the front of the town was to have shipping facilities, and hon. gentlemen know that success in shipping timber depends largely upon the ease with which it is handled. I would like it very much if the minister would favourably consider my suggestion,

and take up the matter with the Public Works Department, and, if reasonable at all, have a wharf of the dimensions proposed; or, if the cost is considered to be too much, then make plans for a cheaper wharf. What the ex-Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley), said is true, that this expenditure was to be made by the Public Works Department for the use of the railway, but to be the property of the Public Works Department. In fact, I think it is the policy of the Railway Department in regard to other wharfs, viz., to hand them over to Public Works Department.

Mr. McKENZIE. Does the hon. gentleman mean that the side of the railway next the stream was to be constructed so that it could be used as a loading wharf?

Mr. LOGGIE. Yes, but if stone were used that could not be done.

Mr. COCHRANE. I desire to tell the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) that I will have the statement he asks for made to-morrow, so far as we can make it.

Mr. MACDONALD. It was understood that after this item was passed we would adjourn.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. BORDEN moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. BORDEN. We will take up Bills and resolutions as far as possible.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I understood the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) would bring up his Post Office Bill.

Mr. BORDEN. So I understood. Then we will take up other Bills as far as it may be convenient to hon. members on the other side, and then resume in Supply, with the estimates of the Minister of Railways and Canals.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 12.55 a. m. Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 1, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 117) to change the name of Ezra Butler Eddy Bessey.—Mr. Fripp.

Mr. LOGGIE.

CANADIAN NORTHERN ALBERTA RAILWAY.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds) moved that the House go into committee to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide that the aid and assistance which, under the Canadian Northern Alberta Act, 1910, the Governor in Council was authorized to give to the Canadian Northern Alberta Railway Company in respect of the construction of the one hundred and fifty miles of railway therein described may, notwithstanding anything in the said Act, be applied to the first one hundred and fifty miles of the said company's railway at present constructed or located from St. Albert, in the province of Alberta, in a generally westerly direction toward the Yellowhead Pass.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I suppose my hon. friend will bring down the correspondence on the subject?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I will do so.

Motion agreed to.

OFFICIAL INQUIRY IN HULL.

Mr. DEVLIN. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) if any of the men whose cases have been examined into by the commissioner in Hull have been acquitted of taking any part in politics. If the hon. minister would like me in courtesy to give him notice of the question, I will not press for an immediate answer.

Mr. MONK. I have had the report of the investigator for a few days, but I have not had time to go fully into it or to take any action respecting those against whom there was no evidence; but I propose doing so as soon as possible.

IMPROVEMENT OF HIGHWAYS.

Mr. COCHRANE moved the third reading of Bill (No. 77) to encourage and assist the improvement of highways.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Certain hon. gentlemen want to leave this afternoon and therefore I will move this amendment without any discussion. I beg to move:

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House, with instructions to amend it by inserting the following words as subsection 2 of section 3:—

The sum of money voted in any year to be expended under this Act, shall be apportioned among the different provinces of the Dominion according to the population of said provinces as established by the last census for for the time being.

House divided on the amendment (Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Boivin,	Maclean (Halifax),
Bourassa,	MacNutt,
Brown,	McCraney,
Buchanan,	McCoig,
Bureau,	McKenzie,
Carvell,	McLean (Sunbury),
Cash,	McMillan,
Chisholm (Antigonish),	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Chisholm (Inverness),	Michaud,
Clark (Red Deer),	Molloy,
Cruise,	Nesbitt,
Delisle,	Neely,
Demers,	Oliver,
Devlin,	Pacaud,
Douglas,	Proulx,
Fortier,	Pugsley,
Guthrie,	Reid (Restigouche),
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Robb,
Knowles,	Ross,
Kyte,	Sinclair,
Lachance,	Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Turgeon,
Law,	Turriff,
Loggie,	Warnock and
Lovell,	White (Victoria, Alta).—50.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Alguire,	Lennox,
Armstrong (Lambton),	Lesperance,
Barker,	Lewis,
Barnard,	McCurdy,
Beattie,	McKay,
Bennett (Simcoe),	Marshall,
Blondin,	Meighen,
Borden,	Middlebro,
Brabazon,	Monk,
Bradbury,	Munson,
Broder,	Nantel,
Burnham,	Nicholson,
Burrell,	Nickle,
Chabot,	Paquet,
Clare,	Paul,
Clark (Bruce),	Reid (Grenville),
Clarke (Wellington),	Robidoux,
Clements,	Roche,
Cochrane,	Sevigny,
Cockshutt,	Sexsmith,
Crocket,	Sharpe (Lisgar),
Crothers,	Shepherd,
Doherty,	Smith,
Donnelly,	Staples,
Elliot,	Steele,
Elson,	Stevens,
Fisher,	Stewart (Hamilton),
Foster (Kings, N.S.),	Stewart (Lunenburg),
Foster (Toronto, N.),	Sutherland,
Fowler,	Taylor,
Goodeve,	Thoburn,
Guilbault,	Thompson (Yukon),
Hartt,	Thornton,
Hazen,	Walker,
Henderson,	Wallace,
Hepburn,	Webster,
Jameson,	White (Renfrew),
Kidd,	Wilson
Lalor,	(Wentworth) and
Lavallée,	Wright.—79.

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Messieurs	
White (Leeds),	Emmerson,
Pelletier,	Lemieux,
Perley,	Murphy,
Kemp,	German,
Rogers,	Ethier,
Stanfield,	Pardee,
Haggart,	Gordon,
Bristol,	Charlton,
Rhodes,	Macdonald,
Mondou,	Papineau,
Barrette,	Séguin,
Rainville,	Gauthier (St. Hyacinthe),
Lamarche,	Lapointe (Kamouraska),
Ball,	Martin (Regina),
Aikins,	Bickerdike,
Boyce,	Richards,
Baker,	Kay,
Tremain,	Carroll,
Lancaster,	Power,
Wilcox.	Clarke (Essex).

Amendment negatived.

Mr. MICHAUD. The hon. member for Kamouraska has not voted.

Mr. LAPOINTE. I am paired with the hon. member for Nicolet (Mr. Lamarche), had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. MACDONALD. I beg leave to move that the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House, with instructions to amend the same by striking out clause six.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Macdonald, Pictou).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Boivin,	Maclean (Halifax),
Bourassa,	MacNutt,
Brown,	McCraney,
Buchanan,	McCoig,
Bureau,	McKenzie,
Carvell,	McLean (Sunbury),
Cash,	McMillan,
Chisholm (Antigonish),	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Chisholm (Inverness),	Michaud,
Clark (Red Deer),	Molloy,
Cruise,	Murphy,
Delisle,	Nesbitt,
Demers,	Neely,
Devlin,	Oliver,
Douglas,	Pacaud,
Fortier,	Proulx,
Guthrie,	Pugsley,
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),	Reid (Restigouche),
Knowles,	Robb,
Kyte,	Ross,
Lachance,	Sinclair,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Thomson (Qu'Appelle) Turgeon,

Law,	Turriff,
Loggie,	Warnock and
Lovell,	White (Victoria,
Macdonald,	Alta.—52.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Alguire,	Lennox,
Armstrong (Lambton),	Lesperance,
Barker,	Lewis,
Barnard,	McCurdy,
Beattie,	McKay,
Bennett (Simcoe),	Marshall,
Blondin,	Meighen,
Borden,	Middlebro,
Boulay,	Monk,
Brabazon,	Munson,
Bradbury,	Nantel,
Broder,	Nicholson,
Burnham,	Nickle,
Burrell,	Northrup,
Chabot,	Paquet,
Clare,	Paul,
Clark (Bruce),	Reid (Grenville),
Clarke (Wellington),	Robidoux,
Clements,	Roche,
Cochrane,	Schaffner,
Cockshutt,	Sevigny,
Crocket,	Sexsmith,
Crothers,	Sharpe (Lisgar),
Doherty,	Shepherd,
Donnelly,	Smith,
Elliot,	Staples,
Elson,	Steele,
Fisher,	Stevens,
Foster (Kings, N.S.),	Stewart (Hamilton),
Foster (Toronto, N.),	Stewart (Lunenburg),
Fowler,	Sutherland,
Fripp,	Taylor,
Goodeve,	Thoburn,
Guilbault,	Thompson (Yukon),
Hartt,	Thornton,
Hazen,	Walker,
Henderson,	Wallace,
Hepburn,	Webster,
Hughes (Victoria, O.),	Weichel,
Jameson,	White (Renfrew),
Kidd,	Wilson
Lalor,	(Wentworth) and
Lavallée,	Wright.—85.

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	Opposition.

Messieurs

White (Leeds),	Emmerson,
Pelletier,	Lemieux,
Perley,	Wilson (Laval),
Kemp,	German,
Rogers,	Ethier,
Stanfield,	Paruee,
Haggart,	Gordon,
Bristol,	Charlton,
Rhodes,	Macdonald,
Mondou,	Papineau,
Barette,	Seguin,
Rainville,	Gauthier (St. Hyacinthe),
Lamarche,	Lapointe (Kamouraska),
Ball,	Martin (Regina),
Aikins,	Bickerdike,
Boyce,	Richards,
Baker,	Kay,
Tremain,	Carroll,
Lancaster,	Power,
Wilcox.	Clarke (Essex).

Amendment negatived.

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

APPOINTMENT OF A TARIFF COMMISSION.

Hon. W. T. WHITE (Minister of Finance) moved the third reading of Bill (No. 88) to provide for the appointment of a Tariff Commission.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is a special feature of this Bill to which I think I should draw once more the attention of the House in connection with the motion for the third reading. I do not intend to review the discussion, which has been pretty thorough. The feature to which I wish to call attention is not to be found within the four corners of the Bill, but is rather to be found in the interpretation which has been given to it by one hon. member supporting the government, and whose utterances have not been contradicted by any member sitting on the treasury benches. No mention is made in the Bill of what shall be the qualifications of the members who are to compose this commission. But the hon. member for St. Antoine division, Montreal (Mr. Ames), speaking on the subject, stated in so many words that the members appointed on the commission should be partisans, and in sympathy with the government of the day. His words to this effect will be found in 'Hansard,' page 2702. He is reported as follows:

> If I may be permitted to offer advice to the ministers, I would say that they should not necessarily confine their choice to men who have fought and bled for the Conservative party. I think that if there is any man in Canada who is eminently fitted for this position, he should not be rejected by reason of his previous political record. We want the biggest men we can get, but we want men who are not out of sympathy with the policy that the party on this side of the House avowedly stands for. We want men who are not out of sympathy with the idea that protection, reasonably applied, is what Canada needs for her development.

Mark these words, Mr. Speaker, and, I repeat, nothing has been said in the course of a rather lengthy debate to show that the government did not accept the view expressed by that hon. member; on the contrary, everything went to show that the hon. gentleman spoke by authority, and that it is the intention that the men appointed on this commission shall be in sympathy with the policy of the present

administration. It is true the hon. gentlemen began by saying:

If I may be permitted to offer advice to the ministers, I would say that they should not necessarily confine their choice to men who have fought and bled for the Conservative party.

So far so good. That means, if it means anything, that if there is a man not in the Conservative party, a Grit, provided he is tainted with the heresy dear to the heart of my hon. friend from St. Antoine, may be well qualified for this office. But to be qualified, he must be in sympathy with the present administration. Later on my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) emphasized these views, interrupting the remarks of my hon. friend from Carleton, New Brunswick (Mr. Carvell):

Mr. AMES. I beg your pardon; the words 'high protectionists' were not used by me. I said that they must be in sympathy with the well known sentiment of the present government.

This is a declaration that one qualification which will be required for the men who are to be appointed to these offices is that they shall be in sympathy with the present administration. Now, I claim, and submit to the judgment of the House, that such a doctrine as that is at variance with the well known constitutional practice of this country and still more with that of Great Britain. We appoint men to office not on account of their sympathies with any party but on account of their fitness for the position to which they are appointed. I remember that during the debate on this Bill my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) recalled an observation that I made at one time to the effect that we were all partisans and that if we were to appoint only people who were not partisans we could not make any appointments at all. I grant this. Nor do I make any exception to it. I proclaim myself, like others, a partisan. And if I were a protectionist as well, I suppose, I should be qualified to be a member of this commission. But I would remind my hon. friend from Halton that we appoint men to office not because they are partisans, but altogether aside from any consideration of whether they are partisans or not. And when we appoint men who are partisans to any office under the Crown, whether temporary or permanent, we expect them, when they take office, to cease being partisans. We appoint a man to the Bench, who up to the time of his appointment may have been a partisan. But though he may have been a partisan we expect that when he goes upon the Bench he will cease to be a partisan and will perform his duties irrespective of his opinions. At the opening of parliament we chose as Speaker a gentleman from the floor of this House, and, of course, the administration supports one of its own followers, one who has been a partisan but the moment he walks upon those steps to that chair he ceases to be a partisan. He himself states that he ceases to be a partisan and will administer justice between the two sides of the House irrespective of the opinions which, up to that time he may have held. Such, however, is not the character expected of the gentlemen who are to fill these commissionerships. It is expected that they shall be partisans, that they shall be selected because they are partisans and are in sympathy with the present administration. I submit, with all due respect for the opinion of my hon. friend from St. Antoine Division, that such doctrine as that is unheard of in any British parliament. It is of the very nature of our system of government that there shall be an alternation of parties. A new administration comes into office—for governments do not live forever—and finds men in office quite at variance with the policy which the members of that administration uphold.

This will certainly not be fair to the new administration, and I appeal to the fairness of both sides of the House to maintain the principle that men should be appointed to this office quite irrespective of their political opinions, or whether they are in sympathy or out of sympathy with the adminstration, but simply for fitness for the office. For these reasons, which I hope will commend themselves to the fairness of hon. members on both sides of the House, I beg to move in amendment:

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House, with instructions to amend the same by adding the following words to subsection 1 of section 3:—

'Who will be selected without any regard to the views of any political party upon tariff or other political questions, but solely by reason of their fitness by character, training and experience, to effectively and impartially discharge the duties assigned to them under this Act.

If this amendment were to pass, section 3 of the Bill would read as follows:

There shall be a commission to be called the Tariff Commission of three members appointed by the Governor in Council, who shall be selected without any regard to the views of any political party upon the tariff or other political questions, but solely by reason of their fitness, by character, training and experience, effectively and impartially to discharge the duties assigned to them under this Act.

Right Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister). The right hon. gentleman has in the course of his remarks this afternoon laid down principles to which he

never paid the slightest attention during the whole fifteen years of his administration. His position is rather amusing, considering the appointments that his government have made from July, 1896, down to the present time. He discovers just now that his whole course of conduct from 1896 up to the 10th day of October, 1911, was absolutely subversive of the constitution; and he desires us to insert a clause in this Bill to the effect that in making selection of members of this commission rigid disregard must be observed of any political considerations. My right hon. friend supports his contention by arguments that destroy his entire position. He says we should not appoint a partisan—for that is what his argument amounts to; he desires to guard against the appointment of any partisan to this Tariff Board. Then, in order to show that the appointment of a partisan is undesirable, he proceeds to point out that every year in this country partisans are appointed to the Bench, they leave their partisanship behind them, and discharge their duties justly and honourably. Also, in order to show that a partisan should not be appointed to this board, he calls attention to the fact that in the Commons of Canada, at the commencement of every new parliament, a partisan is appointed to preside over the deliberations of this House, and that these partisans have always discharged their duties impartially towards both sides of the House. And so he comes to the remarkably illogical conclusion that for these reasons no man who is a partisan should be appointed to the board of this Tariff Commission. Well, I for one am absolutely incapable of appreciating an argument of that kind. It would be just as sensible for my right hon. friend to propose an amendment to the rules of this House, or an amendment to the statute which provides for the creation of judges, carrying into effect the principles which he professes here. What is the purpose of this Tariff Commission? It is not a commission to make a tariff; that has been explained over and over again with such iteration that I would suppose my hon. friend had grasped the idea before he made his motion this afternoon; but apparently I am wrong, and he has not yet comprehended that idea. These gentlemen will be appointed for the purpose of carrying on certain work of investigation and inquiry; and in the course of that work it will be necessary for them to discharge duties of a quasi judicial nature, and to make a report as to the result of their inquiry. Now, if we appoint partisans every day in the year to discharge the highest duties of citizenship, to sit upon the judicial Bench, as well as to preside over the deliberations of this House, and of the Senate, and if we find that these men, once they are appointed, once they are seized of their responsibility, discharge their duties justly and honourably, fairly and impartially, what is it that leads my right hon. friend to imagine that men of the same type appointed to this Tariff Board will not likewise discharge their duties justly, fairly, honourably, and impartially? What need is there of a clause such as this in the Act constituting a Tariff Commission, more than in the Act constituting the Railway Commission of Canada, or in the Act providing for inquiries into public affairs, known as the Inquiries Act, or in the statute providing for the appointment of judges under the constitution of our courts? There is no more reason for it in the one case than in the other. Therefore, it seems to me that this House should not accept the amendment of my right hon. friend. He has referred to this expression and that expression used in the debate. I want to remind him that the government of this country will be responsible for the appointments to that Tariff Commission, that they realize their responsibility, and that they will endeavour to select men who will be above suspicion in regard to their impartiality and their ability to carry out the purposes of that commission. It is impossible to suppose for a moment that any government, in the discharge of the duty devolving upon it under this statute, will be desirous of doing anything else than to select the very best men in the country for the purpose of carrying out this Act. That is the course which the present administration purposes to pursue in regard to these appointments; and I venture to say that when they have been made, my right hon. friend and the other gentlemen opposite who have been raising bogies over these appointments from the first day the Bill was introduced, will find them such as to justify themselves, not only to the members of this House, but to the people of this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer) Mr. Speaker, I need scarcely say that it is perfectly true that I have no disposition to prolong the debate upon what is usually, but not necessarily, a formal part of the discussion of any measure. I only rise to say a few words because I think my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has raised a point which is absolutely vital to the consideration of this whole matter. We are no longer surprised when the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) rises, to find him take immediate refuge behind the tu quoque argument, but it is really getting a little tiresome and I want to tell him that it is no defensive logic and I do not believe it would be considered any defence in the

country. My right hon. friend is in power. He is surely not going to shape the whole of his policy on the position of his predecessor in the past.

The Prime Minister has a record as well as the leader of the opposition and, in that connection, I would like to call attention to something which appears to me to bind my right hon. friend to vote for the amendment which is before the House. My hon. friend still sits for the city of Halifax. There was a Halifax platform. The second plank in the Halifax platform embodies the principle of this amendment in this very definite language of which the meaning is unmistakeable. The second plank in that famous document reads:

> The appointment of public officials upon considerations of capacity and personal character and not of party service.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). My hon. friends applaud the sentiment. The sentiment is embodied in the amendment, and yet they propose to vote down that amendment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Come again.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). There is no difficulty about that. This principle seems to require a few words from myself because the opposite position, which has been so well established through the mouth of the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), was perhaps given more definite expression to by the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) in the speech which he made and in which he referred to some remarks of my own. But, I should like to point out before referring specifically to that speech what is the origin of this whole commission, and what is the bearing of the amendment upon the efficiency of the commission. The country ought to appreciate the fact that the proposition for this commission originated some years ago with the Manufacturers' Association of Canada. They carried a resolution at one of their meetings in favour of this very thing, and they used in regard to it—and this is very significant language—that we ought to take the tariff out of politics. That means, as I have proved at previous stages of the debates upon this Bill, taking the taxing power out of the hands of the people if it means anything at all. It reminds me of the story of a deacon in a darky church within the poultry belt who went to the pastor of the church after he had preached a sermon, and said to him: We wish you to understand that what we want you to do is to preach religion pure and undefiled and keep out of the chicken coop business. Our friends opposite are voting on politics pure and undefiled, and they do not want us to give any attention to a commission which is outside of the ordinary parliamentary procedure altogether. The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. White) said in the later stages of the debate upon this measure that he believed that this measure would be very favourable to the farmers and consumers. I am sure he will not contradict me if I quote his language to that effect. I want the House to connect that language of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance with the language of my hon. friend the member for Brantford. I was mentioned playfully, of course, as a possible candidate for membership on the Tariff Commission. I need not say that I was not an applicant nor do I consider myself in line for any appointment under this government. What my hon. friend objects to is the very thought that any free trader should be upon the Tariff Commission, because, forsooth, he said that he was a gun which would not go off. My hon. friend, who has had an intimate connection with the Manufacturers' Association, wants to shoot somebody. While I may have been a gun of some kind, was my hon. friend not afraid that if I did by any chance go off I would possibly shoot into the ranks of the manufacturers? He was not concerned about the gun going off or not going off if I were a member of the commission, but he was afraid that I would possibly like to shoot into the manufacturers ranks. Was not that the legitimate inference from that language, was not that the meaning behind the words of my hon. friend? Was it not that this commission is by no means expected to touch the sacrosanct manufacturers, but if it does not touch them my hon. friend might shoot some one. Is he going to shoot the farmers and consumers of this country on behalf of the Manufacturers' Association? I invite the Minister of Finance to reconcile his language about this being a benefit to the farmers and consumers with the evident intention of one of his followers that this proposition should not benefit them but that it may possibly have the effect of shooting into the ranks of a large body of the people of this country. I apologize for detaining the House at this stage of the business, but I think that these words used by the hon. gentleman are of sufficient importance to justify me in rising even if I have delayed the debate for a few moments.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clark, Red Deer) what he means by saying that I was very closely associated with the Manufacturers' Association.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). If there was any offence in those words I gladly withdraw them. I understand my hon. friend has been a manufacturer, and the probability is that he had a close connection with that association.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The statement of the hon. gentleman is that I was very closely associated with the Manufacturers' Association. The imputation is that I was an officer or member of the association. Does he say that now?

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). Oh, no, I gladly withdraw it if it is an offence.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. There is nothing to withdraw if the hon. gentleman did not make the statement.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). I withdraw it if it is in the least degree offensive to my hon. friend.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. It is not offensive, but it is not true. I have never been a member of the Manufacturers' Association. Never since it was formed have I had any close connection with that organization. I say that I was perfectly consistent when I said that in my judgment those who undertake to handle tariffs should be believers in tariffs. I said nothing about partisanship. There are gentlemen sitting on his own side of the House who are in sympathy with tariffs, but the hon. member for Red Deer is not. What are his words? He says that the only way to handle a tariff is with a bludgeon. What is a bludgeon for?—for foul murder. The hon. gentleman says that he would handle the tariff in such a way that there would be no tariff at all. I never said anything about partisans one way or the other. I never used the word 'partisan' during the whole of my speech. I know that there are on the Liberal side, from Nova Scotia, from New Brunswick, from Prince Edward Island, protectionists pretty nearly as strong as I am myself and those gentlemen as far as their protectionist views are concerned would be acceptable. But what I said was that I objected to the hon. member for Red Deer being on the commission because he is a recognized enemy of all tariffs.

House divided on amendment (Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Boivin,	Maclean (Halifax),
Buchanan,	MacNutt,
Bureau,	McCraney,
Carvell,	McCoig,
Cash,	McKenzie,
Champagne,	McLean (Sunbury),
Chisholm (Antigonish),	Michaud,
Chisholm (Inverness),	Molloy,
Clark (Red Deer),	Murphy,
Cruise,	Nesbitt,
Delisle,	Neely,
Devlin,	Oliver,
Douglas,	Pacaud,
Fortier,	Proulx,
Guthrie,	Pugsley,
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),	Reid (Restigouche),
Knowles,	Ross,
Kyte,	Sinclair,
Lachance,	Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Turgeon,
Law,	Turriff,
Loggie,	Warnock and
Lovell,	White (Victoria, Alta.)—46.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Armstrong (Lambton),	Lancaster,
Barker,	Lavallée,
Barnard,	Lennox,
Beattie,	Lesperance,
Bennett (Simcoe),	Lewis,
Blondin,	McCurdy,
Borden,	McKay,
Boulay,	Marshall,
Brabazon,	Middlebro,
Bradbury,	Monk,
Burnham,	Munson,
Burrell,	Nantel,
Chabot,	Nicholson,
Clare,	Nickle,
Clark (Bruce),	Northrup,
Clarke (Wellington),	Paul,
Clements,	Reid (Grenville),
Cochrane,	Robidoux,
Cockshutt,	Roche,
Crocket,	Schaffner,
Crothers,	Sevigny,
Doherty,	Sexsmith,
Donnelly,	Sharpe (Lisgar),
Elliot,	Shepherd,
Elson,	Smith,
Fisher,	Staples,
Foster (Kings, N.S.),	Steele,
Foster (Toronto, N.),	Stevens,
Fowler,	Stewart (Hamilton),
Fripp,	Stewart (Lunenburg),
Gauthier (Gaspé),	Sutherland,
Goodeve,	Taylor,
Guilbault,	Thompson (Yukon),
Hartt,	Thornton,
Hazen,	Walker,
Henderson,	Wallace,
Hepburn,	Webster,
Hughes (Victoria, O.),	Weichel,
Jameson,	White (Renfrew) and
Kidd,	Wilson
Lalor,	(Wentworth.—81.

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Messieurs	
White (Leeds),	Emmerson,
Pelletier,	Lemieux,
Perley,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Kemp,	German,
Rogers,	Ethier,
Stanfield,	Pardee,
Haggart,	Gordon,
Bristol,	Charlton,

Rhodes,	Macdonald,
Mondou,	Papineau,
Barrette,	Séguin,
Rainville,	Gauthier (St. Hyacinthe),
Lamarche,	Lapointe (Kamouraska),
Ball,	Martin (Regina),
Aikins,	Bickerdike,
Boyce,	Richards,
Baker,	Kay,
Tremain,	Carroll,
Wilcox,	Clarke (Essex),
Alguire,	McMillan,
Broder,	Brown,
Paquet.	Bourassa.

Amendment negatived.

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

THE GRAIN ACT.

On the order being called for the third reading of Bill (No. 32) respecting grain, Mr. Foster (North Toronto).

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I hope my hon. friend will not take up that Bill to-day. Several amendments have been made and I think the Bill should be reprinted before the third reading.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I do not want to press the Bill if my right hon. friend thinks it should be left over. I had a conversation with my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), last night, and we arranged that these amendments should be taken to-day. I am anxious to get it up to the Senate as soon as possible.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I simply put it to my hon. friend that this is a very important Bill, some important amendments have been made, and it would be well to have it reprinted before taking up the third reading.

Mr. OLIVER. There was no arrangement between the minister and myself. I asked him if he intended to have the third reading to-day, and he said he did. That was the only discussion.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I understood my hon. friend to say he would have his amendments ready. If he has not his amendments ready of course we will postpone it.

Mr. BORDEN. As I understand the right hon. gentleman presses to have it stand over.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think it would be only fair that such an important Bill with so many amendments, should be reprinted before being read a third time.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). If my hon. friend wishes it to be reprinted before the third reading, which will take some time, I move that instead of reading the Bill the third time we go into committee on it again for the purpose of filling in the blanks in clause 3.

Motion agreed to, and House went again into committee on the Bill.

On clause 3, subsection 6—salaries of commissioners,

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I move that the first blank be filled with the figure 6,500 and the second with the figure 6,000. That fixes the salary of the chief commissioner at $6,500, and those of the other commissioners at $6,000 each.

Mr. OLIVER. Would the minister state the reasons that have led him to fix the salaries at these amounts. They are good salaries, $1,000, and $1,500 higher than the salaries of deputy ministers at Ottawa.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The reasons may be twofold although there is only one essentially good reason, and that it that the importance of the commission, the responsibility which will rest on it, and the work which the members are called upon to do are all such as call for a minimum salary of $6,000. The Chairman of a commission generally has added responsibility in a way over and above that of other members of the commission. In this commission all the commissioners will have nearly equal work although the one who is chairman has certain directive powers that entitle him probably to a consideration beyond what is given to the others. The salaries paid to members of other commissions appointed during the last ten or fifteen years are all greater than the salaries paid to the deputy heads of the different departments. If there is any objection to the salary being more than that of another officer of the government that does not seem to have stood as a good reason when the other commissions were appointed and when the commissioners' salaries were fixed. Under all the circumstances I think I have been moderate in the salaries I have named rather than otherwise, and if I made any change I would be disposed to make the salary larger instead of smaller.

Mr. OLIVER. What are the salaries paid to the Railway Commission, and to be paid to the Tariff Commission?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The Railway Commission, I think, get $7,000, $8,000, and $10,000. The Waterways Commission lately appointed receive $7,000, and $7,500. The Tariff Commissioners will receive $7,500 and $7,000.

Mr. OLIVER. In view of the salaries paid to the Tariff Commission the salaries proposed are moderate.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I am glad my hon. friend thinks I have not been extravagant.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. NEELY. Is it the minister's intention to have the Bill reprinted before it comes up for its final reading ?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Yes.

Mr. McCRANEY. My attention has been called to the first subclause of section 107 under the heading of 'Spring Wheat,' which says:

No. 1 Manitoba Hard wheat shall be sound and well cleaned, weighing not less than 60 pounds to the bushel, and shall be composed of at least 75 per cent of hard Red Fife wheat.

I have before me a resolution, a copy of which was sent to the hon. minister, in which it was pointed out that the words 'well cleaned' are a hardship, because dockage is now put upon those who sell grain which is not well cleaned, so that a person who is selling hard wheat which might otherwise grade as No. 1, if it is not cleaned as required by the Act, suffers a double loss—a loss both in grade and in dockage. This resolution points out that justice would be done if the same wording were used as is used with regard to No. 2 Manitoba Northern wheat, and if we used the words "reasonably cleaned' instead of the words 'well cleaned.' It is pointed out that farmers have not facilities for cleaning well, and that all that they can be expected to do is to clean reasonably. I hope the minister will consider that point.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The matter was considered when we were passing over these grades. Not only was it considered in conjunction with the deputation from the northwest who were here, but it has been considered later in conjunction with the inspector himself. There are objections urged against the suggested change in the quality of this grade. The words 'reasonably cleaned' involve a doubt. A man who is inspecting knows when a grade is well cleaned; that is easily apparent. To say that he must see that it is reasonably well cleaned leaves it open to the interpretation of various inspectors in a different way from what it would be if the actual definition were made. That is with reference to the best quality of our wheat, and if any grade of wheat should be raised and kept to a high standard, it is that grade. The same words are used with reference to No. 1 Hard Fife and No. 1 Manitoba Northern, and it is not until you come to the lower grade of wheat that the words 'reasonably cleaned' are used instead of the words 'well cleaned.' I can see the point that my hon. friend makes; but this grade should be high, and when it passes out from inspection. it should be well cleaned. If there are variations in the wheat itself, as to what is mixed with it, the dockage will always be in proportion to the amount of material for which dockage is allowed. If the wheat is reasonably clean, more dockage will be taken than if it is well cleaned. I do not see where the seller stands to lose in that respect. He does not want to get a price for the grain unless it is up to a certain standard and unless it is well cleaned. There will be a heavier dockage for wheat which is partially cleaned and a lighter dockage for that which is better cleaned.

Mr. McCRANEY. The other matter which I wish to discuss is the requirement that the better grades shall be composed chiefly of hard Red Fife wheat. Experiments have been going on for several years to obtain a grade of hard wheat that will ripen in a shorter time than the grades generally used throughout the west. The experimental farm in Ottawa has been doing good work along that line. Dr. Saunders, who has been the superintendent, and his son, Dr. C. E. Saunders, have succeeded in obtaining a new variety of hard wheat as a result of crossing Calcutta Red and Red Fife, which to-day throughout the west is receiving the attention of very many people. There was a land show held in New York city in the month of November last, at which the first prize was awarded for wheat to Mr. Seager Wheeler, of Rosthern, Saskatchewan, and the wheat with which he won the prize was a new variety known as Marquis wheat.

The statement is now made that at that land show the Red Fife wheat took the third prize. An effort is being made to popularize Marquis wheat. It is pointed out that Marquis wheat ripens 15 days earlier than does Red Fife wheat, and one can understand, especially in such a season as we have had during the past year, that 15 days may mean a great deal to the western country in the way of getting grain threshed and harvested. This matter was up for consideration in the legislature of the province of Sasktchewan, and the Minister of Agriculture for that province made the statement that had Marquis wheat been grown by the farmers of the west during the past year, it would have involved a saving, as he estimated of some $15,000,000 to them through its better ripening quality. As I have already said an effort is being made to popularize this wheat. It is said to-day that there are some half million bushels in existence available for seed purposes. It is also said that not only will there be a great addition in the areas which are now under cultivation for wheat, but that the result will probably be the extention to the northward of the wheat belt by some 100 or 150 miles as the result of using a wheat with better ripening qualities

than we now have. I may say that at the city of Saskatoon during the month of February so anxious were the farmers of our part of the country to procure wheat of the Marquis variety for seed purposes, that they were paying as high as $12.80 a bushel for it. It is said that in probably three years' time Marquis wheat will be the popular wheat of the west, and will supercede Red Fife. In view of the success which Marquis wheat has had, and of its having become as well established as it has, it does seem to me that the time has come when we may very well, and without danger to the reputation of our hard wheat, change the requirements so as to admit of Marquis wheat being sold as a No. 1 wheat if in other respects it comes up to the required standard. I have no doubt that the Minister of Agriculture will be asked for samples of Marquis wheat. I know that at the Agricultural College at Saskatoon the experiment with Marquis wheat has produced remarkably better results than the experiments with Red Fife wheat. The legislation as we have it today, which was passed when Red Fife wheat was the only wheat which seemed to be suited to the western country, distinctly discourages experiments which may produce varieties of the earlier ripening qualities; and I would urge upon the minister to amend this Bill so that these better qualities of wheat shall not be restricted to hard Red Fife wheat, but that any hard varieties of wheat may be included. I will put the resolution before the committee for its consideration, and I therefore move:

That clause 107 be amended as follows:

In subsection 1 by striking out the words 'well cleaned' where they occur and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'reasonably cleaned,' and furthur by striking out the words 'hard Red Fife wheat' where they occur and inserting in lieu thereof 'wheat of any hard variety.'

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I have already said a word or two in reference to the first part of my hon. friend's amendment. With reference to the second, when the matter came up first, looking at it just from a layman's point of view, it seemed to me that it might have been well to have elminated the words 'Red Fife' and to have let the clause read 'hard wheat', or to have it this way: 'Hard Red Fife wheat, or hard wheat of equal quality'. However the consensus of opinion when we were discussing this question was that it would be better to let the name remain for the present, although Marquis wheat and some two other varieties that were mentioned (Stanley and Preston wheat) have been experimented with and have proved to be very fine qualities of wheat. It was thought that it would be better that the experiments should be longer continued and that there should be more certainty about it and a little wider acquaintance of people with Marquis wheat before the change was made in this section. Under those circumstances I do not think it would be wise for me to accept my hon. friends suggestion although the time may come when there may be found superior qualities of wheat to the Red Fife; and when these experiments have gone to the stage of becoming actual proof, and there are quantities of such wheat, then it may be reasonable to change the nomenclature of the grain.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). I do not like to press this matter on the minister under the circumstances, but I think really it is important to have some change made at the present stage. In the province of Saskatchewan, at least in that part where I reside, we have experimented for some time with wheat. I myself have been growing Preston for a number of years, and as a matter of fact the Act as it stands now is a dead letter so far as shutting out that wheat is concerned. I sell it year by year and it passes just the same as Red Fife.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). A twin sister to it.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). I think that so far as quality is concerned we suffer no injury.

Mr. McCRANEY. Do you sell on sample?

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). Not on sample, we sell on grade, and I have had it repeatedly graded as No. 1 and 2 Northern, that is pure Preston with not a bit of Red Fife in it as far as I could tell, and bearded wheat too. That is done in actual practice without much damage resulting, but it does not look quite right to my mind that there should be a provision in our Act which the inspectors either wink at, or are unable to carry out. Preston and Marquis are the varieties of grain which I am more accustomed to. I fancy that an expert can tell at almost any time the difference between Preston and Red Fife more by the shape of the grain than anything else. But still they pass it continually as No. 1 and No. 2 Northern, and it is quite just that they should do so I think. I do not know that the tests have shown the Preston to be quite as good a wheat as the Red Fife, but it is so very near it that there is not a material difference. The Marquis also can be distinguished from the Red Fife, while the Preston is a longer and thinner grain than the Red Fife I think the Marquis on the other hand is a little thicker, and possibly a little shorter and of a deeper red. But the tests so far as they have been applied

show the Marquis to be as good a grain as the Red Fife, or a little better from a flour-making standpoint. I do not wish to press this matter too far but I thought it necessary to tell the minister what I have seen myself; and while, as I say, there may be no very great injury to the farmer, I am not sure that to have a law which is virtually ignored is a very good thing. We either ought not to permit our officials to wink at and ignore the Act, or we ought to change the law.

I have grown the Stanley and have found no difficulty in selling it, though I think I only grew it one year. But I know that the Stanley is continually being passed as Red Fife. I presume the same applies to the Marquis.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). Can the grain buyers tell the difference?

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). I think if I were a grain buyer I could tell the difference between the Preston and Red Fife.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). Could the average grain buyers in the West detect the difference?

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). I think so. The Preston is longer and a somewhat thinner grain than the Red Fife. But I think it is practically as hard. There is a marked difference between the Marquis and the Red Fife, at least a difference that can be seen.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). How many years have they been experimenting with the Marquis ?

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). It cannot have been for very long, seeing that it is being sold at $12 a bushel. That may not be true with regard to the Marquis just now, but, even though frozen it is sold at $2, $3, and $4 a bushel. So, there is no danger, at present because none of it will be sold in the ordinary way.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It will practically all be sold for seed ?

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). Yes. No one who has Marquis will sell it except for seed, unless it is altogether too dirty.

Bill, as amended, reported and amendments concurred in.

SUPPLY—NEWS SERVICE TO MAGDALEN ISLANDS.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Rouville). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to the Marconigraph service that has been established between the mainland and the Magdalen Islands. I have on two occasions asked the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) if it was true that news was being supplied by the government to the Magdalen Islands during the season when navigation is closed. And I was answered yesterday that the Postmaster General had established a news service and that this service had begun last week.

Some years ago, I obtained from the Minister of Public Works a condensed cable news service for the fishermen and merchants of the Magdalen Islands, giving them the state of the fish-markets and of staples generally at Halifax and Pictou. That news was cabled from Meat Cove to the islands. But I never asked for the supply of political news to the islands. The service of the cable was also given to the islanders at a cheap rate in order to give them the necessary facilities for communicating with their relatives on the mainland. This year when the estimates of the Public Works Department came before the House, on the item of telegraph lines in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, I called the attention of the Minister of Public Works to that service established through my instrumentality a few years ago. To my astonishment I learned the other day that a more extended service of news had been granted by the government to the islands. I immediately suspected something, and my suspicions were right. I asked the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier), and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen), what was the nature of this service, and was answered yesterday by the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier), that that service was non-political. Well, Sir, I hold in my hand the first instalment of news which was sent by the political editor in Quebec to the Magdalen Islands. And I must protest against it. No political leader has the right to use the moneys of the people to supply partisan news to one section of the country at the expense of the whole country. This first instalment is to be followed by weekly letters to the Magdalen Islands. I shall not worry the House by reading these despatches, but I see one paragraph here which deals with the G.T.P. contract which was interpreted by the Privy Council the other day. And the whole statement is biased, and is given from the Conservative point of view only. I need hardly mention other paragraphs in which eulogies and encomiums are heaped upon the head of the Postmaster General and the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), in connection with Quebec public expenditures. I call the attention of the acting leader of the House (Mr. Foster), to this state of affairs. The question will be brought up again in the House, but, meantime, he should warn

his colleagues that they must not expect the country to pay for partisan news wired to the Magdalen Islands under the excuse of giving to the islanders something of the news of the outside world.

Mr. HAGGART. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux), give us a specimen of this partisanship?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Just before my hon. friend reads, would he kindly state from what he is reading?

Mr. LEMIEUX. From the Toronto Daily 'Star,' which publishes the first instalment of news sent to the Magdalen Islands. It has been published in other newspapers, but I happen to have the Toronto 'Star' in my hands, and from this I read.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). My hon. friend is certain that that is the pure, undiluted news that was sent to the Magdalen Islands?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am morally convinced that these are the items of news sent to the islands.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It is very important to know that it is really so.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Very well. I will take the hint of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster). I will put a question in the order paper or move a motion asking the Postmaster General to give the House an exact copy of the news which was sent from Quebec to the Magdalen Islands. And I shall defer my remarks to another day. But I again state that if the facts are as mentioned in the Toronto 'Star,' it is simply an abuse of the confidence of parliament, and it is a gross abuse of the privileges enjoyed by a minister of the Crown. He has no right to use the money of the people to supply partisan news to one section of the country.

Mr. BENNETT (Simcoe). I would suggest to my hon. friend that he look up the report of the Kingston penitentiary a few years ago, where he will find that the greater part of several pages was taken up in an argument on binder twine to contradict speeches of members in this House.

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

SUPPLY.

Campbellton—to increase accommodation at, $160,000.

Mr. COCHRANE. The committee will remember that a very disastrous fire occurred there last year, and this vote is necessary to replace the buildings then burnt down.

Mr. CARVELL. Does that refer to the stations and buildings alone?

Mr. COCHRANE. It covers station, platforms, engine house, rest-room, roundhouse, turntable, conduits for pipes, heating, gas and electric plant, wiring and installation, machinery, grading and ballasting, freight sheds, ice house, temporary buildings, engineering expenses, land and legal expenses. The work was started last year.

Mr. MACDONALD. The minister was to give us some information with regard to financial results.

Mr. COCHRANE. I have had prepared the following memo in answer to my hon. friend:

Year.	Average miles in operation.	Working expenses.	Earnings.	Profit.	Loss.
		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1907-8	1447	9,157,435 53	9,173,558 80	16,123 27	
1908-9	1447	9,328,021 55	8,527,069 46		800,952 09
1909-10	1447	8,645,070 33	9,268,234 99	623,164 66	
1910-11	1455	9,591,070 41	9,739,120 59	148,050 18	
1911-12	1455	9,994,527 44	10,558,781 03	564,254 00	Estimated.

In answer to the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie), all expenditures on the Intercolonial railway out of revenue have been for maintenance, with the exception of an amount of $200,000 which was taken out of the surplus for the year ending March 31, 1911, and paid out towards betterment of the rolling stock. I may say also that the action of the former minister in reserving that $200,000 was one that I approve. It enabled him to bring the rolling stock up to a better state than it was in previously. As to the surplus at the end of the present year, I

have not yet decided what to do with it, or how much of it to apply in the same way.

Mr. MACDONALD. There are complaints throughout the lower provinces that the rolling stock is not up to the standard, either in quantity or quality. It is said that in order to get a surplus these considerations are being neglected. Has the minister looked into that question?

Mr. COCHRANE. As I said last night, we are taking stock to arrive at a conclusion. Later on we will find in the estimates an item for cars and rolling stock.

Mr. CARVELL. I would like to ask the minister if he will take into consideration the advisability of retaining this surplus in some way for a special fund, and using it towards renewing rolling stock, bridges and whatever else is necessary. I know I am opening up a big question. I am not finding any fault, because my own party friends have erred to the same extent that his friends did when they were in power, and I am afraid that my hon. friend may err in the future. There is a wide difference between the Intercolonial railway and any ordinary railway company. I realize that railway companies are in the habit of charging many items to capital, and justly. If this method of bookkeeping has been adopted on the Intercolonial in the past, to some extent we are following the principles of railway companies. But there is a vast difference between the two. The Intercolonial is an asset of Canada, and it is a necessity to the maritime provinces. It is a great advantage, not only to the maritime provinces but to Quebec and Ontario as well; because while it is true that we have a reasonable freight rate and passenger rate, yet the great part of that advantage inures to the benefit I think of the manufacturers and producers of Ontario and Quebec, certainly to a much greater extent than to the consumers of the maritime provinces. Now the trouble comes in that when we have a surplus of $600,000 or $700,000, as we are to have this year, that goes into the ordinary fund of Canada, and the people of the maritime provinces, or the Intercolonial railway, get no credit for it whatever. It simply swells the revenue of Canada, and it is taken to be used in other portions of Canada—I am not saying it is not properly used, but the difficulty comes in that if unfortunately there comes a year when there is a deficit, then there is a great cry goes up from the rest of Canada that the Intercolonial is a burden, it is something that ought not to be allowed. Several times since I have been in parliament I have heard this cry go up: The Intercolonial is not paying its way; therefore it is going to be sold, or given away to some company, or something of that kind.

If this money were placed in a special fund, out of which betterments could be paid for, we would at least have the satisfaction of knowing whether the Intercolonial railway is paying its way or not. I submit that there has been hardly a year since the Intercolonial railway has been in existence when the people of Canada have been able to tell by reading the report of the minister, or the blue-books, whether the Intercolonial railway has paid its way or not. Possibly I am breaking in on new ground; I know that I am voicing something which has been opposed to the policy of my friends, but I think I am talking common sense, and I am appealing to the minister, not to give me his decision now, but to take this matter into his consideration. Take the figures which the minister gave me last evening; he says that we have a surplus this year of something like $600,000 or $700,000, but that we spent last year a million and a half on capital account. If that be true we have no actual revenue returned to the people. I would like to see the Intercolonial railway put upon a business basis. I am a maritime province man, but I have no connection with the Intercolonial railway. It does not affect my constituency, but I hope that it will in the future, because I believe that the minister is going to effect some arrangement by which a branch of the Intercolonial railway will come through my part of the country. I am anxious to see the freight and passenger rates brought down to the minimum so long as they pay expenses, but I do not like to see a railway run except on business principles, and I would like to see the bookkeeping carried on in such a way that we would know exactly what the road is costing us each year and whether we have a deficit or a surplus. The hon. minister made a statement last night with regard to the board of management, but I do not think that he gave us as much information as we desired. I am not going to ask him here to declare his policy, because evidently the minister does not want to do that now. From the figures given this afternoon, I see that since the inauguration of this board of management there has been a great improvement in the balance sheet at the end of the year. We have had a continuation of surpluses since this board of management was inaugurated, whereas very frequently prior to that we had deficits, I think that the minister would do well to consider carefully the question as to the advisability of doing away with this board of management. I know that there has been a feeling in many parts of the maritime provinces that the board of management per-

haps has not played the game to the extent that somebody would like it to.

An hon. MEMBER. The political game?

Mr. CARVELL. The political game, but I do think that they have played the business game and that is the game that the country wants to-day. I am not lecturing my hon. friend, but I am trying to talk common sense, and I hope that he will give some consideration to what I propose before coming to his decision as to the question of policy.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I remember very well the late Minister of Railways explaining to the House what had been done with the surplus earnings in the way of betterments to rolling stock and betterments to the railway.

Mr. COCHRANE. I explained that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, and the late minister always made that explanation.

Mr. COCHRANE. I did it this morning.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, I had not the opportunity of hearing my hon. friend. It was affirmed by the late Minister that all reasonable improvements which were required and which any ordinary railway company would charge to operating expenses were charged by the Intercolonial railway, and that no improvements had been charged to capital account except such as a railway company would charge to capital account. It seems to me that where entirely new rolling stock is obtained, additional locomotives and cars, it is proper to charge the cost of these to capital account. Where rolling stock has been worn out and new cars are obtained to take their place then it is proper to charge the cost of the new cars to revenue or operating expenses. I understand that where a bridge has been replaced by a heavier bridge, owing to the necessity of providing for heavier locomotives, the difference between what would have been the fair value of the bridge that was replaced and the cost of the new bridge has been charged to capital account. Every railway company does that. I have been told by a gentleman connected with the Canadian Pacific railway that since that road was supposed to be entirely constructed and completed the Canadian Pacific railway has expended more on capital account, in rebuilding, improving grades, laying heavier rails and rebuilding bridges than the original cost of the road. That has been charged to capital account and it would be very improper and unfair to the shareholders to charge it to operating expenses. In order to deal justly with the Intercolonial railway and give the public a proper idea of whether it is paying expenses or not it is very proper that these should be charged against operating expenses and the overplus should be shown as a surplus. It seems to me that that is only reasonable and fair.

Mr. CARVELL. I am sorry to differ from my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) although I quite agree with him that the method which he has described is the method followed by the ordinary railway company. I am sure that if we were to keep on following that method we would never know what the Intercolonial railway was costing us, or whether it was paying its way or not. There ought to be a time at which the Intercolonial railway should be considered as being finished except you are adding new mileage. Of course, if new mileage is being added that is another thing. But, there should be a finality to it at some time. Most of us are business men to some extent and if, in my business, or in any of the enterprises with which I am connected, I kept taking money out of earnings and paying it out in the form of dividends, and if I was issuing new stock to keep the thing going, possibly I myself might get some money out of the dividend, but I would not be creating very much of a property to hand down to my successors.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is not that what the Pennsylvania and Canadian Pacific railway are doing?

Mr. CARVELL. That may be so as far as these railways are concerned, but the business of the country is not done in that way. This is a case, I contend, of running this road in such a manner as to enable it to pay its way. When we have a railway running for forty years surely the time has come when it ought to pay its way or we should know why. Possibly I am talking against the policy of both my friends and my friends opposite, but I hope the minister will give the question some consideration and bring forward some definite proposition.

Mr. FOWLER. There is a matter to which the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) took occasion to refer last evening, when I was, for the moment, absent from the House. It is in connection with certain rails that were supplied for the Salisbury and Albert railway. The hon. member for St. John referred to certain remarks which I had made in the county of Albert subsequent to the election of September 21, and he attempted to show by referring to certain telegrams, which he quoted that my statements on that occasion were not in accordance with the facts. The statements which I made at that time to which the hon. member takes exception were as a matter of fact largely inferences from the condition of affairs as we

saw them. We knew that on the morning of the election, September 21, a number of carloads of rails were brought to Salisbury, the junction point of the Intercolonial railway and the Albert railway. These carloads of rails were never put upon the Albert road, they were never brought away from Salisbury, and shortly after the election they were returned to Moncton. The natural inference was that it was never the intention of the government to hand over these rails to the Albert road for the purpose of repairing its lines. We had no access to these telegrams, and so, as I say, the natural and only inference was that it was merely an election trick and we would be quite justified in drawing that inference, because we knew who was behind it, the hon. member for St. John, who was celebrated for these little election dodges and manipulations. Consequently we were confirmed and fortified in our opinion and in the inference we drew from the position of affairs as we saw it. These rails were returned to Moncton, and I had to come to Ottawa and interview the department before any of them were made use of upon the road.

My hon. friend has quoted certain telegrams which passed beween himself and Mr. Raymond. The condition of affairs was just as I stated in the remarks I made in Albert county subsequent to the election, to which I have already referred. No agreement had been executed between the railway company and the government, and consequently the officers of the department in Moncton declined to allow those rails to go for the use of the Albert railway.

My hon. friend quoted a telegram which shows that this agreement had not been executed and so the quotation which he makes from my remarks at Albert is amply borne out. I said: 'The people of Albert county were fooled about the railway.' Surely they were fooled, they were told they were to get these rails, that the arrangement was all made and these agents of the Liberal party were chasing about the county, were going to the various halls and schoolhouses throughout the county, telling what the government had done and were proposing to do and they were reading telegrams by the score from Mr. Pugsley showing the wonderful, strenuous efforts he was making in order to get this road in running order again. But it was all hot air, simply wind, and nothing was done, and nothing had been done until after September 21, or in fact until October 26. Anybody who has anything to do with these government departments, and I think I speak to a sympathetic audience, knows that it takes some time to get them to move and so it is no wonder that it was not until October 26, with all the force I was able to bring to bear upon the department that I was able to get these rails. I did get them and the road was running on the 1st of December, the very day I told the people it would start. I told the people of Albert they were fooled about the railway. Surely in the face of everything said by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), and his emissaries throughout the county, when they were still without the railway, and suffering great loss of business and distress, I was justified in drawing the inference that the people were fooled about the railway. Promises were made that were not intended to be fulfilled. The only way to judge of a man's intention is by the circumstances surrounding his acts, because you cannot pry into his brain and find inscribed there what he really means; you must judge of his intention by the outward evidence of his acts, and with these carloads of rails going down to Salisbury and remaining there instead of going into the county as was expected, to be used on the road, it was the most natural thing in the world for us to draw the inference that they were never intended to go any further.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Did not my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, after he became minister, cause the cars to remain there up to the 26th day of October when the agreement was delivered at Ottawa?

Mr. FOWLER. No, the cars went back to Moncton and were unloaded.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. FOWLER. I know a number of cars were unloaded, I tried to prevent them being unloaded.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was after the new government came in.

Mr. FOWLER. Possibly it would have been great presumption on my part to attempt to interfere before. I said:

> There had been no authority for these rails to be loaded or removed from Moncton.

Is that statement correct? My hon. friend has shown by the telegram that there was no authority. He said that on information he had received, he wired that the contract was signed and executed. If it was signed it certainly was not filed at Ottawa and that would not authorize the department to send the rails. I am not finding fault with the department but with the manner in which this was done. It was done in such a way as to throw the strongest possible suspicion upon the bona fides of those carrying on the negotiations, and it is no wonder the people of that country think that they were fooled and I said what I thought because that was the only possible inference one could draw. I said:

There had been no authority for these rails to be loaded or removed from Moncton, and as soon as the elections were over and the government was defeated, arrangements were made to withdraw these rails.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is quite incorrect.

Mr. FOWLER. I say that the rails that were loaded in Moncton yard to be shipped to the Albert railway were after the elections, unloaded from the cars in which they had been placed. I say that because I saw that done and tried to stop it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. On what date?

Mr. FOWLER. After the elections.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Was it after or before the present Minister of Railways came into office?

Mr. FOWLER. Possibly it was shortly after. There was no contract and therefore the minister would not have been justified in allowing these rails to go. I said:

I found out that there had been no contract signed or executed in regard to rails for the Salisbury and Albert railway.

As far as the department was concerned, it had not been signed or executed. I do not know what document may have been signed outside of the department, certainly there was none there.

Then there was trouble about the bridges. I again went to Ottawa and got the bridges, and I have the authority for saying to you that one of these bridges is now on the line and on the 1st of December the road will again be in full operation its entire length.

Mr. MACDONALD. Were these rails subsequently obtained for the branch line?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes, they were bought by the company under an agreement with the department that they were to pay, I think, $27 per ton, which I think was an excessive price for them. The rails were sold to the company under the condition that if the branch line were taken over by the government, an allowance would be made for the rails, and if the branch lines were not taken over, the company would pay $27 a ton for them.

Mr. MACDONALD. But in the meantime they are not to pay for them?

Mr. FOWLER. They are not to pay for them until it is determined what interest is to be charged against them. My desire was to have this railway operated through its entire length, but it was shut down by the late government, which was charged with the duty of conserving the rights of the people and looking after their interests. However, after the present administration came in, I found the department sympathetic, although slow, and the result was that on the 1st day of December the railway was operated throughout its entire length, and it has been operated daily ever since, to the great comfort and joy of the people; and of course everybody along the line of the railway is very strongly in favour of the present administration, whereas the other people had only made promises, which, as usual, had a string to them. They remind me of a trick that we used to play when boys. We would take a ten-cent piece, put a hole through it, tie a string through the hole, put the ten-cent piece on the sidewalk, hide in a doorway, and, when any one went to pick up the ten-cent piece, jerk it back. So with the late government: They always made their promises with a string to them, and, as soon as people were ready to grasp them, pulled them back. The hon. member for St. John assured us as a member of this House that he was acting in good faith, and I am bound to accept his statement. I am simply justifying the statement that I made at Albert, and I will leave it to the fair opinion of any member of this House if I was not justified in all the circumstances.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What I complain of is not so much that my hon. friend, in his ignorance of the facts, made the statements that he did, but that when he has acquired a knowledge of the real facts, he should still persist in stating that the people were fooled, and that there was no bona fide intention to supply the rails for this railway.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. gentleman has missed the point of what I said. I said that I was justified in drawing the inference which I did, and I say so still. But if the hon. genleman makes the statement as a member of this House that he was acting in good faith throughout this affair, I am bound by the rules of the House to accept it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is a course which usually does not commend itself to gentlemen. That is not a generous mode of accepting the statement I made. I do not ask my hon. friend to rely on my statement, but I ask him to take the correspondence which appears on the record, and any man reading it, with a disposition to deal fairly and honourably with his political opponents, would say that everything was done bona fide and in a proper and businesslike manner; and there is no ground for my hon. friend, with the knowledge of the facts as disclosed by the record, stating that there was any disposition to humbug the peo-

ple or to do anything that was not fair and businesslike.

Mr. FOWLER. Was the contract in the hands of the Railway Department before the 21st of September?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I stated last evening exacly what the contract was, and I will repeat after the recess what I said.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 99) respecting the Ottawa, Montreal and Eastern Railway Company. —Mr. Bickerdike.

Bill (No. 94) respecting the Windsor, Chatham and London Railway Company. —Mr. Wilcox.

Bill (No. 54) to incorporate the Quinze River and Ottawa Railway Company.—Mr. Brabazon.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 114) to incorporate Révillon Frères Trading Company, Limited.—Mr. Barker.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Campbellton—to increase accommodation at, $150,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend for Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler), who is not now in his place, asked me just before recess if the contract was signed prior to the 21st of September. I may say for the information of my hon. friend that the telegram from Mr. Raymond to me was prior to the 21st of September, stating that the contract had been signed, and it was understood that it would be forwarded immediately to the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals at Ottawa. I observe that in the copy of agreement which is included in the return to the House, and which was signed by the Minister of Railways, the date is given as the 19th of September. Of course that was not the date when my hon. friend signed it, he signed it afterwards, and that evidently was the day when it was signed in New York by the president of the company.

Now my hon. friend for Kings and Albert has been a little disagreeable in the remarks which he made to the committee, and among other things he said as an excuse for not believing that the government was acting bona fide in reference to the supply of rails for this railway, that he was aware of tricks which I have played in the past, presuming, I suppose, political tricks, and therefore he was justified in giving the worst construction possible to what had taken place. I do not propose to follow my hon. friend and say any disagreeable things with regard to him. I think it does no good to import language or insinuations of that kind into the discussion of an important matter such as this. I am not aware however that ever in my political life I gave any assurance to the public which was not given with the utmost sincerity, or that I ever failed to carry out, so far as I was able, any promises which I had made. Perhaps I may say this—and I hope my hon. friend will not take it offensively—I think that if he has any weakness at all it is a desire, when he gets upon his feet, to say things which are disagreeable, and for which I have no doubt he is exceedingly sorry afterwards. I have no doubt my hon. friend has many uneasy moments after he makes a speech in going over the mistakes which he makes, and he promises himself to do better next time. I only hope that my hon. friend will avoid future errors of that kind, because, underneath what appears to be the disagreeable side of my hon. friend's character, he has a kindly heart; you have to search for it often, but still when you do make diligent search, you find it is still there all the same. I should be very sorry indeed to say anything of an unkind nature towards my hon. friend. My only reason for bringing this matter up was to show that whether the hon. gentleman was endeavouring to give a fair and proper impression to the people of Albert county or not, he certainly led them astray when he led them to believe that there was any want of good faith on the part of the late government in this very important matter.

Mr. FOWLER. I was not here when the hon. gentleman began his remarks. Would he repeat what his answer was to my question?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I said that the telegram from Mr. Raymond to me, stating that the agreement had been signed in New York, was prior to the 21st of September. I said also that that was further confirmed by the fact that the agreement which is on file, and which is executed by the present Minister of Railways, is dated the 19th of September, two days before the election, and of course in the vicinity of three weeks before the present Minister of Railways assumed office. I take it for granted that he signed the agreement with the date in it which had been put in by the company. It was signed by Mr. Swan, the president of the company.

Mr. FOWLER. I asked if there was any agreement between the Salisbury-Albert

Railway Company and the government on file in the department at Ottawa or anywhere else, an executed agreement with regard to selling rails and transferring rails from the Intercolonial to the Albert road?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I stated the full circumstances last evening. What I said then I am happy to repeat now, because my hon. friend, I fear, has not done me the honour of reading the report of my remarks in 'Hansard.'

Mr. FOWLER. Yes, I did.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then he has forgotten what I said. I said that in the month of September Mr. E. P. Raymond, who was solicitor of the company, and who, I may say, had given assurance that he held a power of attorney from the Salisbury-Harvey Railway Company, had wired me from New York that the agreement had been executed by the company; and it was understood between Mr. Raymond and myself that immediately upon its being executed it should be forwarded to the Department of Railways at Ottawa.

Mr. FOWLER. But had it been signed by the Minister of Railways?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not at all.

Mr. FOWLER. When was it signed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I said it was not signed until the present minister signed it, some time in October; I stated that yesterday.

Mr. FOWLER. Then I would ask the hon. gentleman if that agreement was operative until it was signed by the Minister of Railways and Canals?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would say that it was, and I will tell my hon. friend why. In the month of September the terms of the agreement were approved by Mr. Raymond, the solicitor of the railway company, and who held a power of attorney from the railway company, and it was also aproved by Mr. Sherwood, the general manager of the railway company. When Mr. Raymond sent me the telegram that it had been formally executed by the president in New York, my view as a lawyer was then, and is now, that if any rails were delivered upon the strength of that agreement, the terms of which had been approved by all the parties interested, by Mr. Alward, acting for the Department of Railways, in St. John, where the terms of the agreement were arranged—that if rails were supplied under that agreement, the company would be bound to carry it out. I have no doubt whatever upon that point.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to read a document which is on file and which was not read yesterday, but which has a bearing, a very important bearing, upon the question of the bona fides of the late government in reference to supplying the rails, and which is also important in view of the point raised for the consideration of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways as to the arrangement being that legislation should be introduced at the present session of parliament. This is a letter from the former Minister of Railways to Mr. Swan, the president of the Salisbury and Harvey Railway Company:

Office of the Minister of Railways and Canals,
Ottawa, Aug. 2, 1911.

Dear Sir,—The policy of the Dominion government, as announced, is to take such lines as may, in the interests of the public, furnish branch lines to the Intercolonial railway. At the session of parliament just closed a Bill was introduced naming the basis on which these lines might be taken over. This Bill got its first reading, and was under discussion in Committee of the Whole House when dissolution took place.

In the meantime, the owners of these lines made representations that the basis could not be worked out practically, and after consultation with the Minister of Railways another basis was proposed, which does not seem unreasonable.

I have your offer to sell outright the Salisbury and Harvey railway, with its extensions and rolling stock for ($120,000) one hundred and twenty thousand dollars. Ordinarily I would not at the present moment make a proposition respecting the taking over of this line, were it not that some nineteen miles of the road are not now open for traffic, and the people who were accustomed to a railway service are suffering a great injustice and hardship, so that I feel strong steps should be taken to remedy this situation.

The government is prepared, therefore, to propose to you that at the coming session of parliament they will introduce legislation, either to take over the road at one hundred and twenty thousand ($120,000) or to take it over on the basis recently arrived at after consultation between the owners of the various branch lines and the Minister of Railways on condition that you will agree, at once to make sufficient repairs to the line to enable it to be operated and begin at once to operate it over its entire length for the convenience of the public. Such repairs to be made under the supervision of the Railway Department.

Should parliament approve of the government taking over this line, the amount of money expended by you in such repairs will either be added to the sale price, or to the capital on which you will be paid interest under the rental basis.

Kindly let me hear from you without delay as the people complain loudly of the inconvenience.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) GEORGE P. GRAHAM.

A. S. Swan, Esq.,
President, Salisbury and Harvey Railway,
Hillsborough, N.B.

I find on file also a letter from me to Hon. Mr. Graham, Minister of Railways and Canals, as follows:

Office of the Minister of Public Works,
Canada.
St. John, 11th Aug., 1911.

Dear Mr. Graham,—In reference to a letter of A. Sherwood, manager of the Salisbury-Harvey railway for loan of rails and iron girders for bridges. Sherwood agrees to modify letter so that they shall be merely a loan to the company pending completion of transfer of road to Intercolonial railway. It is very important that this loan should be made, as the people are put to an enormous inconvenience by reason of road being shut down.

I am, yours very sincerely,
WM. PUGSLEY.

Hon. Geo. P. Graham,
Minister of Railways,
Ottawa.

Members of the committee will see that the letter of the Minister of Railways and Canals of the late government to the president of the company set forth very fully the terms upon which the government would allow the company to have the rails. Following that up, an agreement, as I have said, was prepared, approved by the manager of the railway, approved also by the Solicitor of the railway, who held the power of attorney, as appears from the papers on file, and by the then Minister of Railways. Then, when I received Mr. Raymond's telegram that the agreement had actually been executed by the company, and assuming that he would send it forward to the Department of Railways and Canals, I felt that I was justified in wiring to the department that Mr. Raymond had wired me that the contract had been signed and asking that the rails might be forwarded. For some reason or other there was some delay on the part of Mr. Raymond in sending the agreement to Ottawa. We find on file the communication from Mr. Raymond, which was read yesterday, as follows:

St. John, N.B., October 5, 1911.

Hon. Wm. Pugsley,
Minister of Public Works,
Ottawa, Ont.

Expect to make another arrangement with new government.

E. P. RAYMOND.

That the company expected to make a more favourable arrangement with the new government does not appear. But I think that everybody will agree with me that when the agreement did not arrive in Ottawa in due course of mail, as the deputy minister had a right to expect it would arrive, the department was quite justified in issuing orders, as it did, to withhold delivery.

Now, my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) repeats to-day the statement which he made in Albert, that he was entitled to all the credit for getting these rails actually delivered. I cannot agree with that. The files of the department do not justify my hon. friend in making that statement. It appears that he did communicate with Ottawa, and did offer to give his personal assurance, to assume the personal responsibility to make good to the government any claim in respect of these rails. But my hon. friend the present Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane)—very properly—having in view the Independence of Parliament Act—declined to take any contract from my hon. friend, no matter how good that contract might be, for my hon. friend could not properly enter into it, and declined, as he had the right to decline, to countermand the order with regard to the rails until the company carried out its undertaking to forward the contract to Ottawa. It was not owing to what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) did, unless it was to induce Mr. Raymond to hurry forward the contract. For, the moment the contract arrived the present Minister of Railways and Canals acted promptly and in good faith and executed the agreement which, as I have said was arranged weeks before, and gave the order.

Another thing which strikes me as peculiar. The hon. member for Kings and Albert says he did not know anything about the telegrams on file in the department. Does he deny that after the election, and before the present Minister of Railways and Canals acted he saw the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and asked him the cause of the delay?

Mr. FOWLER. I saw the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on several occasions. We discussed many matters, and may have incidentally discussed this matter,—I dare say we did.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no doubt my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) did so. It was the most natural thing in the world for him to see the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as being the minister from the province. And I assume that it would be at the request of my hon. friend from Kings and Albert that the telegram of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries of the 12th of October was sent. That telegram reads:

St. John, N.B., October 12, 1911.

Hon. Frank Cochrane,
Minister of Railways,
Chateau Frontenac, Que.

Agreement made with late government to supply rails and girders to Salisbury and Albert railway to repair their railway pending the agreement to take over railways by government, since government resigned management refuses to give any further rails. Kindly instruct Pottinger at Moncton to continue supplying sufficient rails and girders so work can be completed. Will see you in Ottawa Tuesday.

(Sgd.) J. D. HAZEN.

Which, as I said yesterday, was a very proper telegram for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to send. To that telegram the Minister of Marine and Fisheries received the following reply:

Ottawa, Oct. 14, 1911.

Hon. J. D. Hazen,
St. John, N.B.

Message received re Salisbury and Albert railway I find upon inquiry that the company has not executed the agreement they promised to, and which it was said they had done. This is reason, I am informed, for non-delivery more rails and girders.

(Sgd.) F. COCHRANE.

If my hon. friend was not informed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries of that telegram it certainly is very surprising indeed.

Mr. FOWLER. Why surprising?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Surprising, because, if my hon. friend was getting the Minister of Mariné and Fisheries to intercede in the matter and to hurry on the delivery of the rails, I would have assumed that the minister would have informed the hon. member for Kings-Albert as to the reason why the rails and girders were not being delivered. At all events, what I say is that before the hon. gentleman informed himself by finding out what had taken place in regard to these rails, the agreement which had been made and the correspondence which had passed between the department and the railway company, he was not acting in a manner which would command the approval of those who were acquainted with the circumstances, when he went to his constituency and told the people that the late government had been deliberately fooling them instead of delivering these rails, in fact, telling them that they never intended to deliver them and that what they did was simply to send forward the rails with the intention of taking them back after the elections. I submit that upon consideration even the hon. member himself will feel that his conduct under these circumstances was of the most unjustifiable character.

Mr. FOWLER. That is very strong language to be used even by the hon. gentleman. In order that the committee may be fully seized of the circumstances in connection with this particular case it would be as well for me perhaps to give a little of the history of the stoppage of operations on this road. Many months before the first step was taken, before the first telegram was sent, this road had ceased operations from Hillsboro to Albert, a distance of about 20 miles, and the people were needing the service of that railway very much. There were manufacturing industries at Albert that were unable to get their products away by reason of the lack of transportation and the people were making every effort possible to get this road reopened. The House was in session there during that time, the government was in power, the government of which the hon. member for St. John was a member, and a supposedly not unimportant member, it was my hon. friend's own province, it was a constituency close to his own, it was a constituency represented by my hon. friend; yet, all these months passed by and these people got no redress nor was any attempt made to redress their grievance. The first date that my hon. friend has put forward is the 2nd of August, months after the road had ceased operation. Why did they get in a bit of a hurry then?—because an election was impending, because this railway ran through an important section of the county of Albert, a part of the constituency of Kings and Albert, because they felt that this man Fowler would likely be a candidate, and under those circumstances, they were determined to keep him out of the House at any cost. They had succeeded once at a tremendous cost and they were determined to do it again if they could. So these gentlemen got busy, not because they wished to redress the grievance that the people of that portion of Albert county were suffering from—no, but simply because they wished to carry that constituency and they felt that it was necessary to take that step. Then, they made a terrible rush.

They got in a very great hurry and my hon. friend did a great deal of telegraphing all over the country. Telegrams were flying thick and fast and a certain gentleman in the county of Albert who was formerly the local member there made himself very busy and I do not know how many trips he made to Moncton beseeching and praying the department there to do something before election day. Why? Why was all this haste at this particular time?—because the election was approaching and not because they wished to assist the people of Albert particularly but simply because they felt it necessary in order to prevent my returning to the House of Commons.

Now the hon. gentleman tells us that under the circumstances that existed in this case, because there had been some negotiations in connection with this matter because there was supposed to be floating around somewhere, he knew not where, an agreement, whether signed or not he knew not, certainly not signed by the Minister of Railways and Canals, we are not justified in casting any doubt upon the intentions of the late government. He was on his reputation as a lawyer and as a Minister of the late government that it

was a sufficient contract entered into between the late government and the Railway Department to justify the carrying out of the terms as they were to be carried out by the government if the contract had gone through. It has been said, I know not with what truth, but I suppose that when they investigate it we will find out with what truth, that a great deal of the business of the Department of Public Works, under the supervision of my hon. friend, the then minister, was done in a very loose way, not that there was anything crooked, or criminal or improper in a wrongful sense, but that the business was done in a very loose way and, having heard what the hon. gentleman said tonight with regard to this matter and in regard to what he would do under circumstances such as he has detailed here, I can understand why there might be a great deal of loose business in the Department of Public Works under his superintendency. No Minister of Railways, no responsible head or deputy head of the Department of Railways, would be justified in allowing rails to such an amount as would cover 20 miles of road to go out from the possession of the Intercolonial railway under any such loose arrangement as that, I care not what statement my hon. friend may make in regard to it on his responsibility or reputation as a lawyer. I grant that my hon. friend is a good lawyer, none better in Canada, but my hon. friend is not serious when he makes the statement that that would be a sufficient contract for him, and if he were advising a client he would not advise him along those lines. I was absolutely justified, I repeat it here and now, under all the circumstances of the case, in drawing the inference which I did draw, and the inference which the people of that district drew, that the government was not serious in the attempt it was making to redress the grievance under which these people had laboured. If the government had seriously desired to do justice to the people it would not have allowed that railway to have remained idle for months notwithstanding that public meetings were being held that petitions were being sent forward, that everything was being done that the people could be expected to do to bring about a change in the running of the road and to secure the opening of that part of it that was not being operated. Therefore, I say I was absolutely justified in the statement I made and I will leave it to the fair judgment of the members of this committee to say whether or not I was under the circumstances, even as detailed by my hon. friend.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman again indulged in street-corner gossip, I suppose. He says it is said that the business of the Public Works Department has been loosely managed. Who told my hon. friend that? Has he learned that from the present minister? We have the testimony of the present minister that he has the greatest possible confidence in the head officers of the Department of Public Works. Let me tell my hon. friend that under the rules governing the administration of the federal government where the principal officials of a department are careful in the performance of their duty there is not likely to be any loose work. So far as the Public Works Department, while I had the honour to preside over it, is concerned, I have no fear of the fullest possible investigation into every act of mine, and as to everything that was done while I was minister.

Mr. BENNETT (Simcoe). Wait a while.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We will wait a while, just as long as my hon. friend wants, but let us wait, do not let us anticipate what may be discovered, do not throw out insinuations as to what may be discovered, do not seek to poison the public mind with respect to the administration of a department until matters are brought out, if there are any that can be brought out, reflecting on the administration of the department. It seems to me that is only fair, only what any public man administering a department has a right to expect from political opponents whether they are members of this House or outsiders.

My hon. friend has complained of delay by the late government in making provision for the opening of this railway. It seems to me my hon. friend speaks in that respect without consideration. This is a private road, owned by a private company which received subsidies from the provincial government and from the Dominion government. It did cease to operate a portion of its line. Very great complaints were made by the people, the very strongest possible complaint was made by the late representative of Kings and Albert, and at the earnest solicitation of Dr. McAllister and representatives from other constituencies in which railways were in a somewhat similar position, the late government asked parliament to enact a law of a very drastic character under which if a road ceased to be operated, proceedings might be taken for the sale of it in order to take the most effective measures possible to secure its being reopened and operated upon a safe and proper basis. But in this particular case the company said we have not the money to put this 20 miles in order, we cannot reopen it, unless we can get rails, we have not the means to procure rails, and we cannot do anything towards reopening the road unless the government will come to our rescue and give us a loan of rails pending the comple-

tion of an arrangement for taking over the various branch lines of railways. That was a very difficult thing to do, if a proposition like that were put up to the present Minister of Railways, he would say that was a question that required careful consideration.

Mr. FOWLER. How long did it take to say all that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It has not taken me very long.

Mr. FOWLER. How long would it take for the people to make their statement, and for you to grant that relief? Would it take all the months that the road remained idle until the 1st of August?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It took a good deal of consideration on the part of the government before they would approve a recommendation which I made that the government should come to the rescue of this road, and make a loan of this large quantity of rails to them. It meant lending the company rails to relay 20 miles of road, it meant contracting quite a large indebtedness, and was a matter requiring very careful consideration, and the government very properly took quite a considerable time before deciding to do it. My hon. friend knows that another part of this railway extending to Alma was closed up by the Albert Railway Company.

Mr. FOWLER. Not the same company.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It may be another company, but a continuation of the line owned and operated by this company.

Mr. FOWLER. That had nothing to do with it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And my hon. friend knows that the rails of that road were taken up and disposed of, and I think my hon. friend had something to do with the matter as solicitor or otherwise, and would know something about it.

Mr. FOWLER. I know all about it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was a piece of road which would have been a feeder to this part, which was aided by the late government and unfortunately it went out of service, the rails were taken up and that part ceased to be operated, thereby, of course, rendering the other part of the road less profitable than it otherwise would have been. I submit that the late government so far from being censurable for any delay which took place with regard to making a loan of these rails, were entitled to receive, and did receive, from the people of Albert county, and should receive from my hon. friend as their representative, hearty thanks in respect of the matter, because what the late government agreed to do was of great public service and it affords me the greatest pleasure to know that the present Minister of Railways has carried out what we agreed to do.

One word with regard to what my hon. friend says was the improper advice which I gave to send forward these rails upon my receiving information that the contract had been signed. The hon. gentleman says that this was a contract which was flying around loose somewhere. It was nothing of the kind. That draft of agreement had been brought to St. John by the law clerk of the department, its terms had been approved of by the deputy Minister of Justice, by the general manager of the Intercolonial railway, and by Mr. Raymond, solicitor of the company, and all that remained was to take it to New York to secure its execution by the president of the company under the seal of the company, after which it was to be forwarded to the deputy Minister of Railways at Ottawa. I think it was not an imprudent thing to say to the deputy minister that it would be proper for him to have the rails loaded and sent forward, because in the ordinary course before those rails would reach the Harvey-Salisbury road, the contract would reach Ottawa, where it would be executed by the then Minister of Railways and the whole matter would be completed. The rails were so loaded that they were kept in the possession and under the control of the authorities of the Intercolonial railway until that agreement reached Ottawa, and when there was inexplicable delay in its reaching Ottawa, when it was found that Mr. Raymond was for some reason delaying in sending it forward, the railway authorities acted very properly in issuing orders not to deliver the rails to the company because the agreement had not reached Ottawa. They acted entirely properly afterwards in waiting until the 26th of October under the present minister when the agreement was received, properly executed, when, without any thanks to the hon. member for Kings & Albert (Mr. Fowler), the present minister carried out the arrangement made by the late minister and ordered delivery of the rails.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not think my hon. friend has explained the long delay of almost a year during which this railway was down before action was taken on the 2nd of August by the government. The only explanation he has given is that he acted promptly and brought the matter before his colleagues. It took his colleagues a long time to inform themselves as to whether or not he was correct in the statements he was making. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman's colleagues should have had more confidence in the statements he made, and should not have required all those months of extra information outside

of what he was able to give them, unless there was some very good reason for it.

My hon. friend has referred to another road, which he says was a part of this, and has said that I had something to do with the disposal of the rails on that road. There was another road in the county, but it was no part of the Salisbury & Albert Railway. It was a road from Harvey to Alma. It has been in existence 17 or 18 years. The ties were all rotten, the bridges were all down, and the rails were being stolen by private parties. They supposed that the road had been abandoned, and they carried off the rails and used them for various purposes. Certain persons who were clients of my office had a judgment against the road, and the rails were sold under that judgment. Why does my hon. friend drag in that transaction? To draw a herring across the trail? I cannot understand what it has possibly to do with this railway.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Was it not all one continuous railway.

Mr. FOWLER. Not at all.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Was it not a continuous railway, although owned by two separate companies?

Mr. FOWLER. As a matter of fact there were three railways there—the Salisbury & Albert, the one under discussion, the Harvey branch connecting Albert with Harvey, under a different management, and the railway from Harvey to Alma, under different management and different ownership. It was the road from Harvey to Alma which was down all those years. nothing was left but the right of way and a portion of the rails. My hon. friend knew that perfectly well. He knew that the Albert Southern, so-called, had nothing to do with the Harvey & Alma, and why he dragged it into the discussion I do not know. Did he want to cast some discredit on myself? I do not know why otherwise; and if that is all the argument that my hon. friend can put up for the long and cruel—and I say it advisedly—way of the late Government, it is a very lame and very poor defence, and it was so considered by the people of Albert county. Let me tell you that the people of Albert county are well pleased and well satisfied now with the result, and I may state that they give the credit to the present member for Kings and Albert for the redress of the great grievance under which the suffered for so many years.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is not the first time that the people have been deceived, as my hon. friend says.

Mr. FOWLER. No. or my hon. friend would not be here.

Mr. FOWLER.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Let me say, as the concluding remarks of this debate so far as I am concerned, that the people certainly have great reason to be satisfied with the policy which was inaugurated by the late government, of taking over the branch line railways, under which that government agreed to lend the rails to this Company in order to have the road improved, so that it could be put in good running condition, and which has been very properly carried out by the present Minister of Railways—I say that the people ought to be gratified that that policy has been brought to such a successful issue; and if my hon. friend is clever enough to make the people believe in a state of facts that does not exist, then he is cleverer than even those of us who have admiration for his intellect would give him the credit of being.

Mr. FOWLER. Let me say this, that the people are satisfied and gratified that there is to-day in power a government which does something more than promise. That was all that the late government did with regard to that constituency at any rate it dealt in empty promises. To-day we have a government that deals in performances.

Mr. MACDONALD. I want to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways to the case of a young man in Nova Scotia named Joseph Benoit, who was dismissed by my hon. friend. He had been for a number of years an employee of the railway, and had paid into the provident fund a considerable amount of money. He has called my attention to the fact that he has received an official letter informing him that he cannot receive back the amount of money which he has paid in. It does seem to me that that is very unfair, particularly in view of the law on the subject. Chapter 22 of the Acts of 1907 says that employees who are discharged from the service for any cause other than those mentioned in paragraph 'b' of section 17, after they have been three or more years contributors to the fund, may be paid out of the fund the total amount of their contributions to the fund, but without interest and less the cost and expenses of medical examinations. Paragraph 'b' of section 17 referred to is this:

> Those who are discharged from the service on account, of wilful default, misconduct negligence in the performance of their duties, drunkenness, fraud or dishonesty.

A charge arising out of political interest does not come within the things mentioned in this paragraph.

Mr. COCHRANE. Would not that be misconduct?

Mr. MACDONALD. He is not charged with misconduct, but with political inter-

ference, which is not misconduct in the sense of the statute, which relates to his conduct on duty or to any offence involving moral turpitude. Certainly it would be straining the construction of this statute very much to keep from this man the money which he has actually paid into this fund, and which was kept out of his wages, because he got interested in politics to an unusual extent. I would like the minister to look into this case and see that justice is done to this man. I am only asking my friend to carry out the statute.

Mr. COCHRANE. I shall be very glad to look into it.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). I have a similar case to bring to the attention of the hon. minister, though it is slightly different, inasmuch as the man tendered his resignation. The case is that of John Girrior, Tracadie, Antigonish county. He was section foreman, and had been in the employ of the department for upwards of 14 years. He was supposed to be a Liberal, I understand, and some people got busy to put him out of the way. Then he received notice some time in October, after this government came into power, that he was no longer to act as foreman and another man who was under him was appointed in his place he however being continued as underman. The result was that Mr. Girrior, who lived about the middle of the section—being an under-man—had to walk to the end of the section every morning before 7 o'clock when the day's work begins. Now, unfortunately he had met with an accident and had his leg broken about a year ago in consequence of which rheumatism developed. The result was that it was very hard for him to walk from the middle to the end of his section in order to get to his work, as he was required to do, every morning at 7 o'clock.

Mr. CARVELL. How far would that be?

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). These sections are 6 or 7 miles in length and it would be half that distance. At any rate it was quite apparent to him in his way of thinking—whether rightly or wrongly—that this was a subterfuge, that he was degraded in the service to get him out of the way in order to make room for the man who was appointed as his successor. Therefore to save himself from the odium of dismissal, which he expected was coming, Mr. Girrior very foolishly tendered his resignation. Now the Employees Provident Fund Act provides that any man who tenders his resignation cannot participate in the fund. Had Mr. Girrior waited and taken his dismissal for political reasons or on account of political partisanship, he would have been entitled to the amount he paid into the fund for the whole 14 years and upwards without interest and less certain charges such as the fees of the medical examiner. Had he stayed in the government service a few months longer he would have been entitled to his pension, but he resigned before the specified period of 15 years had expired. Having tendered his resignation however it is held by the Provident Fund Association that he is not entitled to participate in that fund. The section of the Employees Provident Fund Act to which I refer is the following:

> The following employees, notwithstanding anything in this Act, shall not participate in any of the benefits of the fund under this Act, nor be entitled to a refund of any portion of the contributions made by them to the fund, that is to say:
>
> Those, except as in this Act provided, who voluntarily retire from the service.

The Provident Fund Association has claimed that as Mr. Girrior voluntarily retired from the service he cannot receive the amount which he now claims, namely, the amount which he has paid in. But I submit, and I direct the attention of the minister to this fact; that although in form the resignation was voluntary yet, all the circumstances being considered, it was not a case of voluntary resignation at all. but a case of forced resignation as Mr. Girrior apprehended the situation. Mr. Girrior taking into considération the fact that the other man had been appointed as foreman, and that he was submitted to this extra work, of walking to the end of the section before the beginning of his days work, which under the circumstances he cauld not perform, naturally concluded that this was a means of getting him out of the way. As he puts it himself: There are lots of ways of killing a dog besides choking him with butter. Under the circumstances he very foolishly I think, tendered his resignation. I do not blame the department at all—in fact I do not attribute any blame to anybody as far as that is concerned—but Mr. Girrior thought that by offering his resignation and by making no fuss he could participate in the benefits of the employees fund. He thought that would strengthen his case and he would be all the more likely to receive the benefits to which he thought he was entitled by tendering his resignation, which under the circumstances I submit was not voluntary.

Mr. COCHRANE. The matter has not come before the department in any way at all.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). I believe that.

Mr. COCHRANE. But I will get a report on the case.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I would like to get from the minister some information in regard to the method that is adopted in the case of dismissals. Are the dismissals made by the department, or by the board of commissioners? The appointments, I understand, on the Intercolonial railway are made by the board. When a young man asked me to recommend him for an appointment, and I had to send him to the board. He had to pass some test in regard to his health, his eyesight, his age, and a number of other matters, and then having proved satisfactory he was taken on trial, and everything having proved satisfactory he was finally appointed. Now, the board having the power to appoint men, it would occur to me that it also ought to have the power of dismissing them as well.

Mr. COCHRANE. When complaints are sent into the government, under the rules of the brotherhood, the men cannot be dismissed without an investigation. I am carrying out that procedure to the fullest extent and to show how lenient we have been on the Intercolonial I will state that on the 1st September on the government railways there were 11,473 employees. The number complained of is 77, dismissals ordered 20, suspensions 2, re-instatement 1, investigations asked for or ordered 60. Only 9 of the 20 dismissed men have so far asked for an investigation. On the canals there are about 4,000 men employed. There have been 24 dismissals, 4 investigations, and the constituencies affected number 9. In every case where an investigation on the railways has been asked for, and in many cases where that was not done, an investigation has been ordered.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Do I understand then, that the board has nothing whatever to do with the complaints against employees?

Mr. COCHRANE. Not as far as political complaints are concerned. The board has power to investigate other complaints, of which there have been quite a number. Some of these dismissals were based on other complaints rather than complaints of a political nature.

Mr. SINCLAIR. One of the main reasons for the appointment of this board was that the Intercolonial railway should be taken out of politics altogether, and we were all hoping that result would have been realized.

Mr. COCHRANE. Oh no.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Oh yes. Would it not be better when political or other complaints are made against employees in the service that those complaints should be referred to the board, rather than to the department?

Mr. COCHRANE. I do not think that would be a proper course, because it would be bringing the board into politics. Where the complaint is other than political the board does conduct an investigation.

Mr. SINCLAIR. It has also been represented to me that employees complained against were not allowed to have counsel at the investigation, that counsel were not permitted to take any part in the examination, and that only such questions as the commissioner allowed were asked.

Mr. COCHRANE. Through the commissioner.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The questions must all be asked through the commissioner, and it is in the discretion of the commissioner as to whether questions should be asked at all or not. I have also been informed that the commissioner refused to put certain questions, that were considered fair and right, to witnesses. I would like to know on what ground the people who are complained against are refused the advice of a friend who is willing to attend or of counsel. It puts the employees in a very awkward position, as they are not accustomed to these trials. It will be difficult for them to get fair-play unless there is some one there to assist them and bring out the truth. Would the minister say whether it is true that instructions have been given to the commissioners that no person is allowed to assist the employee in connection with his defence.

Mr. COCHRANE. I follow the rules laid down by the agreement, which states that a man against whom a charge is brought can take a friend with him, a brother employee. And no order has been given that counsel shall not appear.

Mr. MACDONALD. Early in the session I asked if a Mr. John Fraser had been employed as inspector of round-house construction in Stellarton in my county. The minister said that this man was so employed on the recommendation of the gentleman who contested the riding with me. On the same day I was informed by the Postmaster General that this same John Fraser had been dismissed from the post office in Stellarton for defalcation in connection with the trust moneys in his hands as postmaster. Even after this fact was mentioned in this House, the minister permitted this man to remain in the employ of his department not merely until the work of construction which he was employed to inspect was finished, but until some ten days ago when I directed his attention to the matter after I had visited my county and had found the work finished over a month ago, and this defaulter walking around the streets of the town drawing

$3 a day and doing absolutely nothing. It may be that the minister was not aware of these facts, and I trust he was not. I make these statements on my responsibility as a member of this House. Some of his under officials permitted this defaulter to continue as inspector of construction for a month after the work was done—

Mr. COCHRANE. It is not done yet.

Mr. MACDONALD. The minister said the other day that this man was dropped from the employment of the department on February 23.

Mr. COCHRANE. That is true. The chairman of the Railway Board informs me that the work is not done yet.

Mr. MACDONALD. What work is not yet done? I was there less than three weeks ago and the building was being utilised as part of the round-house. It may be that some little details remain to be finished, but the contractors have worked out their contract and gone back. Let me tell the minister that while this man was inspector of the building, he was employed in some small office in the town which took up practically all his time. He did not give his whole time to the work of inspecting. The people in my county know the facts, and many of the political friends of the hon. minister, knowing this man, were surprised to find that one of the first acts of the government in my county was to put this man in an office of semi-trust and keep him under pay long after there was any practical need for his services. This is deserving the attention of the minister, and I ask whether he will inquire into it. If not, we will have to deal with the matter in some other way. I would like an answer from the hon. gentleman.

Mr. COCHRANE. Will the hon. gentleman please put the question again?

Mr. MACDONALD. I have called the hon. gentleman's attention to facts, and I ask him to inquire of people at Moncton and see what the facts are with regard to the case.

Mr. COCHRANE. I did not know that this man had been dismissed from the Post Office Department when I employed him. I did find out what his qualifications were as clerk of works, I found that he had served his apprenticeship as a carpenter for four years, and, after working at his trade for ten years, until 1870, was appointed as foreman carpenter in the Black Diamond colliery, taking full charge of all the surface work and buildings. After 1876, he again took up the building trade and had charge of building stations and freight houses on the eastern extension railway from New Glasgow to Mulgrave. I understand that there never was an investigation, and I do not think it is proper to call him a defaulter, for nothing was proven. I must admit, however, that had I known the circumstances, I would not have appointed him as clerk of work. When I made the statement, that the work was not finished, I made it on the authority of the chairman of the board who claims that it is not finished yet. It was to have been finished in December, but the time was extended by order in council.

Mr. MACDONALD. I would like to know where the hon. minister got this statement as to this man's qualifications. There is no use in anybody trying to make out that he had not a fair trial on the charges of defalcation. He resigned in order to avoid prosecution, and his friends came to my political friends to intercede and prevent action. There is nobody in the county of Pictou, in the vicinity where he lives, that does not know this. If he was engaged in all this great construction work, he has not been doing it for the last thirty years, for he has been doing nothing but living off the public wherever he could get an office or a little job of some kind. I would like the minister to ascertain when the work on this round-house actually stopped, also whether this man has been doing anything in relation to that work for the last month, and whether he has been employed in other work in the meantime and drawing salaries from two or three different sources within the last six weeks.

Mr. LOGGIE. I desire to draw the attention of the minister to the matter that the Boards of Trade of Chatham and Newcastle have taken up with me and also with the Department of Railways for some time past the matter of improved railway service. The deputy minister, at any rate, is well aware of the matter I am going to refer to. The villages of Doaktown and Boiestown are about half way between two principal business towns on the Miramichi and Fredericton. Doaktown and Boiestown are about 35 to 50 miles west of Chatham and Newcastle. The way trains are run at the present time, Northumberland citizens are able to do their marketing in another county, namely, at Fredericton. They leave their home in the morning, go to Fredericton, do their business, and return at night. The people of Chatham and Newcastle consider it a grievance for this reason: If a man living in either Doaktown or Boiestown wishes to do business in Chatham of Newcastle, he cannot reach these towns over the Intercolonial without losing one day and two nights; while he can go to Fredericton and do his business and come back the same night, an equal number of miles. The Boards of Trade of Chatham and New-

castle ask that a train leave either Boiestown or Doaktown in the morning, and go east to the business centre of the county. Chatham and Newcastle are located about half way of the extreme length of the county. But as I said, the Department of Railways have not been able thus far to meet the wishes of the people of Chatham and Newcastle. I am reminded by the Minister of Railways that there is a surplus on the year's operation of about $700,000. May I not ask him to consider if there is not some way by which the residents of Doaktown and Boiestown can use the railway to go east, either to Chatham or Newcastle in the morning, do their marketing in the shire town of their own county, and in the other commercial town of their own county, instead of having to go to the shire town of another county to do their business and return the same night. It seems to me that money would be well spent in giving the outlying districts increased accommodation. It was my privilege to draw the attention of parliament seven or eight years ago to the fact that the Intercolonial was the only trunk line passing through that portion of the province of New Brunswick, and a duty devolved upon the management to see that the outlying districts were given reasonable transportation facilities, which was along the line of building branch lines. I will be told that there is hardly any business for an extra train, and that the people are served by facilities granted them to go to Fredericton instead of going to the business centres of their own county. I want to draw the attention of the minister to the fact that this is a grievance of which the people of Chatham and Newcastle complain.

While I am on my feet, I want to draw the attention of the minister to another matter. He will find in the records of his department a petition from the people on the north side of the Miramichi in the parish of Alnwick, where there is a large amount of fishing business done, praying that the minister will take into consideration the building of a branch line from Newcastle down towards Tracadie, or as far as Tabucintac, a distance of about 35 miles. I am in entire sympathy with the policy of the government in their decision to build branch lines, and thus to accommodate the people of the outlying districts, who at the present time are without railway facilities. I would like, therefore, if the minister would bear that matter in mind. That petition is in his department from the people of the county of Northumberland, who are looking for their turn to come in the near future to get a branch line.

While I am on my feet I would like to take this opportunity of drawing the attention of the minister to another matter. It is urged by my hon. friends, and by the Board of Trade of Newcastle, that at the present time the deep water facilities are not what they ought to be. They ask that a crane be placed on the wharf at Newcastle, and that the Newcastle wharf be enlarged. I have no doubt we shall have the pleasure of a visit from the minister later on, and I am sure he will give these matters his favourable consideration. They have been before the department already, but thus far have not been put right. I think it is my duty to call his attention to these matters, and hope he will give them his favourable consideration.

Mr. COCHRANE. I have received visits from deputations from both Newcastle and Chatham; of course they want the railway to run a different way. The great difficulty has been that there are two roads, one on each side of the river. I think if we adopted one side alone we might give them some relief. It is a matter that I intend to bring before the board. With reference to the wharf, Newcastle and Chatham have both had it. I have received a deputation from Chatham, and they feel they should have it still. As to the branch line, I have not had time to consider whether it is properly placed, or desirable in the interest of the country. But I hope to give it consideration later on.

Mr. TURGEON. My hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Loggie) has asked for a branch line in his county from Newcastle to Nackawic. I think that a branch line should be extended not only as far as Neguac, but as far as Tracadie where it would join the Caraquet North Shore road. This Caraquet North Shore railway is one of the branches which the department is now thinking of taking over in a short time as a branch of the Intercolonial railway. It traverses the most prosperous and wealthy districts in the province of New Brunswick. It is a great lumbering district, and we have immense forests, the development of which has been very rapid recently. The products of that district have not been able to reach the market of the western provinces because they are handicapped by the extra freight they have to pay. The fisheries besides, are immense, and the traffic in that line has been increasing rapidly year after year. I hope the minister will take into consideration the advisability of leaving no gap along that peninsula between the Baie des Chaleurs and Miramichi bay. That road should connect Bathurst and Newcastle. I am sure the board of management of the Intercolonail railway and the Deputy Minister of Railways also, must be acquainted with the possibilities of that route in large passenger and freight traffic. We have also the mines at Bathurst, which are worked by people from the east of Gloucester

county. People are getting more and more prosperous, and therefore better able to bring traffic and earnings to the railway. I trust the Minister of Railways will look into that scheme in the expectation of assuming control of the Caraquet and North Shore railway, which should be extended to Tracadie and Newcastle, there adjoining the Intercolonial railway.

Mr. LOGGIE. I would like to say a word with reference to what the minister has said regarding the possibilities of removing the rails from one side of the river. I would like to remind the minister that that railway has been through for thirty or forty years and while the earnings are not very great, I am sure the people living alongside that river would consider it a very great breach of faith and a grievance should the rails be raised. The population, of course, is small.

Mr. COCHRANE. Did I make the statment that I was going to remove the rails?

Mr. LOGGIE. No, but I thought you said you were going to consider it.

Mr. COCHRANE. I said that I was considering closing one.

Mr. LOGGIE. That is what I mean. I understood the minister to say that he was considering closing one of the railways on one side of the river, and I presume it will be the side of the river which is more sparsely settled and where the income would be less. That is why I wished to draw his attention to the fact that this railway has been through for thirty or forty years and that the residents will consider it a great grievance if the privileges that they have hitherto enjoyed are taken away from them. While we have a surplus, it seems to me that if there be a portion of the road which is not a paying piece we might very well, in the interest of the whole and in the interest of the people at large, consider the localities served by the portion of the railway whose earning power is hardly up to what you would like it to be. I would like the minister to bear in mind the fact that after these residents have had railway facilities for thirty or forty years they would find it a grievance if these facilities were taken away. Chatham and Newcastle each have railway facilities. If Chatham requires increased railway facilities, and she is getting them, that is no reason why Newcastle should not have increased railway and terminal facilities in keeping with the trade requirements of the town. One town is on one side of the river and the other on the other side of the river and there is no reason why there should be any undue competition between these two towns. An expenditure for increased railway facilities at Chatham was agreed to two or three years ago but the improvements are not quite completed. I am sure that the minister will go on and complete that work at an early day. The department now own a very nice piece of property in the largest town in the county of Northumberland. Miramichi district is the Liverpool of the north shore of New Brunswick. From the district of Miramichi many millions of deals are shipped annually and many hundred thousand dollars worth of fish are exported. If I am not transgressing I would say that Miramichi fishermen during the last winter lost $30,000 in duty paid to Uncle Sam's treasury that might have been kept in the pockets of the fishermen.

Mr. LEMIEUX. While we are on the subject of the Intercolonial railway, might I call the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals to the present condition of the railway built from Matapedia in the county of Bonaventure to Gaspé Basin? As my hon. friend knows there are two sections of the railway. There was first the Atlantic and Lake Superior, built from Matapedia to New Carlisle, about a hundred miles, and then a new company was formed which completed the railway from New Carlisle to Gaspé Basin. The second section of the railway, 102 miles, was completed this last fall. The inspection by an engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals remains to be made in order to entitle the company to the balance of their subsidy. As to that I have no doubt that when the inspection is made the minister will find that this second section of the road is of a high class, exceedingly well built and will certainly be an excellent line. What I wish to bring to the minister's attention more particularly is the condition in which the first section of the railway is at present. There have been two companies, the first the Atlantic and Lake Superior and the second the Atlantic, Quebec and Western. The construction of the Atlantic and Lake Superior railway began some thirty years ago and it is a poorly equipped railway. It is really in a very bad state, and this winter the road was somewhat crippled on account, first, of the snow blockade, and second, on account of the many dangers that travellers found in travelling on a poorly equipped road. My hon. friend is authorized by a statute passed here last session to take certain steps with regard to a railway in this condition and I think he would do well this spring to send his engineer to inspect the first hundred miles. When that inspection is made, if the company does not make the necessary repairs in order to equip the road as it should be and if it does not put it in fair running order, the minister by the authority which was given in last year by a statute in amendment to the Railway Act, can force

the company to appear in court and he can cause the road to be sold and, out of the proceeds of the sale, make the necessary repairs.

Mr. COCHRANE. Could you get enough out of it to pay for the repairs?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not know as to that, but this might lead to a second conclusion, that is to say, if there is not enough to put the road in fair running order with the proceeds of the sale the hon. gentleman, under the law passed last year, has authority to take the first section of the Gaspe railway, lease it, and run it as a part of the Intercolonial railway. I think that eventually the hon. gentleman will have to come to this. I do not represent the county of Gaspé any more but I still have the interests of Gaspé at heart and no doubt the time will come when he will have to lease the two sections, the one from Matapedia to New Carlisle and the one from New Carlisle to Gaspé Basin. But he is keen enough in business to realize that if he can get out of the proceeds of the sale enough to make the necessary repairs he will be satisfied with that and the public will be satisfied.

I call his attention to this because the Peninsula of Gaspé is now connected with the outside world by a railway and it would be a great pity if on account of the bad condition in which the first section of the road is, the peninsula should not derive from that railway the benefit to which it is entitled. I am bound to say to my hon. friend that the peninsula of Gaspé has special claims on the government. About 40 years ago, after the construction of the Intercolonial railway, the government of Sir John Macdonald decided to build that branch line from Matapedia to Gaspé Basin, in fact the first contracts were given by the railway department and the first plans were made but the government changed its policy and it remained for private companies to do what otherwise the government had contemplated doing. After many difficulties, after many cases before the courts, after many failures, the people of Gaspé and some enterprising gentlemen have finally succeeded in getting a first-class road over one section at least. With just a little help from my hon. friend by sending his engineer on the road and exacting from the company that the road shall be kept in fair running order the hon. gentleman can be of great service to the peninsula of Gaspé. The road will eventually be a success. At its terminus there is Gaspé Basin which is open practically for nine or ten months of the year and which affords splendid harbour facilities for open navigation, without any special dredging being done by the government in the bay. With such a terminus there is a great future for the road even if it is not taken by the Intercolonial railway and worked as a branch line and I ask the hon. gentleman to give his usual attention to the case of the peninsula of Gaspé, I am sure the people would be grateful if he could see his way to give them fair running conditions on the road.

Mr. COCHRANE. I shall be only too glad to make a note of the hon. gentleman's remarks. Any complaints that have come in with regard to the safety of railways since I assumed office I have referred to the railway board and I have had splendid satisfaction in their prompt and common sense reports on them. I shall refer this matter to the railway board. I think it would be better to have that board deal with it than to send our railway inspector. They have the officials for the purpose and would be only too glad to attend to it.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I wish to address some observations upon the items of Halifax docks and wharfs, and increased terminal accommodation. I desire to impress upon the minister the necessity of extended terminal facilities and railway accommodation at Halifax. I do so because I fear that the minister, coming from Ontario, may not fully appreciate as yet the railway situation in the province of Nova Scotia so far as the Intercolonial railway is concerned. At the beginning of this parliament the minister made some remarks respecting the proposed extensions of the Intercolonial railway from Dartmouth to the Musquodoboit Valley and a proposed extension of the Intercolonial railway into the counties of Pictou and Guysborough which gave me the alarming impression that he was not too strongly inclined to extend these branches, because he was not sure then that they would be profitable. I suppose one could hardly blame him for taking that point of view. Later I was glad to hear the minister state in parliament that it was the policy of the government to carry out the contract which the late ministry made for the extension of the Intercolonial from Dartmouth to the Musquodoboit valley as far as Dean settlement as agreed by the late government and I congratulate the minister upon his decision in that respect.

There is a widespread feeling in Canada that by reason of the fact that Nova Scotia has had the enjoyment of a government owned and operated railway that the province has therefore had great advantage over other provinces in railway transportation. This assumption is open to very grave question, because if we once were to go back to the earlier history of transportation, and trace it down to the present time it is dif-

ficult to say whether the province as a whole has benefited by having a government owned and operated railway rather than a company owned and operated railway. The fact that Nova Scotia has had the Intercolonial railway has doubtless been of some advantage, but it has also had its disadvantages. In that province the Intercolonial railway system pre-empted the very best traffic sections leaving the lean sections to be served by private companies assisted by Dominion and provincial subsidies. It is true there are many sections of the province that do not hold out great inducements to railway traffic, and consequently railway constructing in many sections of the province was long delayed or never begun. I have always taken the position that the Intercolonial railway being in that province as a government system, after having pre-empted the best railway territory, should serve at least some of the lean sections as well. I am not arguing that to-day in view of existing conditions, the government should abandon the ownership and operation of the Intercolonial railway, that would be too big a question to discuss here to-night but I do say that the Intercolonial railway being the chief system in that province and having the major portion of the railway traffic, should go into the railway business to the fullest extent and to the utmost needs of the people of the province. If they fail to do so, I think we who represent that province would be justified in asking that the government transfer the operation of that road to other operators. I shall not however discuss this further to-night.

However, I trust that the government will take the view that being railway owners and operators in the province now, they are willing and anxious to extend the existing system and meet to the utmost of their ability the needs of the different sections of the province.

There is ample opportunity there for extensions and improvements which are necessary, and ultimately sound from a business view point, even if they did not hold out hope of immediate or substantial financial profits. But I rose particularly to discuss the matter of railway terminals at the port of Halifax, which to-day are not satisfactory to shippers, to importers or to local wants. The conditions there, so far as the present needs are concerned, are very much the same as they were ten or fifteen years ago. At that time the Intercolonial railway could hardly meet the traffic demands of the port; but those demands have grown to such an extent that to-day the terminal facilities are hardly adequate to meet the business which the railway finds there. During the winter of 1911, when transatlantic ships were sailing from Halifax to Great Britain, they were very much handicapped owing to their inability, in consequence of the congestion at the terminals, to discharge and receive freight with any degree of promptitude. Just another illustration of the congestion last year. In the month of February last there arrived at the port of Halifax a quantity of freight destined for a point in western Ontario, which was not moved from Halifax until late in the month of April, a delay of considerably over two months, owing to the fact that it was stored in a freight shed, and was covered later with other freight, and it was impossible to get it out before. In addition to the steamers now calling at the port of Halifax, many other steamers would call there during the present winter months were they able to secure facilities. I am not approaching this question in a fault-finding spirit. The Board of Trade and business men of Halifax have been repeatedly urging upon various governments the necessity of extended and improved terminal facilities. Improvements have been made, but there has always been a tendency to make the extensions of terminal facilities merely to suit the immediate needs, instead of making them upon some comprehensive plan that would meet the requirements of the port for a great number of years. The trade at the port of Halifax has grown very considerably in recent years, as shown by the following figures of freight handled during the fiscal years stated:

DOMESTIC.

	In.	Out.
1902-3	188,871 tons.	63,563 tons.
1903-4	74,667 "	64,027 "
1904-5	101,139 "	114,309 "
1905-6	291,677 "	98,448 "
1907-8	240,369 "	107,949 "
1908-9	261,822 "	108,426 "
1909-10	254,395 "	109,971 "

FOREIGN.

	Imports.	Exports.
1902-3	35,940 tons.	102,691 tons.
1903-4	47,767 "	131,176 "
1904-5	38,331 "	100,819 "
1905-6	43,255 "	125,108 "
1907-8	89,209 "	111,088 "
1908-9	97,460 "	123,578 "
1909-10	91,740 "	131,250 "

Of course, not all this tonnage was handled by the Intercolonial railway, but the tonnage handled by the railway itself has grown considerably in recent years. The following are the figures of the tonnage handled by the Intercolonial railway at Halifax during the years 1901, 1906 and 1911:

	Export.	Import.
1901	70,000 tons.	22,000 tons.
1906	113,507 "	35,823 "
1911	131,050 "	72,298 "

I am informed that the increased tonnage handled by the Intercolonial railway at the port of Halifax during the first six months of 1911 was 100 per cent more than during the first six months of 1910, which

indicates that the railway tonnage at that port is increasing very rapidly, and provision must be made for the future growth. The increase during the last three months, I am advised, is greatly in excess of that of the corresponding months of last year. Now, I would like to state to the minister what in my judgment is needed at the port of Halifax. He of course knows that a year or two ago a somewhat comprehensive plan was arrived at by the Department of Railways for extended and improved wharfs and piers. At present the port has in connection with the Intercolonial railway 9 wharfs or piers, 5 of which are at Deep Water, so-called, and four at Richmond. It is, I believe the intention of the Department of Railways to construct at Deep Water some four or five new piers to replace the old ones now existing; the new piers to be of course much more modern and larger, and capable of handling a greater quantity of traffic and in a very much shorter time. Pier No. 1, the contract for which was awarded in August or September last, is now under construction, and when completed will be one of the most modern and largest piers on the Atlantic coast, either in Canada or in the United States.

Pier No. 2 is intended for freight and passenger traffic. Now, I understand—and as the minister probably knows I have not had an opportunity of becoming very conversant with the details of terminals at the port of Halifax—that there is another pier to be constructed, which is No. 3, I believe on the proposed terminal plans of the port, and which is similar to the one now under construction. I am instructed by the business men and by the Board of Trade of Halifax, that it is extremely urgent that tenders be immediately asked for the construction of this pier, because long before it is completed it will be impossible for the new pier No. 2, together with any of the existing wharfs, to handle the traffic which will then be at the port. I trust that the minister, whenever he finds himself at leisure or whenever he can possibly give the matter consideration, after the closing of parliament, will ask his officers to take this subject into consideration, and after he does I hope he will find himself justified, as I believe he will, in directing that tenders be asked for this new pier No. 3 so that it will be carried to completion as quickly as possible. There is another matter which I believe is the settled policy of the department, and that is the erection of a new freight-shed at the port of Halifax, a matter which probably was brought to the minister's attention when he was at Halifax during the late autumn of last year. The present freight-shed is certainly inadequate, and I am further led to believe it was improperly located when originally constructed. I understand a portion of land has been already procured on the upper side of Water street whereon to erect a new freight-shed, and I trust that the minister will order the construction of this freight-shed to be commenced as early as possible, for I can assure him that it is extremely urgent at the present time. There is a further matter to which I would like to draw the minister's notice. I do not know whether his attention has been called to the fact before or not, and it is this: that a portion of the Intercolonial from Halifax to the town of Windsor, is under lease to the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company. The freight-shed which is used by the latter company lies close to the Intercolonial station at Halifax. For certain reasons, which are unnecessary for me to mention, the freight-shed used by the Dominion Atlantic railway is very inconveniently located. All traffic reaching the freight-shed must proceed down or up North street, which offers a very heavy grade, and which renders truckage very expensive indeed, and this handicaps very much the shippers and importers at Halifax in sending out or receiving freight by reason of this fact. I am not aware if the minister's attention has been drawn to this particular point, but it is certainly a matter which deserves the consideration of the department. The Intercolonial should afford a more adequate and convenient freight-shed for the Dominion Atlantic railway.

I wish to say in connection with the terminal facilities at the port of Halifax that some broad and comprehensive scheme of extension of the Intercolonial rails along the water-front must at once, or very soon, be taken into consideration. I would hardly venture to say to the minister what I think should be done, because I can scarcely ask him to consider me an authority in that respect, and whatever judgment I may have regarding the matter is entirely due to a limited personal knowledge of the situation and to information which comes to me by contact with the business men of the city of Halifax. Possibly I may be more ambitious than some of them in what I think should be done in this respect. I would like to make the suggestion to the minister that he and his officers should take this matter up, and possibly it would be wise for him to take into consideration the suggestion to obtain other expert advice upon the matter and consider the whole question of the extension and improvement of terminals at this port. I believe that ultimately the whole of Upper and Lower Water streets, so called, should be expropriated. I do not think it would be necessary to demolish or remove at once the structures erected on

the properties which would be expropriated. The rentals furnished by these buildings or properties would probably yield sufficient to pay interest on the capital amount necessary for the expropriation. At any rate a great portion of Water street should be expropriated so that the rails may be extended farther south. I think it is quite clear that the upper side of Water street at least, and possibly the lower side as far as what is known as the Ordnance yard—possibly this description is not very intelligible to the minister who may not know the location—should be expropriated as quickly as possible. However, as I said, I do not wish to express any definite or fixed views upon this point. And even if I had any definite or fixed views to-night I would hardly venture to give them to the committee in a dogmatic or definite manner. I shall be quite satisfied and content if I have the promise of the minister that during the summer he will take into consideration the matter of the adoption of a comprehensive scheme for the extension and improvement of railway terminals at the port of Halifax, so that at the next session we may discuss the matter more carefully and at greater length. Another matter which possibly I should mention in connection with improved terminals at Halifax is: whether or not the Department of Railways should not obtain possession of, and occupy the present dockyard between Richmond and Deep Water, and which is now in the occupation of the Marine and Fisheries and Naval Departments. If that property could be secured it would afford a great deal of yardage room for the Intercolonial railway, and also give additional dockage room. The feeling prevails at the port of Halifax that this dockyard should be occupied by the Intercolonial railway, and not by the Marine and Fisheries and Naval Departments, and I think myself there is a preponderance of fact in favour of it. I think a suitable location might be obtained on other portions of Halifax harbour, on the Halifax or the Dartmouth side, which would be sufficiently adequate for the necessities of the two departments referred to. But even if the dockyard property was secured by the railway, there is still necessity for the expropriation of a great deal of property along the waterfront at Halifax. And there is this to be remembered; that in Halifax as in a great many eastern towns and cities to-day, the values of property are rapidly increasing, and unless this is done in the near future there will very soon come a time when the Intercolonial railway and the country will find these terminal facilities so imperative and so necessary that they will be obliged to buy the necessary properties, and then at a very greatly enhanced cost. There is just one further matter to which I would like to call the minister's attention, and which I had intended referring to when a later item in his estimates was reached, namely, the vote in connection with the extension of the Halifax and Eastern railway out of Dartmouth.

I refer to the necessity of a bridge across Halifax harbour between Dartmouth and Halifax at a point called the Narrows, where once a bridge was in existence but which some fifteen or twenty years ago fell down and has never since been replaced. The physical conditions along the waterfront on Bedford Basin and Halifax harbour proper and where the Intercolonial railway rails are laid and approach the city, are such that it is extremely difficult to get the necessary room. On the west side of the railway there is high and rocky ground, and it is extremely expensive to increase yardage or track room on this account. With a bridge constructed across the harbour, I think there could be found considerable yard room on the Dartmouth side of the harbour besides affording additional shipping facilities. I urge the minister to make inquiry and investigation as to the cost of the construction of a bridge, not only for the reasons already given, but for the further reason that the contruction of the Halifax and Eastern railway from Dartmouth to Musquodoboit valley is now a reality, and it will not take very long to build that road. If no bridge is constructed across the harbour, it will be necessary for passengers to leave the railway at Dartmouth and take a ferry across to the city of Halifax, and it will be necessary to transfer freight in the same way, or let it get to the city of Halifax via Windsor Junction. I do not wish the minister to understand me as saying here to-night that this bridge should be built at once. I think that first we should ascertain the cost of the bridge, and the subject might with greater satisfaction be discussed later. I think there is to be found in the department a report upon the construction of this bridge; but I think that at least, during the coming summer the matter should be carefully investigated. If the minister would be good enough to undertake that this should be done, I should for the present be content with that. It will not mean a very great expenditure, and at the next session of parliament the matter can be discussed at greater length.

I wish to repeat that the chief purpose I had in rising was to impress upon the minister the imperative necessity of extended and improved terminal facilities at the port of Halifax, not only for the good of Halifax, but for the good of Canada. Physically and historically Halifax is the winter port of Canada on the Atlantic coast. It is destined to be the winter port if not the all the year round port, for the fastest transatlantic

steamship services from Europe to Canada. It is at least bound to be the winter port of the transatlantic steamship services by reason of the fact that these ships are now becoming so large that they will be bound to select Halifax as their port of call and departure; and I say this without intending any reflection upon the port of St. John or upon the harbour known as Country Harbour in the county of my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair). The export and import traffic at the port of Halifax is bound to increase very much indeed, as one can safely predict when he contemplates the tremendous development going on in this country. And I submit that, regardless of the cost, I care not what it may be, it is the duty of the government to give to the Intercolonial railway and to the port of Halifax such terminal facilities as port trade conditions warrant to-day, and in the expanding future.

Mr. McCURDY. I do not think that the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) has at all overdrawn the necessities which exist for improved terminal facilities at the very important port of the county which he represents. For a member who has only represented that constituency for a short time, I think his grasp of the requirements of his constituency so far as this matter goes do him great credit.

As he has said, the Intercolonial railway is in a peculiar position. Not only is it the only road running into and out of the province of Nova Scotia over which all must necessarily travel, but it is the only trunk line of any large importance in the province of Nova Scotia. Its position gives it necessarily, for the present at least, somewhat of a natural monopoly in railway transportation in that province.

In earlier days private companies built railways in Nova Scotia. Most of these were companies with small capital and limited mileage. They were financially unsuccessful in many cases, and the fact is that to-day there are few short railways operating in Nova Scotia. But that development is not peculiar to Nova Scotia. Short railways were built in other provinces serving even the most fertile parts of other provinces, and these are not operating as private small railways to-day, but have been absorbed by larger systems. They did not always pay as short lines, but as parts of large systems they are profitable to the large operating companies. Traffic originates on these short lines and feeds the bigger systems.

I think that Nova Scotians are justified in expecting that the Minister of Railways and the government shall take liberal views of existing transportation needs in Nova Scotia and apply to that situation at very least as liberal principles as large railways in other parts of the country apply in buying and building and operating the cross country lines and feeders, and the feeders should be built, maintained and operated even if they are not always very profitable feeders. Otherwise, how can remote and isolated districts be served? This must be done in Nova Scotia by the Intercolonial railway, as it is the large trunk line operating there.

The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) last evening lauded very highly the operation of the Intercolonial railway. That is right, to a limited extent, but I am not prepared to go to the limit indicated by the hon. gentleman. He said the Intercolonial railway was the best operated railway in the world. I have occasion to travel much on that road and on other roads, and I do not think it is the best operated railroad, even on this continent. I am not sure that the standard of its operation has been improving during the past few years even to the same degree as has the standard of its best competitor. I think that its competitors are giving an improved service and that in comparison the Intercolonial railway does not occupy as favourable a position as a competing road as it did some years ago. I have been told that although the hon. member for St. John so highly praises the Intercolonial railway and considers it the best railroad in the world, he still travels occasionally by another road when he wishes to come to Montreal or Ottawa. So do I, because I consider that for some years past the Intercolonial railway was not the most convenient or the best road in the world to travel on even between Halifax and Montreal.

Competition, we are told, is the life of trade; and I think that the Intercolonial railway has been slack in the past in competing for and seeking to enlarge its patronage both for passengers and freight. When in London a few years ago, I searched the city over to find an Intercolonial railway time table. I did this as a matter of curiosity, not because I needed further information regarding the road, but I wanted to find out what efforts the management of that road habitually made to advertise its business amongst possible patrons. But I could not find an Intercolonial railway time-table in the city of London, and for all that the railway and steamship people in London knew about that railway, it might never have been in existence. The big roads look after and canvass for business, they do it consistently and constantly, and I think that is a department in which the management of the Intercolonial railway can be improved. It is no uncommon thing for shippers in

Nova Scotia to be canvassed by roads competing with the Intercolonial railway once, twice or three times a week, where the Intercolonial railway officials appear once a month or once perhaps in a year. The junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) pointed out that in the past ten or fifteen years no attention had been paid by the late administration to the demand for increased terminal facilities at Halifax. I fully agree with him. I think they have absolutely failed to appreciate the necessity of improving the terminal facilities there, which are shockingly inadequate. I look forward, however, with a great deal of confidence to what this new administration will do in this matter. The hon. member also gave us some impressive figures about the growth of traffic at that port. But he omitted to mention the important fact that the increase in imports in Halifax during the months of February and March, 1911, was 100 per cent over the corresponding months of the preceding year, and I am informed that this year there is a further substantial increase. Now, when the requirements of the public call for additional expenditure generally throughout the country, the money is often freely voted by the Canadian government. But money voted and expended for terminal facilities at Halifax, where they are so urgently needed as at present, is in the nature of an investment, the government would be spending money on its own property, and would increase the earnings of its own railway. Surely it is a shocking state of affairs when a railroad which can borrow money at a very low rate of interest, and is a transportation monopoly, is not ready to provide needed accommodation, or even to look after the business that is offering without the railroad management having to seek it. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), in addressing the committee last night, ventured the opinion that a surplus should not be expected from the operation of this road. That to me is sound. The other railroads that have been built in this country have been assisted by large grants of money and land, and it seems to me it would be as logical to expect that in course of time these subsidies and grants of land should be returned to the government, as to expect that the Intercolonial railway should pay the surplus earned by that road from year to year into the general funds of the country.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I regret that it is necessary to tax the patience of the committee at this late hour by making any further remarks. But when this question of transportation is before the House affecting as it does the constituency I have the honour to represent, I feel that I must say something on the subject. There is no question that comes before this parliament that is of such vital importance to the people I represent as the question of railway extension in the province of Nova Scotia. It would perhaps have been a good thing if the minister had given us a general statement last night, if he had followed the usual custom that has been adopted in this House I think for the last thirty years, of outlining the conditions of transportation in the country, and informing the House what he proposes to do. A good deal of time has been taken up in proposals made by hon. gentlemen because we do not know what the minister himself proposes to do during the year 1913 and this year. If he had cleared the way, and laid down the things that he intends to do with the money he is asking the House to give him, we would be in a better position to judge as to whether it is any use to discuss these other matters that are left out of the purview of his plans during the present year.

My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean) congratulated the minister on the fact that he has decided to extend the Intercolonial railway from the town of Dartmouth to Dean Settlement in the county of Halifax. I regret that I am not able to congratulate my hon. friend on the extension of the branch that was proposed in my constituency. I did have some hopes during the first days of this session that no discrimination would be made by the minister between the counties of Halifax and Guysborough. When the House met in the early days of the session I was much pleased to see a million dollars in the estimates for the construction of a branch line from Sunnybrae in the county of Pictou to Guysborough in the county of Guysborough, with a spur from the Cross Roads of Country Harbour to the deep waters of that harbour. I was pleased that the estimate that was placed before parliament by the previous government had been continued by this government. It appears however, that during the Christmas holidays, and I would expect my hon. friend the Minister of Railways to be engaged in some more congenial work at such a season than hardening his heart—after the Christmas holidays we learned for the first time that the money that was intended to construct the branch line in my constituency was struck from the list for the present year. Now I would like to point out that this is not a party question in the county I represent. It is a questioin on which both parties have committed themselves up to the hilt. The Prime Minister himself did me the honour of visiting my county, he spoke in three places, and in each place he spoke of the great necessity of this road, and he used language that was understood by the

people there to pledge himself and his party, if he were returned to power, to the construction of that line.

Not only is that the case, but it will be in the recollection of hon. gentlemen who were in the last parliament that when the resolution relating to the construction of branch lines was moved in this House by the hon. member from North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie), the Prime Minister spoke in favour of the branches that were advocated in that resolution, and this Guysborough branch was one of them. The right hon. gentleman used very decided language and led everybody who listened to him to believe that it was his policy to construct those branches if returned to power. Mr. Rollings, the gentleman who ran against me in Guysborough in the interests of the Conservative party, not only advocated this branch in this election, but in the former election of 1908 he issued a card which he placed before the people of that county in which he says:

I strongly advocate the construction of a railway throughout the length and breadth of Guysborough county—the non-railway county of Nova Scotia and I deprecate any attempt being made by any persons or parties who seek to use as an election scheme this matter so vital to the interests of eastern Nova Scotia.

This was the card that my opponent placed before the county of Guysborough in 1908, and in the election of last September it was an important issue in that county. I had a great deal of confidence at that time in telling the people that we were on the eve of having railway extension there because the late government had committed themselves to the construction of this branch line. The Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Graham) had announced his policy in the House. The government had placed a million dollars in the estimates for the purpose of commencing the construction of the line, they had placed a staff of surveyors in the field, and they had surveyed a large part of the line. They had also purchased the Sunnybrae branch at a cost of $100,000, got the deed of this branch, paid the money and that property will be entirely useless to this government unless the road is extended to a port in the county of Guysborough. When all these steps were taken by the late government I had a great deal of confidence in telling the people of that county that we were pretty certain now to have railway extension. You can imagine the disappointment, not only of myself, but of every person in the county of Guysborough, when it was learned that the present government had abandoned, for the present at least, the plan of the old government to construct that branch line. One would have supposed that, as the contract had been let, and the contractor had deposited his money, and was ready to commence work on a part of the line, the government would not have interfered, especially as this parliament had committed itself to its construction, as both sides of this parliament had agreed to the principle of building it and had voted, prior to that date, a large part of the money to do so. I have never known a case in the history of this country where a project was carried so far by one government, and was turned down by the next government without any good reason, I submit, so far produced to satisfy me or any other hon. gentleman in this House that it should have been done. The Minister of Railways has made some excuses why that step was taken by the present administration. He is skilful in that way, but I want to draw his attention for a moment to the language which he used in the discussion which took place here some weeks ago. I entered a protest against the action that had been taken by the government on the occasion of that discussion, and the minister replied to me in this way. I copy his language from 'Hansard':

I may say further——

He says,

—that although hon. gentlemen opposite have quoted a great number of figures, there are no statistics in the department which I preside over, to warrant us in going on with the construction of this railway now. I believe that before committing the country to any expenditure, we should be able to give the people a just reason for our action and we should see that the tax-payers of Canada get a fair return for the money expended, or at least sufficient to pay the interest on the capital.

I submit that these are pretty hard conditions. In business ventures, of course, that is the rule that people lay down; they do not want to invest their money in any venture unless it will pay and unless they get some return for their capital. But, I submit that this is not a rule that has been adopted in this country in the case of the assistance which has been given by parliament to transportation. We have been subsidising railways, we have been deepening rivers, we have been constructing canals at vast expense for the last forty years in Canada and this is the first time, I submit, that any Minister of Railways has laid down the principle that we will not give aid to transportation in Canada unless the money we invest will not only pay the running expenses of the road but the interest as well. That is the way in which a Jew would approach a question of finance, he wants to see interest coming, he wants to know, when he puts his dollar in that he is going to get something out. That is not the way in which this ques-

tion has been treated by previous Ministers of Railways or by previous administrations in this country. When I say that I want to prove what I say and can prove it. Every hon. gentleman here knows that we have spent enormous sums of money in aiding transportation. It is placed in the books at $400,000,000. What return are we getting for it? What return in interest are we getting for the enormous amount of money we gave the Canadian Pacific railway? What return are we getting for the hundred million dollars that we put into the canals largely in the province of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals? Why, sir, we have not only spent an enormous sum in transportation in Ontario Canals but after we did so we passed an order in council declaring the canals absolutely free. Bring along your ships, pass through the canals, we will open the gates for you, we will give you the facilities and we will not charge you a cent! That is the way the government of this country has been treating the transportation problem in the province that my hon. friend comes from. Absolutely free! A hundred million dollars invested in canals and no interest coming to the people of Canada. I am not objecting to this because it develops the trade of this country. That is not the only case I might give, for there is the Intercolonial railway itself upon which a very large sum has been expended. Does any one expect to get interest out of the Intercolonial railway? Such a proposition has never been put up before by any Minister of Railways in this country and this is the kind of excuse that should not have been made in this case. If it is right to give these facilities free in the canals, if it is right that we should have spent such enormous sums of money in deepening the St. Lawrence river, if it is right that we should have built the Intercolonial railway connecting the different provinces together, and if it is right that we should have made these enormous contributions to transportation without expecting any return, why stop when a branch line is asked for in the county of Guysborough to connect some 18,000 people who are in an isolated position and who have good trade to offer the road? Why is it that this proposition is put up to them and they are told that unless the road that they propose to build will not only pay running expenses but interest on the money, they cannot get it?

I do not think that my hon. friend should have given such an excuse as that, and I think on consideration he will see the unfairness of his proposal. The present minister is himself making a number of proposals with reference to transportation throughout Canada. He proposes to build a car ferry to connect the government railway on Prince Edward Island with the Intercolonial railway on the mainland. That is a good proposal. It has always been a handicap to the people on the island that they have to tranship their freight from the cars on the island to the steamship and then back to the cars on the mainland, and if these transhipments can be avoided it would be a splendid thing for the province of Prince Edward Island. Does any hon. gentleman say that that shall not be done unless the people on the island can show it will pay running expenses and interest on the capital? If you put it on that basis you cannot confer this great benefit on Prince Edward Island. We all know that the Prince Edward Island railway has never yet had a surplus, but at the same time it furnishes a good deal of traffic to the main line and in that way helps the road.

My hon. friend knows that it will be many years before the Hudson Bay railway can be expected to pay running expenses, yet that does not prevent him from entering upon its construction. But he says to the people of my constituency: You cannot have this road unless it pays expenses and interest.

I believe that this Guysborough road would offer a large amount of traffic, that it would develop a good trade. There is timber enough along the line to keep the road busy for the first ten years. This is a good timber country, and a large part of the wood is hardwood which cannot be profitably floated down streams. Spruce, pine and hemlock are being floated down to the ocean, but there are enormous quantities of hardwood in that country that would be reached by this railway. At Country Harbour the line would tap one of the best ports on the coast of Canada. I have no reflection to make on the port of Halifax, which is one of the best harbours in the world, but if you are going to enumerate the great harbours in Canada, you will have to include Country Harbour. There you strike a fishing industry east and west of this harbour, The men engaged in that industry are anxious to secure a better market for their fish. I am informed that certain gentlemen of his own party in Nova Scotia, interested in the construction of this line, interviewed the minister a few days ago, and that he informed them that if they could assure him of ten car-loads of fresh fish a day he would undertake to build the line. He said: 'You claim to have a great fishing industry there that can be developed at the port of Country Harbour, and the Port of Guysborough. What does it amount to? Could you furnish a branch line with ten cars of fresh fish per day?' That is a very large order, Mr. Chairman. It is so much fresh fish that you could not find a market for it in

Quebec and Montreal. If you placed three car-loads of fresh fish on the Montreal market I am informed you would break the price. It is not like the Boston market, where you could put ten or twenty cars per day on the market. It would not be possible to sell at Montreal and Quebec more than half the quantity which my hon. friend said would have to be loaded on the branch line we are proposing before he would undertake the construction of the road. I do not know how many car-loads we would have, but I do know that at Canso the fresh fish business has been developed to a large extent, and an average of over a carload a day is shipped. Of course there are months in the winter when the fishermen do not go out to sea. They work until about the first of February, but there are a few months when they do not operate. They have no railway facilities at Canso, they have to transfer their fish from boat to rail at Mulgrave. They have an average of over one car a day leaving Mulgrave all the year round. This is good traffic for the Intercolonial railway.

Fresh fish is such a perishable commodity that it has to be put on the market quickly and disposed of quickly, and transportation means everything to the business. If we had a branch line to Country Harbour, we have a splendid fishing locality both east and west of that harbour for 25 or 30 miles, and the fish could be collected at that point. I have no doubt that a very large business could be built up, but it will take time. You can see the isolated position in which these people are. They are denied connection with the Intercolonial railway. The present administration says: You must not have anything to do with the market of the United States. Of course, we have the sea there; our people are accustomed to the sea; and we could take our fish by the sea to Boston and place it on the American market, but we are denied that privilege by the heavy duties we meet when we get it there. The Canadian market for fresh fish is a very limited one. The fish cannot be sent very far west. I believe that with better facilities we might send more there. But we are denied the right of sending our fish to the markets of the United States, and by the same administration which denies us that right we are denied connection with the Intercolonial railway, with the chance of selling our product in the home market.

Mr. BURNHAM. Was it the government or the people of Canada who denied you that right?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I do not think the people of Canada ever intended to deny us that right. If they had to give a verdict to-day, I think they would give a different one. It is unfortunate that the question was mixed up with so many other questions, and we did not get a square verdict upon it.

Mr. LENNOX. It was not mixed up with other questions.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I did not find any difficulty in getting a different verdict in my constituency. It was the most popular cry I ever had in my constituency. All I had to say was: Let us cultivate the home market as much as we can, but you are getting a preference in the Boston market. If you have a barrel of mackerel to sell, you now pay $2 a barrel to land it on the Boston market. The people of the maritime provinces are not the only people who are selling mackerel in Boston. It comes from England, Ireland, Denmark, Norway, and nearly every other northern European country, and every one of them would have still to pay $2 a barrel to send their mackerel to the Boston market, while the Nova Scotian will get it in free.

Mr. McCURDY. Do you not agree with the late administration's theory that the consumer pays the duty?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I know that is the economic theory, and I suppose, considering the question as a broad question, that is true. But in this case the producer would get the advantage. We are not selling, I suppose, 20 per cent of the mackerel that goes into the market of the United States, consequently, if all these other people have to pay $2 barrel in order to send their mackerel to that market and ours goes in free, we would be able to levy that $2 on the American consumer. That is the way I explained the matter to my electors, and they were quite satisfied with it. This is true not only of mackerel, but of codfish, haddock and every other kind of fish that we sell in the American market. It was one of the greatest things ever offered to the fishing industry of the maritime provinces, and I hope we shall get it yet, as nothing will build up the country to such an extent as reciprocity would have done. But I am not going to lament about it. I am ready to face the future and try to make the best of the decision that has been given. At the same time, as the leaders of hon. gentlemen opposite have succeeded in getting that decision made in the country, shutting us out of that market, we hope that now they will consider our claim for a road so that we can sell our product in the Canadian market, and will give us this branch line of railway, or we shall not be able to reach the Canadian market for a large part of that coast. Then, I would like to ask the minister about another matter. Some time ago I asked him how it was that he had made up his

mind to build the road from Halifax to Dean Settlement, while he had decided not to build the branch line from Sunnybrae to Country Harbour. This is the question and the answer:

With reference to the following language used by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals in his speech in the House on January 18, 1912, referring to the construction of this branch railway, namely: 'I believe that before committing the country to any expenditure, we should be able to give the people a just reason for our action, and we should see that the taxpayers of Canada get a fair return for the money expended, or at least sufficient to pay the interest on the capital, does the minister apply the same condition to the expenditure involved in the proposed line between Dartmouth and Dean, settlement in the same province?'

The minister answered that he did apply the same rule practically to the case of the proposed line from Dartmouth to Dean Settlement.

Now I submit that if my hon. friend will do that, if he will apply the same rule to the branch line from Sunnybrae to Country Harbour—I have not a word to say against the road from Halifax to Dean Settlement. I voted for it at the time it came up and I am quite willing to vote for it now—he will find the Guysborough branch to be a better financial proposition. The road that I am proposing is to start at a great coal mine and it ends at a great harbour. It has traffic along the line that is at least equal to the other, but it has got these two things that the other road has not got, and it certainly needs no argument for anyone to see that it is a better financial proposition than the road from Dartmouth to Dean Settlement which ends in the woods. My hon. friend tells me that he is applying the same principle to the Guysborough branch that he is applying to the Halifax branch. If that is so he is bound to restore a million dollars to the estimates and go on with the construction of the former branch. But my hon. friend gave me some further information in answer to a question in the House in reference to the contract. The contract, as my hon. friend will recollect, was let by the late government and to a contractor who was ready to commence work at the time of the government's defeat. I am told that he had his machinery on board a ship at Sydney, and was ready to start for Guysborough to begin the construction of the road at that point, and he had deposited his money as security. I would like to ask whether the money is still in possession of the government.

Mr. COCHRANE. The money has been returned.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Thank you. Well this is the question that was asked:

Was the successful tenderer instructed not to proceed with the work of construction? If so, why?

The answer given to that question was this:

Yes, Surveys of the whole of the railway had not been completed before tenders were called. The first location of the line was from Sunnybrae easterly along the east branch of the St. Mary's river through the county of Pictou, thence southeasterly to Melrose in Guysborough county. Another location which was urged was one from Sunnybrae southerly following Barren Brook to the west branch of St. Mary's river, thence easterly through Guysborough county to Melrose, a common point to both locations. The last mentioned location was examined only in a preliminary way. The question as to which of these routes should be adopted had not been settled. No reliable estimate of the cost of the work had been made. There not being at hand sufficient information to show that there was justification for the building of the line, and the incurring of the outlay, it was thought well to cancel the contract and abandon the proceedings until complete and reliable data and information could be obtained, and the minister satisfied that, before committing the country to the expenditure, the same was justified.

That is a long answer to a short question. I suppose the meaning of it is that the road was not all surveyed. One section of the road surveyed, that portion from the town of Guysborough to the Cross Roads, Country Harbour, and from Cross Roads, Country Harbour, to deep water at Country Harbour, that section was surveyed and the contract let. The other section of the road between Melrose and Sunnybrae was not settled. And what does my hon. friend do? He cancels the contract for the part that was surveyed and contracted for, because forsooth the route of the other portion was not settled. And what does he do to settle it? He dismisses the staff of engineers that were at work trying to settle the route at the time he took office. If there was any difficulty about which direction the road should take, why did the minister not let his engineers go on and finish their work and get the information so that the question might be settled. It is not a difficult question to settle. My hon. friend in his remarks to the House endeavoured to show that there were some fierce disputes going on about the location of this line. I submit that was not the case. There was a difference of opinion about it, but so far as I am concerned that need not stand in the way for a moment. If that is the only trouble my hon. friend can let his engineers settle it. Whether it goes down the east river or down the west river is not such an important matter as that it should tie up the construction of the line. I would be quite

willing for him to go on with his investigation and take the best line in the judgment of his own engineers. That ought to be satisfactory to him. That is what the late government were trying to do. They had surveyed the line down the east river and they had secured the information, but it was suggested that a better line existed down the west river and the engineers were busy trying to determine that question when my hon. friend took office, and in place of allowing them to go on and finish their work he telegraphed them to stop their operations and to get out of the field and do nothing more. Then we are told in the House that the reason why the other branch of the line was stopped was that the minister did not have the information in regard to the western end of the line. Now I think it is my duty to point these facts out to my hon. friend and to assure him that he need not worry over the question of the dispute that he says existed between my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) and myself in regard to the western section. I am quite willing to leave it to his own judgment, whichever he says is the best route after he gets the report of his engineers. Then let the railway go down one or the other rivers, it does not make any material difference so long as he builds the line from Sunnybrae to Guysborough and Country Harbour. I wish to assure him on that point so that it may not be used in future as an excuse for not going on with the work. Now, I submit that my hon. friend should not apply a different principle in the case of the railway in the county of Guysborough that he applies in the case of the road in the county of Halifax. He tells me that he does not, but I feel quite sure that if he will only take the trouble to investigate the matter he will find that the proposal that I am making for him to build in the county of Guysborough is a better financial proposition than the one he has decided to adopt in regard to the county of Halifax. I thought I should fail in my duty if I did not make it clear to my hon. friend that both sides are committed to the construction of the line that I am advocating. Not only is his leader, and the party following him, committed to this construction, but the late government were also committed and the construction of the line as proposed should therefore, have been allowed to have gone on. All my hon. friend had to do when he assumed charge of the department was to keep his hands off. The money was provided, the contract was partly let, everything was in progress to have the road built, if my hon. friend had only left the matter alone construction would have gone on. The minister, however, chose to interfere with that construction and he has not shown any good reason why he did so.

Mr. SINCLAIR.

Mr. MACDONALD. I would like to associate myself with my hon. friend from Guysborough in the efforts which he is making to induce the minister to continue the policy adopted by the late government —a policy which was ratified by his leader during the late campaign and received the support of the Conservative party in eastern Nova Scotia—in regard to the construction of the railway in Sunnybrae, in my county, to Country Harbour. Before proceeding, however, I would like to ask the minister as to whether he has received the report of Mr. Archibald, who I understood was deputized to go over this proposition?

Mr. COCHRANE. I think it has come in.

Mr. MACDONALD. Would the minister bring that down ?

Mr. COCHRANE. Yes, no objection; I will have it on Monday.

Mr. MACDONALD. Very well. The feeling which exists among the people of Nova Scotia is that the failure of the minister to go on with this railway is a distinct discrimination against our province. There is no other reasonable explanation. I venture to say that if a like condition existed in any other province, there would be no question about the action taken. If my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples) had in his province of Manitoba any situation that was half so aggravating as this, he and the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers) would have it solved, more particularly as the previous government had outlined the policy, so that all that remained was to——

Mr. STAPLES. I think they can trust the hon. gentleman to ventilate any grievance that may exist. He would rather have a grievance than a remedy. We will give him the remedy.

Mr MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman will use his influence to have the remedy applied I will gladly give up any solution I may have by reason of a grievance. I have plenty of other grievances without keeping this one. I say this is a distinct discrimination against eastern Nova Scotia. Look at the action of the Minister of Railways in regard to the St. John Valley railway. In the province of New Brunswick they have railways up and down and across, subsidized by previous governments. They have two transcontinental lines, as I mentioned this afternoon in discussing this question. Yet, in spite of all that great railway accommodation, with one railway running up one side of the St. John river, the Minister of Railways is going to be so liberal as to make an arrangement with

the province of New Brunswick under which a railway is to be constructed by that government on the west side of the river, and he is going to pay them forty per cent of the gross receipts.

Mr. COCHRANE. The province guarantees the bonds for $25,000 a mile.

Mr. MACDONALD. No wonder. When the money comes in and is counted up, he is going to hand over to the province forty per cent of it. It is not surprising that they agree to pay the interest on the bonds when the Minister of Railways is going to provide the money. My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), has outlined the situation so far as his county is concerned. Let me point out one or two other considerations. A railway twelve miles long to Sunnybrae has been purchased at a cost of $100,000. Every day this government operates the Sunnybrae railway without extending it to the country beyond, it is losing money, as the minister knows, having looked into the matter. The only way by which they can make that purchase of any value to the rest of the people of Canada is to extend that railway to the deep water beyond. I am at a loss to understand what the proposition of the minister is in regard to the matter. My hon. friend from Guysborough has reviewed it and practically the minister says: I want to look into this thing. What for? How is anybody to guarantee him what the operation of the railway will result in? Has he any guarantee before he pays forty per cent of the gross proceeds of this proposed railway to the province of New Brunswick? Before the session closes he will probably ask us to vote subsidies amounting to millions for the construction of railways. Has he any guarantee in regard to any of these new railways that their interest will be paid or that they will be successful? Not at all. But this is the unreasonable ground he takes in regard to this enterprise. The minister has control of the only trunk line of railway in our province. Then, he must either build these branch lines, or let the transcontinental railways come in, and they will quickly build them. He will not have to go far to hunt among the transcontinental railway companies to find one that will willingly build these branch lines if he will give the right of way in order to connect these branch lines with their railways in the other provinces.

Mr. COCHRANE. I would be glad to get an offer.

Mr. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman wants people to come and make him offers——

Mr. COCHRANE. You are making the statement.

Mr. MACDONALD. The hon. minister wants to sit here and do nothing while waiting for offers. His business as minister is to see what can be done for the railway development of the country.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald), favour handing over the Intercolonial railway to a private company?

Mr. MACDONALD. I will explain to my hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Davidson), who has nothing to do with the Intercolonial railway, where I stand on the question, and will do it in a perfectly frank way. But at the present moment I am dealing with a special situation on which I am addressing the minister——

Mr. JAMESON. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that no person except himself has a right to speak of the Intercolonial railway ?

Mr. MACDONALD. Not at all; the hon. gentleman can talk from now until tomorrow about the Intercolonial railway, when I get through. I have told the hon. member for Annapolis that I am ready to give him my views on the question he brings forward. But I do not propose, when I am addressing the minister on a special point, to be diverted to a general discussion. I was saying the Minister of Railways controls the only trunk line in the province of Nova Scotia, and, unless he is willing to engage in the construction of a branch line which the people of that province regard as essential to its prosperity, he should at least do the next best thing and allow the transcontinental lines to come into Nova Scotia so that we may ask them to build the branch lines which he refuses to build. If he will do that I believe it will result in our getting the railway accommodation that we require. How long is the minister going to wait——

Mr. STAPLES. How long is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald, Pictou) going to talk about it ?

Mr. MACDONALD. As long as I please, and if my hon. friend does not like it he will have to do the other thing. I say, how long is the minister going to look into this question ?

Mr. STEVENS. I rise to a point or order. The hon. member a moment ago said that it was nobody's business to talk of the Intercolonial except himself and one or two others.

Mr. MACDONALD. I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. STEVENS. The hon. member did. But I raise a point of order. What item are we discussing? What bearing has all this discussion on the item before the

Chair? I am willing to sit here all night discussing the business of the country, but I do not think it is reasonable for hon. members to discuss all manner of grievances.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend has gone beyond his point of order.

Mr. STEVENS. I am explaining my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Bennett, Simcoe). There is no point of order, as I understand it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Stevens) asks the Chairman what item we are on. It is Fredericton, increased accommodation to—$46,500. I think perhaps the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) is just coming to that.

Mr. MACDONALD. I am sorry the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) hears so badly as to understand that I said it was nobody's business about the Intercolonial but my own and one or two others. I never made use of any such remark. I did make some reference to the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Davidson), who interrupted me with a remark that he did not live along the line of the Intercolonial, and hoped that I would deal with the proposition he suggested. But I did not wish to be diverted from the argument I was pursuing upon a matter in which I was especially interested. I am sure the minister will agree with me. We have no desire to be captious in discussing his estimates. But I want to point out that this question of the administration of the Intercolonial is one of great importance to the people in Nova Scotia, and this is practically the only opportunity we have had to discuss it. I want to impress upon the minister the seriousness of the proposition as we understand it. Our people have been waiting a long time for the promised railway communication in eastern Nova Scotia, where we have a water-front extending to the Straits of Canso, and where there are numerous harbours, just as good harbours as that of the city of Halifax. Now when railway advancement is taking place everywhere in Canada, with guarantees by provincial governments and federal government to ensure the construction of branch railways all over the country, after a long period of waiting, the people along the coast and in the central part of the province felt last year that they had succeeded in getting the federal government to provide for the construction of these two lines of railway in eastern Nova Scotia; and when they know that the department has at its disposition a survey and examination by the provincial government and various railway companies, and when in good faith the federal government advertised for the construction of the link in the railway which reaches the waters of the Atlantic, and when the government went on to implement the construction by purchasing the Sunnybrae railway, the people regard it as a discrimination against them when the minister suddenly comes in and stops the whole thing. I had hoped the rumour I had heard was true that the minister had not gone back on his first resolution. There were suggestions of political reasons for the delay, which would result in a contract being continued under some different management. But if the fact is as the minister says, that the deposit has been returned, I assume that so far as anything could be accomplished under the tender asked for last year, it has become a thing of the past. I wish to say to the minister that in taking this course he is unfair to our people. The same information which enabled him to come to the conclusion that he should build from Dartmouth to Musquodoboit was at his hand in regard to the proposition from Sunnybrae to Guysborough. Governments cannot be moved except upon their own volition, I assume, but whatever motive is behind the minister's action I would like to discover it. I warn him that there is only one way in which he can rid himself of a deep impression in our part of the country that he is doing them a great wrong, and that is by providing in the supplementary estimates the amount which was in the original estimates but which he has cut out. Everybody in this country recognizes the necessity of the road. The situation in Nova Scotia is such that unless the Minister of Railways goes out and creates extensions and brings railway facilities to places where they are desired, the people of Nova Scotia will say to him: If you will not do it, you must permit the Transcontinental railway to have running powers over the Intercolonial, and let them come in and divide those extensions. Let me remind the minister that out of his 1,496 miles known as the Intercolonial railway, in that portion of the railway more particularly from the town of Amherst east to Truro and from Truro to Sydney, my hon. friend has the only part of his whole railway which initiates freight for shipment to the west. He has imported freight at Halifax from steamers in the winter time, but in other periods of the year, if he had not the return freights to the west that he gets from Nova Scotia, his balance at the end of the year would not be on the right side but badly on the wrong side. There are two large companies which alone contribute one-eighth or one-ninth of all the revenue which is collected in that province, and these are operated in that portion of the province. Now, here is the difficulty which exists with every minister. This House will rise in a month or six weeks, and from April until November and

January the government of Canada is absolutely powerless to do anything to remedy the situation that exists in an industrial and business way along the line of the Intercolonial. Supposing a business condition arises there under which it is necessary to spend a large sum of money, my hon. friend could resort to a Governor's General's warrant, but that would be a very unusual procedure, besides being of doubtful legality. But from the month of April after the estimates are voted, he, as general manager of this 1,500 miles of railway, is not in a position to initiate the expenditure of a single dollar outside the ordinary purposes of expenditure, until he meets parliament again next winter.

Mr. STAPLES. That is right.

Mr. MACDONALD—It is absolutely essential that the large railway enterprises of the west should be prepared, as they are prepared, to look after facilities and create conditions under which the opportunities afforded large manufacturing interests can come to fruition. How would it be if in all other portions of Canada a railway company would say to a business man: You will have to wait until the next meeting of directors which will take place nine months after this? It is true your project may be a pressing one, and it is in the interest of the railway and of the country, but we cannot do anything in that line until our directors meet next year, or nine or ten months after this. That is the position that every Minister of Railways is in who has to deal with these conditions.

Then, we have another difficulty. We are living in the great freight producing part of the country where the Intercolonial railway obtains the greater part of its east and west business. We produce in eastern Nova Scotia to-day something like 10,000,000 tons of coal. We produce a greater quantity of iron and steel than is produced in any other part of Canada. With the Intercolonial railway under existing conditions not a pound of coal can be sent from Nova Scotia west of Montreal so as to compete with American coal, even with the duty added. Why? Simply because my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, when he carries that coal to Montreal, has to hand it over to the Grand Trunk railway, the Canadian Pacific railway or the Canadian Northern, and the arbitrary division of freight which is always made in the traffic arrangements means that when the new company takes that traffic at Montreal it takes such an additional share of the freight rate that it is impossible to send the coal to Ottawa or anywhere further west than Cornwall, and nowhere up into the Canadian Pacific railway country here. The same thing applies to steel products. You have to levy two prices for the two railways, whereas, anywhere else in Canada practically, with the tremendous extent of the Canadian Pacific railway and the Grand Trunk railway systems, the manufacturer who has products to dispose of can put them on the one railway which will carry them to any part of Canada and, by the long haul rate, deliver them in competition with foreigners or people from other places under satisfactory conditions. Every man in the maritime provinces is put under the handicap that it is impossible to transport his products west of Montreal.

Then, there is another difficulty that the minister under present conditions is unable to overcome. Gentlemen who live in the west know, gentlemen who live in Ontario know, that the large corporations of the country develop the business possibilities that exist in the vicinity of their railways. They take hold of them, assist them and provide conditions under which they can be developed and made a success of. That is going on all over the country. The Minister of Railways cannot do that. What a proposition it would be if the Minister of Railways came down to parliament and asked to have placed in his hands a vote of money which he could utilise in his judgment in regard to a question of that kind? No minister has ever thought of it up to the present time, and I am quite sure that no minister would have thought of entering into that arena. Then, there is another consideration. All Canada has contributed to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. STAPLES. Does the hon. gentleman not think that he is pretty wide of the item that is under discussion?

Mr. MACDONALD. There are some gentlemen who come from other parts of Canada who have made us listen to grain Bills and other questions affecting the farmers of the west for days, and we would like at least for one night if the hon. gentleman will bear with us while we entertain them with our little needs and necessities. If my hon. friend (Mr. Staples) is getting tired I am perfectly willing to excuse him. He may go and I can assure him that we will not do anything unlawful while he is away. We in Nova Scotia have contributed our part, and we were glad to do it, to aid in the construction of the Canadian Pacific railway. We are to-day contributing in an equal degree to construct the Grand Trunk Pacific, both of which enterprises have never touched our province, one stopping at St. John and the other at Moncton. We are guaranteeing and pledging the credit of the country to an enormous extent to ensure the construction of a third transcontinental, the Canadian Northern, with the continental system of which our prov-

ince has no connection. With the exception of Prince Edward Island, which is isolated as an island and is therefore impossible to be connected directly with a railway system, we are the one province that is not in touch with any transcontinental railway system. We have all these disadvantages by reason of the fact, but we are confined to one railway—the Intercolonial railway. What I say to the minister is—and this is the point that I have been waiting to make—that he is the only source to which we in eastern Nova Scotia can look for consideration in regard to our railway necessities and I say to him that he should provide for these necessities and, if he fails to do so, I urge upon him to give to these railway systems, by an arrangement with them which would be equitable, and in the country's interest, opportunities for coming into our province over the line of the Intercolonial railway so that they could take part in the business life in which we are interested and we could go to them and say: Here is a business proposition, will you take hold of it and will you go on and give those facilities which the government of the Dominion do not see their way clear to provide? There is the issue—to my mind a plain and simple idea—that the minister must satisfy the needs of the province of Nova Scotia, as they have been recognized by the late government, and provide such facilities as will enable her industrial opportunities to find full fruition, or he must give to the transcontinental railway lines an opportunity to come into our province and make such an arrangement as will enable us to obtain from them those facilities which we think are in our interest and would be in the interest of any railway enterprise that was operating in Nova Scotia.

Mr. KYTE. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) in moving that this House go into committee on his estimates, did not follow upon the usual course of making some announcement in regard to the future policy to be carried out with respect to the operation of the Intercolonial railway. We have heard from him this afternoon that there is a surplus of some $700,000 upon the year's operations. I think it is scarcely a matter to become very boastful of in view of the fact that we have great need for additional railway accommodation, as has been pointed out by my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) and my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald). In the absence of any declaration of policy by the Minister of Railways and Canals yesterday afternoon I presume that the statement he made a few days ago in respect to the intentions of the government as regards acquiring branch lines still stands. On the 10th January last the minister stated that:

> The government would be prepared to take them over after investigation to find out what branch lines on the Intercolonial railway can be taken over that will become feeders of that road, and not milkers of it.

I stated that in the absence of any further declaration of the future conduct of the department in respect to the acquisition of branch lines I assumed that the Minister of Railways stands by that statement. I assume that in the absence of any further definition as to the future policy of the department in reference to the acquisition of branch lines the minister stands by that statement. If these branch lines were dividend-producing institutions, there would perhaps not be the demand to have them taken over that there now is. The fact is that for obvious reasons these branch lines have not been paying institutions and cannot be under the present conditions. In my judgment, instead of having a surplus from the Intercolonial railway, it would be more in the interests of the maritime provinces if the moneys which remain after paying the operations of the railway from year to year were applied for the purpose of acquiring these branch lines. The statement of the minister discloses a surplus of nearly $700,000 on the operations of the present year. That would represent a capital sum of $17,500,000, on which this surplus would be sufficient to pay the interest at four per cent. It would not require anything like this amount to pay for all the branch lines which the representatives of the maritime provinces are seeking to have taken over by the government, and it would be highly proper that the government from year to year should set aside this surplus to meet the interest charges on the capital sums required to purchase these branch lines. It has been pointed out that in Nova Scotia two companies, the Dominion Iron and Steel Company and the Nova Scotia Steel Company, contribute more than a million a year towards the traffic of the Intercolonial railway, and both of these companies are operating in Cape Breton. I am particularly interested in a railway running through my constituency for 30 miles. It is one of the roads which the late government intended to take over under the statute passed in 1910. That statute had in contemplation the taking over of some 13 branch railways in the maritime provinces. At the last session a resolution was introduced by the then Minister of Railways enabling him to complete negotiations with these railway companies for the taking over of the roads.

Mr. COCHRANE. Will the hon. gentleman mention any railway that could have been taken over on the standardization fixed in that statute?

Mr. KYTE. The resolution introduced by the late Minister of Railways at the last session was to give him authority to take over such railways as were available and were not provided for by the statute passed in 1910. I regret that the present Minister of Railways has not introduced a similar resolution, because it would then be some guarantee to us that his intentions in regard to taking over these branch lines of railway were good.

Mr. COCHRANE. Resolutions are good.

Mr. KYTE. Yes, when they are supplemented by statute as it was the intention of the late minister to do had it not been for the unexpected dissolution of parliament last year.

I rose to impress on the minister the desirability of resuming these negotiations opened by the late government. I cannot accept the statement of the minister that only such railways as will guarantee a surplus in their operations should be taken over by this government. The only trunk railway we have in the province of Nova Scotia is the Intercolonial railway and that province has contributed very largely towards the earnings of the road, a large share of the surplus of last year must be credited to that province. If these railways were paying institutions there would not perhaps be the same demand that they should be taken over, but while the government is undertaking large expenditures from which profits cannot reasonably be expected, there is no reason in the world why the department should not carry out a similar policy with respect to railway operations and give us the benefit of this policy in the maritime provinces.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If my hon. friend will allow a few items to stand on which it is desired to have some discussion, we might pass quite a number of items in regard to which no discussion will be necessary.

Hampton—improvement at, $31,300.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am glad to see the item for improvements at Hampton, but I regret that the item of $15,000 which was placed in the estimates by the late Minister of Railways has been omitted. That was for the construction of a spur from Hampton station to Hampton village. The cost was to be about $40,000 and it would give very great and needed accommodation. I hope the minister will look into it personally.

Mr. COCHRANE. I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. SINCLAIR. In connection with the item of public highways there is a highway approaching Mulgrave where the Intercolonial railway crosses the highway in two places. For a number of years negotiations have been going on between the local authorities and the Intercolonial railway to divert the highway so as to avoid accidents in that locality.

Several deaths have occurred at these crossings, which are very dangerous. The difficulty could be avoided by diverting the road so as not to cross the railway at all. At present the road crosses the railway twice, whereas if it could be built along the northern side of the railway it would not cross the railway at all. The question of who should bear the cost of building this piece of highway has been before the government of Nova Scotia and the Department of Railways for some time. As the minister will have money to expend on public roads now and as he will have only himself to deal with on behalf of the Intercolonial railway and also on behalf of the road expenditure, he will be in a position to decide this vexed question. If he would do so he would be conferring a great benefit on that locality, and would probably save a great deal of expense in future to the railway in the way of claims for accidents.

Mr. COCHRANE. I shall be very glad to look into the matter.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). There is another place on the Intercolonial railway, not very far from the place referred to by my hon. friend, which I would ask the minister to consider at the same time. I refer to the crossing at Sylvan Valley in Antigonish county, where several persons have been killed and numerous accidents have occurred. Some years ago, an electric bell was placed there, but while at first it seemed to be an improvement, it has not given satisfaction. The reports in the department will show that this is a place where there should be an overhead bridge. It would not cost very much, and would remove the danger that now exists.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Where does the minister intend to spend this money for the protection of highways?

Mr. COCHRANE. At Forbes street, New Glasgow, Maclean's crossing, Hopewell, near Oxford station, Amherst, Moncton, Little Metis.

Mr. MACDONALD. Do you propose to put a subway at Forbes street in New Glasgow?

Mr. COCHRANE. Yes.

Surveys and inspection, $15,000.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Inverness). On this item I wish to refer to a line of railway which is proposed to be constructed from Orangedale to Cheticamp. I have listened to the pronouncement of policy by the minister with regard to the requirements of

proposed lines, and, while the standard which he has laid down is a pretty high one, I have no doubt that this line will come up to his requirements. He has made reference to two features—cost of construction and prospective earning power. The reason I refer to this line is that I desire to ask the minister to have a survey made of it next season in the strong belief that the findings of the engineers will fully justify the immediate construction of the road. With regard to the cost of construction, I think the report of the engineer will bear me out in saying that it is not a difficult or expensive line to construct, as there will be no serious engineering difficulties to encounter. I am very well acquainted with the route of the line from Orangedale to Cheticamp, having spent sixteen years in the practice of my profession through that country. I am convinced that there will be no serious cuts and certainly no streams of any size to cross. The only river to be crossed is the Margaree, which is not very large. I am, therefore, convinced that the cost of construction will be below the average. With regard to earning power of this proposed road I think no branch line that has yet been discussed in this House has as good possibilities as this line. It will go through Whycocomagh, Ainslee Glen, South Ainslee, East Lake Ainslee, Margaree Valley to South West Margaree thence either by St. Rose along the shore to East Margaree Harbour, or along the Margaree river to Margaree Harbour with a branch to St. Rose, thence through to Cheticamp. There may a difference of opinion as to the route from South West Margaree to Margaree Harbour, but I am willing to leave the determination of the route with the engineers. That is a matter which the engineers will decide, and I shall be satisfied with whatever decision they may arrive at. This line as proposed passes through a prosperous and comparatively thickly settled section of farming country. The line would give railroad accommodation to at least 20,000 people. The mineral wealth of the district is immense. There are pyrites mines at East Lake Anslie which have been developed to a limited degree, but the great difficulty which this concern have to contend with is the want of transportation facilities.

Notwithstanding the fact that the owners of this property are under the necessity of trucking this ore some 10 or 17 miles, they still have done in the past considerable business. With a railway affording connections with the Intercolonial they could get the product of these mines to Halifax cheaper than they can now to Whycocomagh the shipping port, and could carry on their operations all the year. There are several pits open here which have been operated for some time—in fact they are opening them now with renewed energy and they entertain great hopes that this road which I am discussing will be constructed which will give great impetus to their industry. In the neighbourhood of this proposed line there is an enterprising concern sinking for oil. I have their latest report which indicates that they will be successful in the near future in locating oil wells. If that is the case this industry alone will be sufficient justification for the building of this line. At St. Rose there are located the St. Rose coal properties. There has been enough development done there to enable the owners to know the quantity and to determine the quality of the coal on those properties. There are already located one 4 foot seam, two 6 foot seams and one 8 foot seam. The quality of the coal is first class, but unfortunately we cannot hope to have these coal areas developed unless we get some transportation facilities. We are not blessed with good harbours as a rule as are other parts of the province of Nova Scotia, in fact we have not a good harbour within 26 miles of these properties. These properties in themselves I have no hesitation in saying would furnish at least a thousand tons a day of freight all the year. I arrive at this conclusion from the amount of freight that is furnished by the neighbouring mines of Inverness. I must now refer to the gypsum properties of North Inverness. Gypsum of course is a low priced ore and has not been developed very much down there on account of lack of proper transportation during the whole year, but I can tell the hon. minister there is at present operating the Great Northern Mining Company's mill. This concern is prepared to enter into an agreement with the government, as the minister already knows to furnish this proposed road between 6 and 7 carloads a day of the manufactured gypsum. The same concern is willing to pay 75 cents a ton for carrying the manufactured product of these mills from the mills at Cheticamp to Port Mulgrave. If this rate were extended to Montreal it would amount to $8 a ton. This would show the great necessity for this railway, so far as this industry is concerned. It is only one of the industries that would be developed in northern Invernsss as a consequence of providing railway facilities. We have important copper areas in Cheticamp which are being opened up, and which will give employment to a large number of our people who now have to leave their home to find employment elsewhere. There is another argument in favour

of the construction of this railway from Orangedale to Cheticamp which I would also like to point out, I refer to the fisheries in the northern part of Inverness. I think I am not going too far when I say that off the coast of Inverness are located the finest fishing grounds possibly in Canada. We are of course deprived of transportation facilities, we cannot get to the fresh fish market. The result is that 90 per cent of the catch of fish along that coast has to be salted, which of course involves extra labour and expense and our fishermen do not get the prices for their catch that they would if they had the advantage of fresh fish market. The result of all this, so far as the fishing industry is concerned is, that almost all our young men have abandoned fishing and have gone away to seek employment elsewhere. If we only had this road extended down along the coast we would get these young men to return to this industry. Last year notwithstanding the disadvantages that we had to encounter the value of the fisheries of that coast amounted to over $200,000. With proper transportation facilities I have no hesitation in saying we would ship from Inverness fish to the value of at least between $600,000 and $700,000. The freight on that would go a long way to enhance the value and earning power of the Intercolonial railway. We have large forests of lumber down there that have never been disturbed because we had no way of shipping lumber from that part of the country. With a railway through that particular part of the county such as I have referred to, the lumber from these vast forests will be shipped over this branch line. There is another matter that I would like to refer to particularly, and I am sorry the Postmaster General is not in his seat, that is, that the fact that the construction of this road to Cheticamp would bring the Magdalen Islands to within 40 miles of a railway. At present these islands are at least 130 miles distant from a railway line. That is to say, the distance between Pictou and the Magdalen Islands is 130 miles, and from Cheticamp 45 to 50 miles. This is an important matter to the people of these islands. I am sure if the Postmaster General were in his seat he would agree with me that by means of this railway we would be able to supply the people of the Magdalen Islands with facilities which we cannot now do. A daily boat service to the Magdalen Islands in summer would be made possible by the construction of this line to Cheticamp. The transportation service to the islands would be greatly improved, and the Postmaster General would be able to give them a daily mail which I think they are not at present enjoying. There would be no difficulty in the world in providing a daily mail during the season of open navigation. I may point out that the gulf is open from Cheticamp to the Magdalen Islands for a considerable space of time longer than it is between Pictou and the Magdalen Islands. The question of transportation would be, I am sure, important to those people, and I desire to press this matter very particularly upon the Postmaster General. There is another feature of this proposed line which is of importance to the government. At present there are five steamers plying along the coast of Inverness county. The subsidies voted by the government to these steamers amount to something like $18,000 a year, but there would be no necessity for continuing these subsidies if only this railway were constructed and the Inverness railway taken over as a branch line to the Intercolonial railway. I desire to refer now to the Inverness railway. I claim that the government lost a splendid opportunity when they failed to build a line from the strait of Canso to Inverness. I was told lately by an official high up in the Railway Department that the owners of that road are willing to hand it over at any time to the government. If that is so I trust the government will take advantage of the offer. When I point out to the Minister of Railways that last year that road had a net earning power of $90,000, that it is now carrying the product of one coal mine, a coal mine owned by the owners of the railway and that it is quite possible for it to carry the products of two other coal mines, he will realize the importance of this line as a feeder to the Intercolonial. If that line were owned by the government these three industries would be placed on an even basis, and one would have as much consideration as the other. It is only reasonable to suppose that the present owners of the road, who also own and operate a coal mine, will pay particular attention to the development of their own property, and that I think is borne out by the facts. I may point out also that on account of the extraordinary rates paid over that line, the whole traffic of that part of the country has been brought to the various little harbours in schooners which certainly would not be the case if this road were owned by the governemnt as a branch to the Intercolonial railway when only single freight would be charged. I think I may suggest to the Minister of Railways the desirability of having this Inverness road considered from the view point of taking it over. As I have said already, if the owners are so willing to hand the road over to the government I think the latter would make a great mistake if they did not avail themselves of the offer.

In closing, I would ask the minister to have a thorough survey made of this line

from Orangedale to Cheticamp. I would desire not only an engineer's report, but a report also of the traffic possibilities of the line. I would like also to have a report of the possibilities of the Inverness and Richmond railway. I am not in the least afraid but that these reports will fully justify the immediate building of the Orangedale-Cheticamp and the taking over of the Inverness road.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would ask the hon. minister to allow the remaining estimates to stand.

Mr. MACDONALD. The item for increased accommodation along the line and for Truro might pass. One item was rolling stock. I want that to stand.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). What is 'increased accommodation and facilities along the line'? Has it anything to do with building railway stations?

Mr. COCHRANE. It includes the following:

Amherst, paving at, $12,650.
Amherst, track scale, $2,500.
Sandy Cove, extension of siding, 600 feet, $1,000.
Kinsack, extension of siding, 300 feet, $600.
Sydney, piling turn table tractor, $500.
Sydney, addition to freight shed, 150 x 40, $8,325.
Sydney Mines, addition to freight shed, 100 x 40. $4,700.
Coal branch, addition to station, $310.
Bureau, siding, to improve loading facilities, $880.
Kempt, freight sheds, $1,300.
Sayabec, new station, $6,800.
St. Germain, addition to freight shed, 30 feet, $640.
Laurier, station and addition to freight shed, $6,700.
St. Leonard junction, addition to freight shed, $1,200.
Lotbinière, addition to freight shed and coal shed, $665.
Barachois, additional sidings, $1,250.
Eel River, addition to freight shed, $1,215.
Rimouski, addition to freight shed, $1,245.
St. Anaclet, freight shed, $880.
St. Ann, addition to freight shed, $715.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). Is that a station at Truro?

Mr. COCHRANE. The contract is let.

Mr. MACDONALD. Who is the contractor?

Mr. COCHRANE. The same man as before.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). Has the hon. minister a report of the condition of the stations at South River in Antigonish and at Tracadie? When the board of management were inspecting the road last year, they were of opinion that the station at South River was not in proper condition. Attempts had been made to repair it, but even so it was in a dilapidated state. The trouble was that the foundation was bad and the building heaved. The stationmaster who had been there for some years was advised by his doctor that the conditions were unsanitary, and, as it was not convenient to get a suitable house to rent there, he quit the service. Owing to the condition of the station, his health began to fail and it forced him to give up his position. Another station of which the board of management promised to improve conditions was Tracadie. The health officer for the county wrote that conditions were entirely unsatisfactory and such as to be a menace to the health of the stationmaster's family. This was a couple of years ago. There are other letters on file from the clergymen and other prominent citizens to the same effect. For some reason this work had been put off from time to time. But it was agreed on the occasion of the visit of the board of management and staff last summer, that necessary repairs to the building and improvement of the surroundings would be made. Parliament dissolved not long afterwards and nothing was done. I hope there will be no further delay in the matter.

Mr. COCHRANE. I will have a note made of that and will go into the question.

Mr. MACDONALD. Before we rise, the hon. member for Kings, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Hughes), who was compelled to leave to catch a train, asked me to ask the minister to bring down the papers in connection with the car-ferry matter, before we came to that item in Supply.

Mr. COCHRANE. What papers?

Mr. MACDONALD. I am not sure, not being familiar with the matter. I believe some papers were moved for.

Mr. COCHRANE. I understand that these have been brought down.

Mr. MACDONALD. I will advise the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes, Kings), of that fact.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In connection with the large item that is left standing, I think perhaps the general question of railway accommodation in the maritime provinces in connection with the Intercolonial railway might be discussed somewhat along the lines followed by my hon. friend from Pictou. I should be very glad if the minister, when we resume the discussion would let us know just in what condition the proposed agreement is for the operation of the St. John Valley road, including the aid for the bridges across the St. John river.

Mr. COCHRANE. I can give the hon. gentleman that information now. The

agreement has been arranged and is away for signature. It is on a little different terms from the other agreement. The provincial government guarantee the bonds at $25,000 a mile, and they issue bonds for $10,000 more and receive the subsidy from the federal government of $6,400 a mile. The principal change is that we guarantee the bonds of the bridge for $1,000,000. They are not allowed to issue more bonds except the two issues, and we have the right then to issue bonds beyond the $35,000 for any betterments the road may want during the currency of the lease.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the agreement include the building and operation of the line all the way from St. John to Grand Falls?

Mr. COCHRANE. That line is only approved as far as Andover, and that is not fully settled yet.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But it is settled as far as going to St. John?

Mr. COCHRANE. It will be a matter of agreement where to join the Intercolonial.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will my hon. friend be able soon to lay the agreement on the table?

Mr. COCHRANE. I think very shortly.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Will the same terms be available for the province of Nova Scotia for the branch lines projected in that province?

Mr. COCHRANE. As the ex-Minister of Public Works knows, there has been a little change made in the agreement of last spring, and I think he had a good deal to do with making the agreement. I have been told that this road passes through a very fertile country, and if what I am told is true, I am surprised that this road has not been built long before now. The prospects of the road are better than those of any other road I am acquainted with. I would be glad to discuss with the government of Nova Scotia any proposition which they might make. I do not like to commit myself to any proposition, because I am only one member of the government. But if I get a report as favourable as I have with regard to this road, I think it will be only reasonable to do something of the same kind in Nova Scotia.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Minister of Railways is quite right in saying that the agreement is arrived at.

Mr. COCHRANE. The guarantee of the bonds.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The provincial government were to guarantee the bonds for $25,000 a mile, and then the Dominion government was to grant aid at $6,400 a mile pursuant to the statute for a road between St. John and Grand Falls, where it was to connect with the Transcontinental. It was also agreed upon between the late Minister of Railways and the provincial government that aid was to be given for two large bridges across the St. John river, one across the river near Mistake, so-called, another at Andover and another across the Kennebecasis. Then the Intercolonial was to lease the line for a term of ninety-nine years. I may say that the late government took up this whole question of railway aid, and all the different propositions really formed part of one comprehensive scheme. We agreed, for instance, to build the Hudson Bay railway, we agreed to guarantee the bonds of the Canadian Northern so as to link up the eastern with the western section. Then we made an agreement that the government could compel the Canadian Northern to exchange traffic with the Intercolonial at Montreal.

Mr. COCHRANE. Was there an agreement made between the Canadian Northern and the Intercolonial for an exchange of traffic?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. COCHRANE. Is that in writing?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. COCHRANE. I never heard of it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend ought to look into that, because it is very important. It provides that the government has a right to call upon the Canadian Northern railway to exchange all its traffic at Montreal with the Intercolonial railway; an important arrangement, and very beneficial to the country. It was a part of our policy. These different features were all linked up together, these branches in Nova Scotia were to be built, and the government adopted the policy of taking over the various branch lines of the Intercolonial railway in Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia; branch lines were also to be built in Prince Edward Island. We were to assist the St. John Valley line also. All these features were part of a comprehensive scheme which the government decided upon with a view to further railway development in different sections of Canada. I think hon. gentlemen from Nova Scotia have good reason to complain of the omission of that very important piece of road for which provision was made by the late government.

Mr. COCHRANE. They will have to be patient a little longer.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They have been patient for a great many years. I can testify that they were pressing this matter for a great number of years, and finally it was agreed that the government would aid the St. John Valley road in this way, and these other

branch lines should be built. I hope my hon. friend will look into the matter again, and see his way clear to restore the items for the construction of branches in Nova Scotia which have been omitted.

Mr. CARVELL. Perhaps I did not understand the minister as to the assistance to be granted the St. John Valley. I am aware of the guarantee of bonds for $25,000 a mile for the road. My recollection is that the agreement that was arrived at between the late Minister of Railways and the provincial government of New Brunswick, in the month of July last, was to the effect that the government was to furnish aid to the extent of about $400,000 for bridges, and the bonds for the balance of the bridges were to be guaranteed by the province. I now understand that the Federal government guarantees the bonds for the whole million dollars for the bridges.

Mr. COCHRANE. Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then the difference between that and the proposition of the late government is that we were not guaranteeing bonds for the bridges, but we were to give a substantial cash bonus, supposed to be one-third the estimated cost of the bridges. Then the provincial government were to provide an equal amount. I understand now that instead of giving a cash subsidy this government agrees to guarantee the bonds.

Mr. COCHRANE. Yes.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I asked the minister whether the terms would be available to the government of Nova Scotia. Do I understand it is a question of the probable revenue of the road; that is, that that is the only question that will have to be considered ?

Mr. COCHRANE. In that respect, yes. I know we are taking desperate chances at 40 and 60 per cent. I do not know that there is going to be anything in it for the Intercolonial railway.

Mr. SINCLAIR. It is forty per cent of the gross earnings ?

Mr. COCHRANE. Of the gross earnings. It makes a great deal of difference where that road will run, and whether it is possible to make both ends meet on the forty and sixty per cent basis. For the Intercolonial as a whole, it takes about ninety-five per cent of the revenue to meet running expenses. I would not like to commit myself to any definite proposition, but I would be glad to discuss any proposition the provincial government may have to make. I would rather encourage the building of roads in that way than to see the federal government undertaking the whole responsibility of an enterprise to develop the natural resources of a province. I think that the federal government should build what you might call trunk lines; but these branch lines in a province constructed solely for the purpose of developing natural resources, I would aid in the same manner as we are aiding the St. John Valley road.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The way we looked at the matter was this, that in all probability for a few years both governments might sustain some loss. We consider that the federal government would lose some money in operating on the 40 per cent basis, but also the provincial government would incur some loss because until the earnings reached $2,500 per mile, the 40 per cent would not pay the interest and therefore for three or four years there might be a loss on the part of both governments. But I felt, and I think the late Minister of Railways and Canals felt, that when the earnings reached $2,500 or $3,000 per mile it would pay on a 40 per cent basis. The Canadian Pacific railway lease the Tobique Valley railway, they operate on a 40 per cent basis, and I am told that the results have been quite satisfactory.

Mr. COCHRANE. Have they to provide anything for betterments ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know, but it is not unusual that we have companies operating on that basis.

Mr. McKENZIE. When the minister comes before the committee again I desire and would like him to tell me as well as he can the particular purpose to which this vote in the estimates for the Sydney mines diversion will be devoted.

Mr. COCHRANE. I will give all the details.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. COCHRANE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What business will be taken up on Monday ?

Mr. COCHRANE. I understand that the Boundary Bill will be discussed on Monday, and then estimates.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.40 a.m., Saturday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 4, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 119) respecting certain patents of the Continental Can Company.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill (No. 120) for the relief of Ethel May Stewart.—Mr. Clark (Red Deer).

POST OFFICE INSPECTORSHIP AT MOOSEJAW.

Mr. KNOWLES. Before the orders of the day are called I wish to draw the attention of the Postmaster General to the fact that a return, called for by an order of the House which was passed on the 22nd of January, for all papers, etc., in connection with a vacancy in the appointment of post office inspector at Moosejaw, Saskatchewan, has not been yet been brought down.

Hon. L. P. PELLETIER. I will see to it.

PRIVATE BILLS—QUEEN'S COLLEGE KINGSTON.

Upon the orders being called for further consideration in committee of Bill (No. 68) respecting the Queen's College at Kingston —Mr. Nickle; and Bill (No. 69) to incorporate Queen's Theological College.—Mr. Nickle.

Right Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister). I would like to remind the hon. gentleman who has charge of these Bills that we fixed to-day for the second reading of Bill (No. 115) to provide for the extension of the boundaries of the province of Manitoba, and as it is possible that there may be some prolonged discussion on the Bills now coming before the consideration of the House, I would ask that they should stand until a later date in order that we might proceed with the debate on the Manitoba Boundaries Bill as already arranged.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand.

HOUSE IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

House in committee—Third Readings.

Bill (No. 108) respecting the Trust and Loan Company of Canada.—Mr. Baker.

Bill (No. 46) respecting the Dominion Trust Company, and to change its name to British Empire Trust Company.—Mr. Cromwell.

DOMINION TRUST COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 80) respecting the Dominion Trust Company, Limited, and to change its name to the Dominion Trust Company.—Mr. Macdonell.

On section IV—

Mr. MACDONELL. I move that the word 'committees' be substituted for 'boards' in this section. The word 'boards' was left in the Bill by oversight in the committee. The change is desired because the word 'committee' is that which is used in the by-laws of the company and throughout its literature, and so it is the one that will best correspond with the requirements of the company.

Mr. NESBITT. How will it read then?

Mr. MACDONELL. It will read:

The head office of the company shall be in the city of Vancouver and the directors may establish branch offices and local advisory committees at such other places in Canada and elsewhere as they may determine.

Mr. NESBITT. Is not the word 'boards' generally used in Bills of this kind?

Mr. MACDONELL. The word 'boards' is frequently used, but the word 'committees' is used quite as frequently. They are convertible terms of practically the same meaning, but, as I have said, the literature of the company and its by-laws contain the word 'committees,' and it is to bring this Bill into correspondence with these that I move this amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

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

MR. EZRA BUTLER EDDY BESSEY.

Mr. FRIPP moved the second reading of Bill (No. 117) to change the name of Ezra Butler Eddy Bessey.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would ask the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), if he has considered this Bill. It is a proposition to change the name of a person born in the province of Quebec, and does the Minister of Justice think that such a Bill comes within the jurisdiction of this parliament? I am of opinion that such a Bill would fall within the jurisdiction of the province in which the register of the birth of the gentleman is kept, and the registers are carefully kept in the province of Quebec.

Mr. HENDERSON. In looking over this Bill I was under the impression that it came more properly within the jurisdiction of the provincial legislature as a matter of property and civil rights. However, I do not wish to raise any objection to the Bill going through, as I am aware that the young man will be a gainer by about three quarters of a million dollars if he gets his name changed within two years after he becomes of age. I knew his father and grandfather very well, and I have no desire to see any objection raised to the Bill. I had not thought of the point raised by the right hon. gentleman the leader of the opposition; there may be something in it. It is quite possible the young man was born in Hull, of that I have no knowledge. But as his parents resided in Hull at one time, I have no doubt the right hon. gentleman may be

quite correct. I fail to see, however, that that is a material point.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would be sorry to do anything that would injure the prospects of this young gentleman. I also knew his family and grandfather very well. I have no desire whatever to interpose between him and the rights which he is to obtain under the will of his grandfather. But the very suggestion my hon. friend now makes is one which is in the interest of the young gentleman himself, because, if we pass an Act here that we have no power to pass, we might seriously interfere with his prospects.

Mr. HENDERSON. One moment Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SPEAKER. There is nothing before the House.

Mr. HENDERSON. I thought the second reading of the Bill was before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. No, it was passed and referred to the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.

Mr. DOHERTY. Perhaps I may still be allowed to say one word on the point raised by the right hon. gentleman who leads the opposition. It does seem to me there is a great deal to be said in support of his suggestion that the jurisdiction in a matter of this kind belongs to the legislature. But so far as precedents go, I think I am correct in saying that there is a precedent for passing Bills of this kind by this House. There is one case where, if my memory is not at fault, we changed the name of a gentleman to Mr. Amor De Cosmos, however, this is a private matter, and the gentleman himself who is promoting the Bill will have to incur the consequences, if it is found that we have not jurisdiction.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I think there is a concrete case as a precedent. My hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier), I think is aware of a Bill passed by the local legislature some years ago. I do not know of any similar Bill passed by the federal House.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

RESOLUTION ON NAVAL BILL.

Mr. LAMARCHE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago you ruled that my former question was out of order, according to the rules of the House. Since then I have amended it, and now beg to submit it again.

Mr. HENDERSON.

1. Does the government intend to give an opportunity to the members of the House of Commons to discuss the resolution of Mr. Sevigny, which stands as No. 25 on the orders of the day as a notice of motion?

2. If so, is it the intention of the government to give an opportunity to the House to declare itself on the merits of the said resolution?

Mr. BORDEN. A great many applications have been made to the government to give an opportunity of calling up resolutions and Bills under the head of Public Bills and Orders. It is thought undesirable in any of these cases to give such an opportunity as is here asked for, as it would result in seriously delaying the work of the House.

COAL COMBINE IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. STEVENS:

1. Has the government received from the provincial government of British Columbia a request to investigate whether or not a combine or understanding exists among the coal producers and dealers of British Columbia to establish and maintain the prices charged for coal?

2. If so, will the government order such inquiry, and when?

3. Has any answer been sent to the government of British Columbia? If so, what?

Mr. CROTHERS:

1. The Lieutenant Governor of British Columbia on the 3rd of May, 1909, transmitted to the then Secretary of State copy of a minute covering a resolution of the legislative assembly of British Columbia which reaffirmed a request that the Dominion government should cause inquiry to be made with a view to ascertain the cause of the alleged excessive price charged to consumers of coal in that province. This communication from His Honour the Lieutenant Governor of British Columbia was acknowledged by the Under Secretary of State on the 14th of May, 1909.

2. The present government has not had an opportunity up to the present of considering the request which was first brought to its attention by the inquiry of the hon. member.

3. It does not appear that any reply has ever been sent to the government of British Columbia except the acknowledgment by the Under Secretary of State on the 14th of May, 1909, above alluded to.

SEPARATE SCHOOLS IN KEEWATIN.

Mr. BARETTE:

1. Did the government receive a petition from Messrs. Larose, Poirier and Smith of Le Pas, Keewatin, asking for the creation of a school district, to be established by the

commissioner of the northwest territories in council?

2. If so, when does the government intend to give to the aforesaid commissioner, the councillors indicated by section 6 of chapter 62 of the revised statutes of Canada, 1906, and the authority required by section 10, for the establishment of school districts?

*Mr. LAVALLEE:

1. Did the government receive a petition from Messrs. Larose, Poirier and Smith, of Le Pas, Keewatin, asking that a school district be established by the commissioner of the northwest territories in council?

2. If so, does the government intend to have the councillors appointed in accordance with section 6, chapter 62, of the revised statutes of Canada, 1906, and the authority required by section 10 of the same statute, for the stablishment of the school district, before submitting to the House the whole Bill enacting the annexation of Keewatin to the province of Manitoba, in accordance with the resolution now in the Orders of the Day, dated **19th February, 1912, by the hon. Mr. Borden?**

Mr. BORDEN:

1. Yes.

2. The petition alluded to was received on the first of December, 1911, more than three years after the House of Commons had unanimously declared by resolution passed on the 13th day of July, 1908, that the territory therein mentioned should be added to the province of Manitoba. The Revised Statutes came into force on the 31st day of January, 1907, and no action has since been taken by either the preceding or the present administration under section 6 or section 10 of chapter 62. In view of these circumstances such action seems unnecessary at the present time.

MR. FRED. P. ROBINSON.

Mr. CARVELL:

1. Has one Fred. P. Robinson of Fredericton, New Brunswick, been appointed preventive officer for the whole or any port of New Brunswick? If so, for what portion?

2. What are his duties and what salary does he receive?

3. By whom was he recommended for the position, and what is the date of his appointment?

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. Mr. Fred. P. Robinson, of Fredericton, has been appointed an acting preventive officer of customs for service wherever required in New Brunswick.

2. His duties are to endeavour to detect and to prevent frauds on the customs revenue. Salary $1,200 a year.

3. His employment was authorized 1st February, 1912, on the recommendation of the Minister of Customs.

NAVAL SERVICE.

Mr. MONDOU:

1 Does the government intend to propose the repeal of the Naval Service Act?

2. If so, does the government intend, in case of such repeal, to propose another Act containing the policy of the government in matter?

3 If such other Act is proposed, is it the intention of the government to submit the same for the approval of the people before being put into force?

Mr. HAZEN:

The answer to each of these three questions is—'Yes.' After such consideration and inquiry as may be necessary, the government will present its naval policy to parliament and to the people. That policy will undoubtedly require legislation which will involve the repeal of the present Naval Service Act. In the meantime that Act will remain on the statute-book for purposes in connection with the Fishery Protection Service and otherwise. Before any permanent naval policy is put into force, the people will be given an opportunity to pronounce upon it.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—INVESTIGATION BY MESSRS. GUTELIUS AND STAUNTON.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. What amounts by way of salary or other remuneration are F. P. Gutelius and G. Lynch Staunton to receive each year while they are engaged in investigating the affairs of the National Transcontinental Railway?

2. What salary did F. P. Gutelius receive from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the year immediately preceding his appointment by the government?

3. Was the said F. P. Gutelius employed on the Heinze Railroad in British Columbia? If so, in what capacity?

4. Did the said F. P. Gutelius enter the employment of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company at the time of the sale of the Heinze Railroad to the latter company?

5. How long was the said F. P. Gutelius employed by the Canadian Pacific Railway at North Bay and Montreal, and what were his duties at each place?

6. What experience has the said F. P. Gutelius had, respectively, in the operation, management and construction of railroads?

7. What connection, if any, is the said F. P. Gutelius to have with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company while he is employed by the government?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. $65 a day, and reasonable expenses.
2. The department has no information.
3. The department has no information.
4. The department has no information.
5. The department has no information.
6. Received the degree of civil engineer from Lafayette college, class of '87.

1887—Engineer in charge of surveys, plans and construction of municipal separate sewerage system, Englewood, New Jersey. Contract work.

1888—Engineer in charge of surveys and construction of a 1,000 foot tunnel on the Cleveland and Pittsburg railway, near Mineral Point, Ohio. Contract work.

1889—Engineer in charge of the construction of some 20 bridges on the river division of the Cleveland and Pittsburg railway, together with the construction of two stations, all of which was contract work.

1890—Engineer in charge of surveys, plans and construction of Whisky Island and Cleveland Shop-Yards, Cleveland and Pittsburg railway. Contract work.

1891—Engineer in charge of surveys and plans for various water-powers in Montana, and engineer in charge of the construction of Flint Creek-Hydro-Electric plant, near Georgetown, Montana

1892—Engineer in charge of surveys and construction for the Butte City Water-Works Company, involving the construction of some 20 miles of 24-inch wood pipe supply main. Contract work.

1893—Contractor for the extension of Butte City Electric railway from city to cemetery including Montana street bridge over Silver Bow creek.

1894—Engineer in charge of plans and construction of highway bridge at Chalk Bluffs over the Big Hole river, Silver Bow county, Montana. Contract work.

1895—Architect and engineer in charge of construction of nine dwellings and business blocks, Butte, Montana. Contract work.

1896—General superintendent in charge of engineering and construction of the Trail Creek tramway from Trail to Rossland, British Columbia. Contract work.

1897—General superintendent in charge of engineering and construction of the Columbia and Western railway from Trail to Penticton, the construction extending from Trail to West Robson. Contract work.

1898—Superintendent, Canadian Pacific railway, in charge of surveys, plans and construction of the standardization and curvature and grade revision of the Columbia and Western railway from Trail to Rossland.

1899 to 1900—Resident engineer in charge of surveys, plans and construction in the revision of grades and alignment on the Columbia and Kootenay railway which consisted of rebuilding the greater part of this railway in which some thirty bridges were eliminated and others made permanent.

1901 to 1902—Inspecting engineer for the Canadian Pacific railway reporting direct to the general manager on maintenance and construction work for the entire Canadian Pacific railway system.

1902 to 1904—Engineer, maintenance of way, in charge of the preparation of standard plans, specifications and contracts for the guidance of construction and maintenance engineers for new lines, extensions, additions and betterments for the Canadian Pacific railway from coast to coast.

1904 to 1906—Engineer, maintenance of way, in charge of the preparation of standard plans, specifications and contracts for the guidance of construction and maintenance engineers for new lines, extensions, additions and betterments for the Canadian Pacific railway for lines east of Fort William.

1906 to 1908—Assistant chief engineer, Canadian Pacific railway, performing the duties of chief engineer in charge of all maintenance matters on the entire system and the construction department of eastern lines, which required supervision of betterments, additions and maintenance of existing lines, and the construction of new lines, among which was the St. Maurice Valley railway, Staynerville branch, South Bank branch, the filling or making permanent of scores of trestle bridges, alignment and grade revisions, including the crossing of Magog swamp, re-arrangement of terminals, new terminals, engine houses, shops, stores, coaling plants, yard additions, new yards, section houses, track scales, grain elevators, and docks, most of which was contract work, preparation of contracts and specifications and the settlements of all disputes in connection therewith.

General superintendent, Canadian Pacific railway, in charge of construction, maintenance and operation of the Lake Superior and eastern divisions, having immediate charge of the construction of additions and betterments including the filling or making permanent of all of the trestle bridges on the Lake Superior division, re-construction and extension of terminals at Chalk river and Cartier including yards, stations, engine houses, and other facilities, further extensions to Place Viger terminals, and in charge of double tracking to St. Martin junction and Adirondack junction and entire new terminal at Sortin.

7. No connection.

SUPPLY OF CEMENT TO DEPARTMENT OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York):

1. Were any tenders received up to January 30, 1912, for supplying approximately, 210,000 barrels of cement to the Department of Railways and Canals?

2. If so, what are the names of the corporations, firms, or individuals who tendered?

3. Has any contract been awarded in respect to such tenders? If so, what is the name or names of the successful tenderer or tenderers, and at what prices has such contract been awarded at each delivery point?

4. What is the name or names of the corporations, firms, or individuals who contracted to supply cement to the Department of Railways and Canals for the year 1911, what quantity did each contractor supply at each

delivery point, and at what prices?

5. What was the contract price of cement supplied by the Lakefield, Portland Cement Company to the Department of Railways and Canals, under contract of March 10, 1909, delivered at Frankford, Campbellford, Trenton and Hastings?

6. What are the names of the contractors who supplied cement to the Department of Railways and Canals, other than the Lakefield Portland Cement Company, in the year 1909, and what prices were paid to such contractors for cement at each delivery point in that year?

7. Is the government aware as to whether or not the product of all the cement mills extending from Montreal, Quebec, to Windsor, Ontario, with but two exceptions, are controlled by two mergers or trusts?

8. Is the government aware as to whether or not the Department of Railways and Canals in the year 1910 paid 48 cents per barrel more for cement than in the year 1909 at the same delivery points?

9. Is the government aware as to whether or not the duty upon cement imported from the United States is equal to 67·30 per cent of the selling market price at the American mills, or 43¾ cents per barrel?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Yes.

2. Canada Cement Company, Montreal; Alfred Rogers, Limited, Toronto; W. McNally & Co., Montreal; Stimson-Reeb, Builders' Supply Co., Westmount, Montreal.

3. The tenders are still under consideration.

4. Alfred Rogers, Ltd., Toronto, and the Canada Cement Co., Ld., Montreal, as follows:—

Trent Canal.

Alfred Rogers, Limited—
Trenton Junction, 16,000 brls. at $1.95, less 10 cents for bags.
Campbellford, 25,000 brls. at $1.95, less 10 cents for bags.
Hastings, 23,000 brls. at $1.95, less 10 cents for bags.
Newmarket or Holland Landing, 15,000 brls. at $2, less 10 cents for bags.

Canada Cement Company—
Trent Canal.
Glen Miller or Frankford, 20,000 brls. at $1.95, less 10 cents for bags.
Campbellford, 25,000 brls. at $1.95, less 10 cents for bags.
Hastings, 23,000 brls. at $1.95, less 10 cents for bags.
Lakefield, 7,000 brls. at $1.95, less 10 cents for bags.

Canada Cement Company—
Quebec Canals.
St. Gabriel shed, Montreal for Lachine canal, 23,000 brls. at $1.85, less 10 cents for bags.
St. Gabriel shed, for Soulanges canal, 17,250 brls. at $1.85, less 10 cents for bags.
Chambly Canton for Chambly canal, 600 brls. at $2.05, less 10 cents for bags.
St. John for Chambly canal, 600 brls. at $1.90, less 10 cents for bags.
St. Ours lock, 450 brls. at $2.10, less 10 cents for bags.

Canada Cement Company—
Rideau Canal.
At Ottawa, 1,500 brls. at $1.95 barrels net.

Canada Cement Company—
St. Lawrence Canals.
Cornwall, 6,650 brls. at $2, less 10 cents for bags.
Morrisburg, 200 brls. at $2, less 10 cents for bags.
Farran's Point, 250 brls. at $2, less 10 cents for bags.

Canada Cement Company.
Welland Canal.
Welland, 300 brls. at $1.90, less 10 cents for bags.
Port Dalhousie, 500 brls. at $1.90, less 10 cents for bags.
Dunville, 350 brls. at $1.90, less 10 cents for bags.
Merritton, 350 brls. at $1.90, less 10 cents for bags.
Port Colborne, 1,500 brls. at $1.90, less 10 cents for bags.

Canada Cement Company—
Sault Ste. Marie Canals.
Sault Ste. Marie, 200 brls. at $1.95, less 10 cents for bags.
Four bags to the barrel, making 350 lbs. net.

5. 1909—Lakefield Portland Cement Company—
Trent Canal.
Frankford, $1.57, less 10 cents bags returned, 4 bags to barrel.
Campbellford, $1.48, less 10 cents bags returned, 4 bags to barrel.
Trenton, $1.50, less 10 cents bags returned, 4 bags to barrel.
Hastings, $1.48, less 10 cents bags returned, 4 bags to barrel.

6. Vulcan Portland Cement Company—
Quebec Canals.
F.O.B. cars, St. Gabriel shed, No. 2; Montreal, $1.46, less 10 cents bags returned, 4 bags to barrel.
Cornwall Canal.
F.O.B. cars, Ottawa and New York siding, north side of canal, $1.57, less 10 cents bags returned, 4 bags to barrel.
Intercolonial Railway.
Delivered at Halifax, 200 brls. at 43 cents per 100 lbs. in bags.

Stimson-Reeb, Builders Supply Co.—
Intercolonial Railway.
Delivered at Rivière du Loup, 200 brls. at 41¼ cents per 100 lbs.
Delivered at Moncton, 200 brls. at 43½ cents per 100 lbs.

Owen Sound Portland Cement Company—
Sault Ste. Marie Canal.
F.O.B. Sault Ste. Marie, $1.75, less 10 cents for bags, 4 bags to barrel.

7. The government has no information in regard to this.

8. The Department of Railways and Canals paid for cement in the years 1909 and 1910, as follows:—
At Frankford, in bags, 1909, $1.57, less 10c. for bags; 1910, $1.98, difference 41 cents.
Campbellford, in bags, 1909, $1.48, less 10c. for bags; 1910, $1.95, difference, 47 cents.
Trenton Jct., in bags, 1909, $1.50, less 10c. for bags; 1910, $1.98, difference, 48 cents.

Hastings, in bags, 1909, $1.48, less 10 c. for bags; 1910, $1.95, difference, 47 cents.
Lakefield, in bags, 1909, $1.58, less 10c. for bags; 1910, $1.94, difference, 36 cents.
Fenelon Falls, in bags, 1909, $1.53, less 10c for bags; 1910, $1.99, difference, 46 cents.
Newmarket or Holland Landing, in bags, 1909, $1.60, less 10c. for bags; 1910, $2.08, difference, 48 cents.

Quebec Canals.

St. Gabriel shed, Montreal, in bags, 1909, $1.46, less 10c. for bags; 1910, $1.86, difference, 40 cents.

Cornwall Canal.

Cornwall, in bags, 1909, $1.57, less 10c. for bags; 1910, $2.01½, difference, 44½ cents.

Sault Ste. Marie Canal.

Sault Ste. Marie, in bags, 1909, $1.75, less 10c. for bags; 1910, $2.36½, difference, 61½ cents.

Rideau Canal.

At Ottawa, in bags, 1909, $1.60, less 10c. for bags; 1910, $2, difference, 40 cents.

Welland Canal.

Welland Canal, in bags, 1909, $1.65, less 10c. for bags; 1910, $1.91, difference, 26 cents.

9. The duty collected on cement, including the duty on paper bags containing the same, imported into Canada from the United States during the year ended 31st March, 1911, according to the Trade and Navigation Tables, is 32 per cent of the value of the cement, or 43¾ cents per barrel of 350 pounds.

SEPARATE SCHOOLS IN MANITOBA AND KEEWATIN.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

Has any demand been made to the government, verbally or in writing, by any member of the House of Commons, praying for the establishment of a separate school system in the province of Manitoba or in Keewatin? If so, by whom?

Mr. BORDEN. The government does not consider that an inquiry of this character is either usual or pertinent.

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY BONDS.

Mr. MARTIN (Montreal, St. Mary's):

1. Do the Canadian Northern railway bonds, said to have been unconditionally guaranteed by the Dominion of Canada both as to principal and interest, cover the terminals in Winnipeg, Montreal and elsewhere?
2. Is the Canadian Northern Railway Company issuing and putting on the financial market of New York, special bonds for said terminals?
3. Have the moneys realized from the sale of the said railway bonds been applied for the purposes for which they were issued?
4. Does the government intend to order an auditing of the moneys so realized from the sales of these railway bonds, to ascertain whether or not such moneys have been applied for the purposes for which the bonds were issued?
5. Does the government intend to order an auditing to ascertain whether the terminals of the Canadian Northern Railway Company are included in the securities guaranteeing the bonds issued?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds):

1. The Dominion of Canada has not guaranteed the securities of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, or any of the companies connected with the Canadian Northern system, which are a charge upon terminals at Montreal or Winnipeg.
2. The government has no information.
3 & 4. Moneys realized from the sale of securities of the Canadian Northern Ontario Company's railway, guaranteed by the Dominion under chapter 6 of the Acts of 1911, are being applied in aid of the construction of a line of railway from Montreal to Port Arthur, as provided by the said Act and deed of trust made thereunder. Such sums only are paid out of these moneys as the chief engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals shall certify as justified, having regard to the proportion of work done as compared with the work of construction of the whole line.
5. In view of the previous answers an auditing as is suggested is not called for.

MR. AZARIE BIBEAU.

Mr. WILSON (Laval):

1. Has Mr. Azarie Bibeau, a sessional clerk during the last parliament been dismissed? If so, at whose request?
2. Has he been replaced? If so, by whom?

Mr. BORDEN:

1. Yes. It was found on inquiry that Mr. Azarie Bibeau had been paid during sessions at the rate of $4 per day, and that he was repeatedly absent without leave and had not done any departmental work for some years. This was deemed a sufficient reason for his dismissal.
2. Yes. By Charles Meneilley.

CARRIAGE OF MAILS BETWEEN SOREL AND ST. VICTORIA, QUEBEC

Mr. CARDIN:

1. On what date were tenders for the carriage of the mails between Sorel and St. Victoria, county of Richelieu, furnished to the Post Office Department?
2. Who were the tenders at the date, and what was the amount of each tender?
3. Who obtained the contract and at what price?
4. Were some of the tenderers recommended by the hon. the Postmaster General?
5. If so, who are they and by whom were they so recommended?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Tenders were received at department, 19th January, 1912.

The following tenders were received: Adelard Paulhas, $400; F. E. Pelletier, first offer $425, later reduced to $400; Adelard Paulhas, $425; Pierre Pelletier, $440; Chas. Ethier, $499; Ovila Bussiere, $500; J. B. Aubuhcon, $599.

3. F. E. Pelletier at $400 per annum, instead of $450, the price paid before.

4 & 5. No.

BUDGET—BOUNTIES ON IRON AND STEEL.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1 At what date will the Budget debate be brought on?

2. Is it the intention of the government on the occasion of the Budget debate to give a favourable answer to the application of the manufacturers for a renewal of the bounties on iron and steel?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds):

1. An announcement will be made in due course.

2. It is not the custom to answer questions of this character in advance of the Budget speech.

MAIL CONTRACT BETWEEN VAL DES EBOULIS AND RIGAUD, QUE.

Mr. BOYER:

1. Who has the contract at present for the carriage of the mail between Val des Eboulis and Rigaud?

2. When was the contract granted?

3. Did the department ask for public tenders for the said service?

4. What are the names of the persons who tendered, and the amount asked by each of them?

5. When did the contract granted to Pierre Quesnel expire?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Eugene Quesnel.

2. 24th January, 1912.

3. No. It was not necessary as contract was below $200.

4. Answered by No. 3.

5. 31st December, 1911.

SOULANGES CANAL EMPLOYEES.

Mr. BOYER:

1. Has Damien Lalonde, chief electrician on the Soulanges canal, made a report respecting assistant electrician Cuillerrier, accusing him of having stolen tools and goods from the powerhouse?

2. If so, does the department intend to make an inquiry to establish the truth of the accusations brought against Guillerrier?

3. When this inquiry takes place, by whom will it be held, and where?

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think that this question can be asked until it is presented in a different form. One of the rules applicable to the asking of a question is that the question shall not reflect upon individual character. This, I take it, is a violation of the rule.

Mr. BOYER:

1. What are the names of all persons employed on the Soulanges Canal, permanently and otherwise, up to the 21st September, 1911?

2. What were their duties and the salary of each.

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Names of persons employed by the year or per month for 12 months:

L. A. Sauvé, overseer, $1,700 per annum.

Dam. Lalonde, chief electrican, $1,100 per annum.

L. A. Leroux, assistant electrician, $65 per month.

Denis Tremblay, assistant electrician, $5 per month.

Eugène Cuerrier, assistant electrician, $65 per month.

J. O. Dennis, clerk, $800 per annum.

A. D. Valois, storekeeper, $65 per month.

Em. Lalonde, lineman, $60 per month.

J Pte. Denis, carbonman, $60 per month.

J. Bte. Denis, carbonman, $60 per month.

W. L. Lefebvre, weirman, $60 per month.

J. Bte. Brabant, weirman, $60 per month.

Names of persons employed by the month who work 8 full months and are employed ¾ time for the four months of winter.

Jos. Robillard, lockman No. 4, $60 per month.

A. St. Marseilles, lockman No. 4, $60 per month.

Jul. Sauvé, lockman No. 4, $60 per month.

Geo. Chartrand, lockman G. Gate, $60 per month.

Chs. Methot, lockman No. 5, $60 per month.

Jos Girard, lockman No. 5, $60 per month.

M. Sauvé, lockman No. 5, $60 per month.

H. Methot, bridgeman No. 7, $60 per month.

Jos. Hamel, bridgeman No. 7, $60 per month..

Avila St. Germain, oiler and cleaner, $1.75 per day.

Names of persons employed for 8 months, during season of navigation.

Elie Gamelin, assistant lineman, $60 per month.

Leon Descarries, lockman No. 1, $60 per month.

Jos. Besner, lockman No. 1, $60 per month.

Os. Campeau, lockman No. 1, $60 per month.

Wilfrid Sabourin, lockman No. 1, $60 per month.

Ludger Brasseur, lockman No. 2, $60 per month.

J. Bte. DeMontigny, lockman No. 2, $60 per month.

Alex. Ménard, lockman No. 2, $60 per month.

Ad. Pilon, lockman No. 2, $60 per month.

Jos. Clément, lockman No. 3, $60 per month.

Rock Leroux, lockman No 3, $60 per month.

O. DeMontigny, lockman No. 3, $60 per month.

Geo. Leroux, lockman No. 3, $60 per month.
Théo. Ménard, lockman No. 4, $60 per month.
Rene Denis, lockman G. Gate, $60 per month.
O. Bériault, lockman G. gate, $60 per month.
J. Bte. Périard, lockman G. gate, $60 per month.
Alf. Biron, lockman G. gate, $60 per month.
Jul. Clément, bridgeman No. 1, $60 per month.
Jos. Ménard, bridgeman No. 1, $60 per month.
Wilf. Leroux, bridgeman No. 2, $60 per month.
Urgel Goyer, bridgeman No. 2, $60 per month.
Chs. Clément, bridgeman No. 3, $60 per month.
F. St. Marseilles, bridgeman No. 3, $60 per month.
P. Cholette, bridgeman N. 4, $60 per month.
Dd. Robillard, bridgeman No. 4, $60 per month.
F. Cholette, bridgeman No. 5, $60 per month.
B. St. Germain, bridgeman No. 5, $60 per month.
Geo. Lalonde, bridgeman No. 6, $60 per month.
O. Rousselle, bridgeman No. 6, $60 per month.
O. Bissonnette, boat lineman No. 5, $60 per month.
M. Huneau, boat lineman No. 5, $60 per month.
E. Paquette, boat lineman No. 4, $60 per month.
J. Bte. Trottier, boat lineman No. 4, $60 per month.
P. Walsh, boat lineman No. 1, $60 per month.
Nap. Décoste, boat lineman No. 1, $60 per month.

Names of persons employed by the month, who work greater part of each month in year.

Jos. Aquin, head foreman, $3.25 per day.
Barnabé Mallette, assistant carpenter, $2 per day.
Fr. Lucas, blacksmith, $3 per day.
Moise Pilon, assistant blacksmith, $2.75 per day.
Ed. Halley, machinist, $88 per month.
Am. Richard, oiler and cleaner, $2 per day.
Ad. Frigon, stone cutter, $3.50 per day.
Ed. Leclerc, tug engineer, $2 per day.
Wm. St. Marseilles, tug captain, $2 per day.
J. Bte. Juillet, carpenter, $3 per day
N. Massé, carpenter and driver, $3 per day.
Ald. Gauthier, carpenter and painter, $2.75 per day.

A number of foreman, labourers, carters, &c., are employed during the year but only when the works are under way and none can earn 6 full months in a year.

Engineering staff for protection works at upper entrance, Soulanges canal:

J. T. Lemire, resident engineer, $1,500 per annum.
W. Gauthier, rodman and chainman, $2 per day

Mr. COCHRANE.

J. Moussette, boatman, $2 per day.
F. Prieur, boatman, $2 per day.

Surveys.

L. S. Pariseau, engineer in charge, $2,400 per annum.
Pierre Piché, assistant engineer $1,500 per annum.
Paul Bourbonnais, transitman (summer season), $80 per month.
John Gourley, rodman (summer season), $2 per day.
Adam Gourley, chainman, (summer season), $2 per day.
Ald. Legault, chainman (summer season), per day.
Heven Legault, labour (summer season), $2 per day.
Arthur Deschamps, boat watchman and cook (summer season), $40 per month.

Temporary Staff.

Richard Methot, foreman, $2.75 per day.
Gaspard Déquire, foreman, $2.75 per day.
Jos. Léger, labourer, $2.75 per day.
J. Bte. Larocque, labourer, $2.75 per day.
Alex Sauvé, labourer, $2.75 per day.
D. Isabelle, foreman, $2.75 per day.
F. X. Martin, labourer, $2.75 per day.
Dan. Marleau, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Oliver Deschamps, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Oliver Bissonnette, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Jos. Briand, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Honoré Mirand, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Alf. Gaurant, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Jos. Dubois, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Jos. Leblanc, sr., labourer, $1.75 per day.
Jos. Leblanc jr., labourer, $1.75 per day.
Xavier, Marleau, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Stephen, Leblanc, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Dam. Leblanc, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Jean Marie Roy, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Jos. Lavigne, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Honoré, Sauvé, labourer, $1.75 per day.
X. Levesque, labourer, $1.75 per day.
M. Isabelle, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Jos. Larocque, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Jos. Oliver Pilon, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Jos. Pilon, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Jos. Chevrier, labourer, $1.75 per day.
J. Bte. Piché, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Fred Miron, labourer, $1.75 per day.
George Castonguay, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Octave Castonguay, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Pierre, Castonguay, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Arthur Castonguay, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Evereste Chevrier, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Omer Chevrier, labourer, $1.75 per day.
F. X. Chevrier, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Albert Bradley, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Tel. Bradley, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Ignace Rousselle, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Léon Legros, labourer, $1.75 per day.
J. Bte. Biron, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Jos. Bissonnette, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Tel. Rousselle, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Jul. Rousselle, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Ernest Isabelle, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Eli Lalonde, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Dam. Leblanc, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Wilf. Méthot, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Urgel Dupuis, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Jos. Séguin, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Jos. Legros, labourer, $1.75 per day.

Amédée Séguin, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Edw. Sauvé, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Jos. Denis, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Augustin Legros, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Octave Goulet, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Arthur Ranger, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Abel Séguin, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Narcisse Legros, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Arsène Miron, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Henry Roy, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Olivier Vernier, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Christin Lévesque, labourer, $1.75 per day.
George Hamel, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Olivier Aselin, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Dep. Cadieux, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Xavier Lévesque, labourer, $1.75 per day.
George Martin, jr., labourer, $1.75 per day.
George Martin, sr., labourer, $1.75 per day.
William Valade, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Tréflé Bériault, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Denis Desforges, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Louis Vernier, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Alex. Baker, labourer, $1.75 per day.
William Desforges, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Oct. Montpetit, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Norgert, Dequire, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Wilf. Bissonnette, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Willie Castonguay, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Adélard Pilon, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Avila Richard, labourer, $1.75 per day.
A. Gaboriault, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Donat Bozon, labourer, $175 per day.
Dossisse Mallette, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Amédé Gareau, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Tréflé Houle, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Réné Labric, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Aut. Denis, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Eug. Chaput, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Lazare Martel, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Fred. Séguin, labourer, $1.75 per day.
John Dixon, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Avila Piché, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Dieudonné Pilon, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Jos. Piché, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Alf. Castonguay, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Alex. Castonguay, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Gus. Lucas, labourer, $1.75 per day.
J. P. Leroux, foreman, $2.75 per day.
Félix Thevret, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Magloire Poirier, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Maurice Leroux, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Jos. Périard, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Onéz. Chevrier, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Jos. Bissonnette, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Donat Goyer, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Hormisdas Séguin, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Euclide Ranger, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Gaspard Beron, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Dolor Montigny, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Albert Robillard, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Conrad Leroux, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Ernest Cuellerier, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Jos. Sauvé, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Regis Lefebvre, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Omer Lévesque, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Arthur Sauvé, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Wilf. Leclerc, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Cléophas Leclerc, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Olivier Rousseau, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Omer Brunet, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Adélard Brunet, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Alex. Rousseau, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Léon Legault, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Placide Ménard, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Nap. Malette, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Henri Lefebvre, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Tel. Sauvé, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Josephat Lefebvre, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Alfred Martin, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Edmond Demers, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Albert Demers, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Justinian Poirier, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Joseph Ménard, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Aldage Fontaine, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Darcy Cousineau, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Arine Juillet, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Olivier Martin, labourer, $1.75 per day.

Employed on General Repairs.

Henri Roy, horse and cart, $2.25 per day.
Xavier Lévesque, horse and cart, $2.25 per day.
Tél. Campeau, horse and cart, $2.25 per day.
Urgel Dupont, horse and cart, $2.25 per day.
G. Marceau, horse and cart, $2.25 per day.
Ant. Denis, horse and cart, $2.25 per day.
Amédé Gareau, horse and cart, $2.25 per day.
Tréflé Houle, horse and cart, $2.25 per day.
J. Bte. Piché, horse and cart, $2.25 per day.
Wm. St. Marseilles, horse and cart, $2.25 per day.
Arthur Biron, horse and cart, $2.25 per day.
Horace Biron, horse and cart, $2.25 per day.
Henri Roy, team, $3.75 per day.
Jos. Lecompte, team, $3.75 per day.
Dam. Leblanc, team, $3.75 per day.
Wil. Méthot, team, $3.75 per day.
Eph. Goulet, team, $3.75 per day.
Raoul Sauvé, team, $3.75 per day.
E. Tremblay, team, $3.75 per day.
Jos. Lavigne, team, $3.75 per day.
William Valade, team, $3.75 per day.
Barnabé Labri, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Raoul Biron, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Pierre Chevrier, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Omer Clément, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Dieudonné Chevrier, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Honorius Biron, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Arthur Ménard, drill runner, $1.75 per day.
Ovila St. Denis, fireman, $2.25 per day.
Wm. Valade, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Ad. Ménard, team, $3.75 per day.
Hector St. Germain, aid-carpenter, $2 per day.

Temporary Employees.

Donat Martin, labourer, $1.75 per day.
O. P. Martin, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Wilf. Vincent, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Pierre Allard, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Ernest Gamelin, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Zotique Moreau, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Fred. Thérien, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Avila Gauthier, team, $3.75 per day.
Xavier Bériault, team, $3.75 per day.
Ant. Thavette, team, $3.75 per day.
Avila Séguin, team, $3.75 per day.
Adélard Ménard, team, $3.75 per day.
Eugène Bissonnette, team, $3.75 per day.
Armand Lefebvre, team, $3.75 per day.
Alex. Leroux, team, $3.75 per day.
Paul Vincent, team, $3.75 per day.
Pacific Charlebois, team, $3.75 per day.
Fortunat Daoust, team, $3.75 per day.
Ferd. Rouleau, foreman, $2.75 per day.
Raoul Leroux, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Ad. Robillard, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Tel. Robillard, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Omer Dupont, labourer, $1.75 per day.

Maurice Séguin, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Azarie Marsan, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Réné Félix, labourer, $1.75 per day.
George Denis, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Hormisdas Lévesque, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Avila Denis, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Jos. Langevin, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Jos. Leroux, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Emmanuel Legault, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Albert Legault, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Théo. Denis, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Procule Charlebois, labourer, $1.75 per day.
J. Bte. Lalonde, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Henri Félix, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Arthur Marleau, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Osias Leroux, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Aldéric Cousineau, labourer, $1.75 per day.
Norbert Normand, labourer, $1.75 per day.
H. Duval, inspector of works, 35 cents per hour.
Willie Ménard, bundling empty cement, bags, 20 cents per hour.
Conrad Le roux, bundling empty cement bags, 20 cents per hour.
Joseph Ménard, bundling empty cement bags, 20 cents per hour.

2. Answered by No. 1.

Mr. BOYER:

1. Has a person named Denis Methot, recently appointed assistant electrician on the Soulanges canal, replacing a person named Cuillerrier, the required experience to perform such duty?
2. If so, can the government state where this man acquired his experience?
3. Who are the persons who furnished certificates, references, &c., showing that the said Denis Methot has the requisite experience to perform such duty?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Methot had experience with machinery generally. The department does not require expert electricians for such positions. Any intelligent man, especially if he has a general experience in machinery can be trained in a very short time. In this case it was arranged that either the chief electrician or one of his trained assistants would take the appointee in hand and that he would never be left alone in charge of the electrical machines until properly acquainted with their working.

It may be stated that the man Cuillerrier had no more knowledge of electrical machinery when appointed some years ago, than has Methot.

2. He had no experience at the time of his appointment.
3. He had no certificates and none were required in his case.

Mr. BOYER:

1. Has the government received a report respecting an assault committed by Damien Lalonde, chief electrician on the Soulanges canal, on the person of one of his assistants, named L. A. Leroux?
2. Is the government aware, as reported, that the said Damien Lalonde was arrested for this act, that he appeared before the court on the 22nd February, and that his trial has been put off to the 28th instant?
3. Is it within the knowledge of the department that the said Damien Lalonde, without any other authority, dismissed the said L. A. Leroux, in order, as alleged, to replace him by a person named Macdonald, and that his appointment had been afterwards ratified by the department?
4. What is the date of L. A. Leroux's dismissal?
5. What is the date of Macdonald's engagement?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. The superintending engineer, was handed a letter by Mr. Leroux relating the circumstances of the assault in question.
2. The superintending engineer reports that he was notified of the arrest by Leroux.
3. Lalonde did not dismiss Leroux. It was necessary to put a man in his place, to complete the staff, so Macdonald was appointed temporarily, by the overseer, who reported to the superintending engineer and his action was approved of.
4. Leroux left the service on the 19th February.
5. The 19th February.

BRITISH COLUMBIA FISH HATCHERIES.

Mr. SHEPHERD:

What was the cost of construction of each of the following hatcheries in British Columbia: Anderson Lake, Kennedy Lake and Cowichan Lake?

Mr. HAZEN:

Anderson lake hatchery, $6,964.94. Kennedy lake hatchery, $7,505.57; Cowichan lake hatchery, $9,023.81.

HERRING FISHING IN BRITISH COLUMBIA WATERS.

Mr. SHEPHERD:

1. Was herring fishing permitted in the waters adjacent to Nanaimo harbour and Departure bay after the season 1910-11 had closed?
2. If so, upon whose authority and to whom were such privileges granted?
3. By whom were the necessary permits issued?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Answered by No. 1.

ST. LAWRENCE SHIP CHANNEL—GOVERNMENT DREDGES.

Mr. CARDIN:

1. Are the captains, engineers, mates and other navigators employed up to last autumn on the government dredges and towboats employed in dredging the channel of the St. Lawrence between Montreal and Quebec, engaged for the season of navigation of 1912?

2. If some of them are to be dismissed, who are they, what position did each occupy, who asked for these dismissals, and why?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. The matter is under consideration.
2. Answered by No. 1.

PINK ROCK WHARF, N.B.

Mr. FOWLER:

1. What is the total cost to date of Pink Rock wharf, Westmorland county, N.B.?
2. Who is wharfinger, and what amount of tolls have been collected from the public?
3. What quantities of gypsum or other freight have been handled on the wharf by the Albert Manufacturing Company, or C. J. Osman, free of tolls, under an alleged agreement with the Public Works Department?
4. Is the title of the land upon which the wharf is built, vested in the Crown? If so, from whom was it obtained, and at what price?

Mr. MONK:

1. $16,065.64.
2. (a) No wharfinger has, as yet, been appointed; (b) no tolls collected.
3. No records of such shipments kept in the department.
4. No, but the agreement entered into with the Albert Manufacturing Company is considered a sufficient title.

FISHERY INSPECTORS, NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

What are the names, addresses and present salaries of the fishery inspectors in the province of Nova Scotia?

Mr. HAZEN:

John G. Morrison, Englishtown, inspector for Cape Breton Island, salary $1,200 per annum.

Robert Hockin, Pictou, inspector exercising jurisdiction over Cumberland, Colchester, Pictou, Antigonish, Guysborough, Halifax and Hants counties, salary $1,200 per annum.

Andrew C. Robertson, Barrington Passage, inspector for Lunenburg, Queen's, Shelburne, Yarmouth, Digby, Annapolis and King's counties, salary $700 per annum.

DEPARTMENT OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—BIOLOGICAL BOARD.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Who composes the Biological Board of the Marine and Fisheries Department?
2. What is the salary or allowance paid to each member of the board, including expenses?
3. Where are the biological stations situated?
4. What was the yearly cost during the past five years of the operation of the board?
5. Does the board make yearly or any reports to the department?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Professor E. E. Prince, L.L.D., F.R.S.C., Commissioner of Fisheries, Chairman representing the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Professor R. Ramsay Wright, M.A., L.L.D., &c., vice chairman representing the University of Toronto. Professor Arthur Willey, D.Sc. F.R.S., representing McGill University, Montreal. Professor L. W. Bailey, Ph. D., L.L.D., F.R.S.C., representing the University of New Brunswick, Fredericton, N.B. Rev. Abbé V. A. Huard, D.D., representing Laval University, Quebec. Professor A. P. Knight, M. A., M.D., &c., representing Queen's University, Kingston. Professor A. B. Macallum, Ph. D., D.Sc., representing the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Dr. A. H. MacKay, L.L.D., representing Dalhousie University, Halifax, N.S.
2. No salary or allowance is paid to any member of the board for his services. The chairman is a salaried officer as Commissioner of Fisheries.
3. St. Andrews, New Brunswick; Go-Home Bay, Georgian Bay, Ontario; Departure Bay, Nanaimo, British Columbia.
4.

1906-07	$ 2,596 84
1907-08	15,829 30
1908-09	21,599 70
1909-10	14,386 79
1910-11	9,700 43

5. A report is submitted annually for publication in the report of the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Twenty technical and fishery reports have been published at intervals as supplements to the Fishery Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, under the title of 'Contributions to Canadian Biology being studies from the Marine Biological Stations of Canada,' and nineteen further reports are being printed and nearly ready for issue by the King's Printer.

FEDERAL SUBSIDIES TO MANITOBA AND NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. What is the population of Manitoba according to the last census
2. What is the gross amount that will be payable as arrears to the government of Manitoba by the Federal government on account of debt allowance, land account and buildings, under the new adjustment now before parliament?
3. What amount, in addition to the arrears referred to in question No. 2, will be payable as provincial subsidy out of the revenue of Canada to the province of Manitoba for the year ending March 31, 1913, under the adjustment now before parliament?
4. What is the population of Nova Scotia as per last census?
5. What is the amount to which the province of Nova Scotia will be entitled for provincial subsidy from the Federal government for the year ending March 31, 1913?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds):

1. 455,614.

2. Arrears on account of allowance in lieu of debt (in respect of four years—July 1, 1908, to June 30, 1912)—payable when Bill becomes law, $810,648.52; approximate arrears of allowance in lieu of land (same period), payable when Bill becomes law, $1,368,000; special allowance building account, payable one-half July 1, 1912, one-half July 1, 1913, $201,723.57. Approximate total, $2,380,372.09.

3. Manitoba will receive, if the Bill becomes law, for the year beginning July 1, 1912 (Subsidy Acts make grants to provinces payable half-yearly in advance July 1st and January 1st, each year), approximately $1,349,345.39.

4. 492,338.

5. For the year beginning July 1, 1912, Nova Scotia will receive $636,671.28.

POSTMASTER AT TRACADIE ROAD, N.S

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Has any complaint been received by the Postmaster General of the Post Office Department against John H. McPherson, postmaster at Tracadie Road, N.S.?

2. If so, what was the complaint, and who made it?

3. Has any notice been sent to Mr. McPherson?

4. Does the department intend to take further action in this case?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1, 2, 3 and 4. The Post Office Department has received to-day the following telegram:—

Halifax, N.S., March 4, 1912.

The Secretary,
Post Office Department,
Ottawa.

John H. MacPherson, Postmaster, Tracadie Road, stated to have died four years ago. Report by to-day's mail.

(Sgd.) W. E. MacLELLAN,
P. O. Inspector.

DISMISSAL OF MR. CHARLES FLEMMING.

Mr PARDEE:

1. Has Charles Flemming, employed in the Inland Revenue Department at Petrolia, Ontario, been dismissed? If so, for what cause?

2. Was an investigation asked for? If so, will it be granted?

Mr. NANTEL:

1. Yes. For intemperance.

2. Yes. No investigation will be held as evidence was conclusive.

LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER AT ILE ROUGE.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Has any one asked for the position of Mr. John Irving, floating lighthouse keeper, of Ile Rouge? If so, what are their names?

2. Is it the intention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to dismiss the said John Irving? If so, will an inquiry be granted him?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Representations have been made to the department that Mr. L. T. Delisle, formerly employed as captain, should be reinstated.

2. The matter is under consideration.

DRY DOCK AT QUEBEC.

Mr. BELAND:

1. Who are the persons or companies now conferring with the government on the subject of the construction of a dry dock in the port of Quebec?

2. In the case of companies, who are the directors and through whose intervention are they coming to terms with the government?

Mr. MONK:

1. The representatives of the Quebec harbour board and of the shipping federation.

2. No company has made any application to or entered into any pourparlers with the government upon the subject.

CHICAGO DRAINAGE CANAL.

Mr. LAVALLEE:

1. What steps have been taken by the honourable the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to prevent the proposed increase of the flow of water from Lake Michigan through the Chicago drainage canal?

2. Is the minister aware of the damage this increased flow of water would work to shipping by a lowering of the lake levels?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, on learning of the application of the trustees of the Sanitary District of Chicago, to be allowed to increase the quantity of water withdrawn from Lake Michigan through the Chicago Drainage Canal to ten thousand cubic feet per second, directed Mr. John Kennedy, Consulting Engineer of the Harbour Commission of Montreal, and Mr. W. J. Stewart, C.E., Chief Hydrographer of the Department of the Naval Service, Ottawa, to proceed to Washington and watch on behalf of Canada, proceedings in that connection before the United States Secretary of War.

At the said hearing, the trustees of the Sanitary District of Chicago were present, the case in their behalf being presented by counsel.

Opposing the application, there appeared representatives of shipping interests from all over the Great Lakes; also representatives of various cities and harbours, including some from Chicago itself, and from as far east as Cleveland.

The Canadian representatives took no part in the proceedings, further than to ask for an adjournment of the hearing until the 27th March, 1912, a request that had already been made by the Right Honourable the Prime Minister of Canada through the British Ambassador at Washington. This request on behalf of Canada was readily granted.

In addition, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has arranged for a conference of representatives of the shipping interests, to take place at Ottawa on the 5th March, with a view to discussing with him ways and means of presenting Canada's objection to this application, at the hearing arranged, for the above named date, at Washington.

2. The minister is aware that great damage would result to shipping if sufficient water were diverted to affect the lake levels.

SUPERIOR COURT BENCH, HULL.

* Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has the Minister of Justice read the following from the Ottawa 'Citizen' of the 29th ultimo:—

'NEW JUDGESHIP.

'Hector Chauvin may go to Hull Superior Court Bench.

'The announcement made by Judge McDougall, presiding at the Hull Superior Court yesterday that it was probable that a new Superior Court judge would be appointed at an early date, caused much satisfaction amongst the members of the Bar Association who were present.

'Judge McDougall stated that he had interviewed the Minister of Justice and told him that he was unable to handle the great number of cases before the court, and that as he would be debarred from sitting on the bench during the hearing of a number of cases in the coming Hull assizes, owing to his having been at one time retained by some of the principals in the case, it would be necessary to secure the services of another judge. Moreover, owing to several of the Montreal judges being at present on the sick list, it would be difficult to obtain one to preside at Hull.

'In reply the Minister advised Judge McDougall that an appropriation would be made during the present session, providing for an additional Superior Court judge, who would reside in the district of Ottawa, pending the establishment of the Nominingue district.

'It is stated that the new judge will probably be Mr. Hector Chauvin, whose name has been mentioned in connection with a judgeship very frequently of late.'

2. Is an additional Superior Court judge to be appointed as suggested by Mr. Justice McDougall.

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. This question was practically answered on Thursday last (Feb. 29). The answer will be found on page 4197 of 'Hansard' (unrevised). If the hon. member so desires I will repeat the answer:

I have not seen the statement of Mr. Justice McDougall, but the Quebec legislature has provided for a new judicial district to be called Montcalm, and that until there is a proper courthouse at the Chef-Lieu of Montcalm district, the judge to be appointed shall reside at Hull. It is the intention when we introduce the Bill to provide for the additional judges which are asked for by the different provinces to make provision for the salary of the judge which the legislature has determined is required for the district of Montcalm and who is to reside at Hull, and that was so stated to the Hon. Mr. Justice McDougall.

2. When the necessary legislation is passed an additional judge will be appointed.

MAGDALEN ISLANDS NEWS SERVICE.

* Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Who sends the weekly letter by Marconigram to Magdalen Islands, and what is his salary?

2. What is the nature of the news supplied?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Mr. David Watson, of Quebec.

2. I think eight dollars per week, but I will have this verified.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all letters, petitions, requests, memoranda, ministerial or departmental instructions in the possession of the government or any department thereof, relating to the alleged change of name of Blind River post office, in the province of Ontario.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a copy of all letters, contracts, memoranda, or notice cancelling contracts, and of all other papers and documents in the possession of the Department of Railways and Canals, bearing date after January 1, 1911, relating to the construction of certain branch lines of the Intercolonial railway between Sunnybrae and Guysborough and Country Harbour, and between Dartmouth and Dean Settlement, in the province of Nova Scotia.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a copy of all documents, correspondence, inquiries, accusations, petitions and reports in the Department of Railways and Canals, referring to the dismissal of Mr. Theophile Morice, an officer over the delivery of coal of the Intercolonial railway at Rivière du Loup.—Mr. Gauvreau.

For a copy of all papers and correspondence in connection with the removal of the postmaster at Rathburn, township of Mara, county of Ontario, and the change of the location of the post office at said point.—Mr. Pardee.

For a copy of all contracts, correspondence or writings whatsoever, respecting the construction of a dam in 1908 or 1909, called the Lake Timiskaming dam constructed or built over the rivers forming the inflow or the discharge of the said lake, exchanged between the government of Canada and the contractor or contractors.—Mr. Boulay.

For a copy of all correspondence between the Intercolonial authorities, the Minister of Railways and the Department of Justice, and all other persons, relating to a claim of the Matepedia Water Works Company against the Intercolonial, including therein all plans, designs, inquiries, evidences and other reports concerning this matter; also a copy of all plans, designs, notices and correspondence between the Intercolonial authorities and M. P. Laberge, the Dominion Lumber Company and John Fenderson & Co., relating to the placing of an aqueduct pipe on the land No. 170 of the cadastre of St. Pierre du Lac.—Mr. Boulay.

For a copy of all papers, documents, letters, &c., connected with an inquiry made by the Intercolonial authorities of the loss of a horse killed on the Dalhousie branch, belonging to Mr. Xavier St. Laurent, of Causapscal, since 1905.—Mr. Boulay.

For a copy of all inquiries, correspondence whatsoever relating to the death of the late Absolon Lavoie, of Amqui, accidentally killed on the Intercolonial railway at Metis, county of Rimouski, during the summer of 1911.—Mr. Boulay.

For a copy of all letters, complaints, charges and other documents connected with or giving any information as to the discharge of Thomas Hale, of Westville, Nova Scotia, as correspondent for the 'Labour Gazette.'—Mr. Macdonald.

1. For a copy of all reports of engineers from 1874 to 1900, relating to the most suitable site in the harbour of Quebec for the construction of a dry dock.

2. Of all correspondence exchanged on the subject of a choice of a site for the dry dock now existing at St. Joseph de Lévis, at the time of its construction.

3. Of engineers' reports, plans, maps and bearings relating to the construction of a new dry dock in the port of Quebec since 1900.

4. Of all correspondence exchanged between the different companies and the government relating to the construction of a new dry dock in the port of Quebec, since 1909.

5. Also for the production of all documents submitted by the different companies who have asked for the government grant provided by the Dry Dock Subsidies Act.—Mr. Béland.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams and petitions, sent to the government, or any of His Majesty's ministers, praying for the establishment of a separate school system in the Keewatin territory.—Mr. Lemieux.

For a copy of all documents, letters, messages, recommendations, requests, tenders, &c., respecting the contract granted to Alexander Duchesneau, for work done to the wharf at St. Valier, county of Bellechasse.—Mr. Lapointe.

EXTENSION OF BOUNDARIES—MANITOBA.

Rt. Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 115), to provide for the Extension of the Boundaries of the province of Manitoba. He said: Mr. Speaker, when the resolutions upon which this Bill is founded were in Committee, the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), asked that we should lay upon the table of the House a map showing the boundaries as proposed; I have done that and have also handed to my hon. friend a copy. This map has been prepared by the geographer, and I believe it shows accurately the boundaries as proposed by the resolutions, and by the Bill of which I now move the second reading.

I might also give to the House some information as to the population within the added territory as furnished to me by the officials who have charge of the census. The population is as follows:

Origin.	Number.
English	108
Scotch	33
Irish	6
French	16
Scandiavian	2
Eskimo	259
Halfbreed	525
Indian	4,822
Total	5,771

It is thus apparent that there has been very little settlement and apparently very little development in the territory which is thus to be added to the province of Manitoba. However, we cannot tell what development may come in the future. We know that the Hudson Bay railway is to be constructed, and we also know that the government of the province of Ontario have it in mind that the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario railway will, in the course of time, be extended through a portion of this territory so as to reach a port on Hudson bay.

The boundaries now proposed are the same as those which were affirmed by this House on the 13th day of July, 1908. I might state that between 1905 and 1908, the province of Saskatchewan laid claim to some portion of the territory which is now proposed to be included within the boundaries of the province of Manitoba. That was alluded to by the then Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), in moving the resolution I have just mentioned, on July 13, 1908. He used this language as expressing the conclusion which the government had reached in that connection:

> After giving due consideration to this claim on the part of the province of Saskatchewan, it seemed to us that, as between the claim of the province of Saskatchewan and of the province of Manitoba, to have the territory which lies north of Manitoba and east of Saskatchewan allotted either one way or the other, the weight of argument was certainly in favour of Manitoba and we could not grant the prayer of Saskatchewan. We therefore had to ignore it.

The present administration has seen no reason to depart from the conclusion which was thus arrived at.

Objection was taken during the debate on the resolutions to certain financial provisions which were then proposed, and which are embodied in this Bill. Criticism was directed against the date at which these financial provisions shall take effect. I need not remind the members of the House that the claim of Manitoba for an extension of its boundaries is of long standing. It was said, and I think accurately said, by the right hon. gentleman who leads the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), when he was moving the resolutions in 1908, that that claim dated as far back as 1884. It was renewed with a good deal of insistance in 1901, and as far as I am able to understand, it was proposed or suggested at that time that the claim of Manitoba in that regard should be postponed until what were then the territories lying west of Manitoba should be formed into provinces. Those territories were constituted into the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan during the session of 1905. The right hon. gentleman who then lead the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) dealt with the claim of Manitoba in that regard when he moved the first reading of the Autonomy Bills. He spoke of the claim of Manitoba to an extension of its boundaries as one which was entitled to fair and just consideration, but he attempted to justify the delay in dealing with that particular matter by saying that it could not be properly dealt with until Ontario and Quebec, and also the new province of Saskatchewan, then being constituted, had been consulted. Subsequently to that date Saskatchewan, Ontario and Quebec were consulted, and the result was the proposal of the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), embodied in the resolutions of July 13, 1908. The suggestion is made that although Manitoba put forward a claim which was entitled to consideration in 1905, but which claim was not acceded to at that time for the reason already alluded to, a delay of some six years having intervened, Manitoba should have no consideration whatever, for the time which has intervened between 1905 and the present time. I am not disposed to accept that conclusion.

I have already said that Manitoba urged, and urged with great insistence, that inasmuch as her claim should have had consideration in 1905 it would be proper, and only just and fair, that whatever financial provisions were to be embodied in the Bill providing for an extension of her boundaries, should date not from to-day, but from the period in 1905 when the new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan were first constituted. We have not seen fit to date these financial provisions so far back as that, but we do think inasmuch as the boundaries which are now proposed were unanimously affirmed by this House in 1908, that it is no more than just to the province of Manitoba that those financial provisions should date and take effect from the 1st day of July 1908, and we ask this House to support us in that conclusion. What are we giving to Manitoba? We are increasing the lands indemnity from the sum of $100,000 to $562,500, the same as to Saskatchewan, and estimated on the same basis as in the case of that province. But we have asked Manitoba to accept, and Manitoba has agreed to accept, a deduction of $149,230 from that sum, leaving the net amount to be received by Manitoba in respect of her public lands of the sum of $413,370. Now my hon. friend the member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) has put the case very strongly in that regard. I do not know whether I quite apprehend the point of my hon. friend, but apparently he thinks that we are not giving Manitoba quite sufficient compensation in respect of her public lands, because I observe that in the course of his remarks on that question in the debate on the resolution, he declared that Manitoba has restored to us swamp lands which are worth at a fair calculation $21,000,000 in capital or $1,000,000 a year in annual revenue. While I do not accept the computation of my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) I think there is at least enough in his argument to justify us in saying that the proposal to which we are now asking the assent of the House does no more than ordinary simple justice to the province of Manitoba. After all, Mr. Speaker why should there be any discrimination between the province of Manitoba and the province of Saskatchewan in that regard? It is perfectly true that Manitoba was constituted into a province in 1871, and that Saskatchewan was constituted into a province in 1905, but everyone of us realizes also that the financial position of this Dominion is different to-day from what it was in 1871, and that consideration can properly, and in the public interest ought to be, extended to the province of Manitoba to-day which it was not possible to extend to that province when it was first constituted in 1871. And I venture to think that a proposal which takes away and removes any discrimination between the enlarged province of Manitoba and the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, is after all one which is eminently in the public interest, one which is entirely justified by every sentiment of fair-play and one that should appeal to every member of this House. Further than that, Mr. Speaker, I need not allude to the fact that Manitoba is handing back to us these lands of which a detailed statement was given upon the introduction of this resolution, except to bring the testimony

of my right hon. friend who leads the opposition to the value of the asset which the Dominion of Canada is receiving in the return by Manitoba of these lands. Speaking in the debate upon the Autonomy Bill in 1905, at page 1439 of 'Hansard' of that year the right hon. gentleman said this:

> The swamp lands are perhaps the most valuable lands in the province of Manitoba. They require some preliminary work for drainage but when drained there are no better lands in the whole province. When the late government gave to the province of Manitoba the swamp lands they made her a valuable gift, and it has proved to her a most important asset.

Well, Manitoba, in consideration of the financial arrangements exactly similar to those made for Alberta and Saskatchewan, is handing back to us the swamp lands, the very great value of which have been urged by the right hon. gentleman who leads the opposition, and by the member for Edmonton. We have charged Manitoba with every dollar which she has received out of these swamp lands, less the cost of administration, we have also charged Manitoba with 150,000 acres of land granted to the University of Manitoba. These stand in a somewhat different position from the swamp lands, because, when these lands were granted to the university, the province of Manitoba had no control over them as I understand. They were dealt with for the University of Manitoba, and so far as the sale of them is concerned the proceeds accrue to the university and not to the province as a whole. We have thought it only fair and reasonable, therefore, that value should be deducted as on the date, or about the date, when they were first granted. That value has been estimated at $2 per acre. So that the total amount in respect to which Manitoba accounts to the Dominion for the lands granted to the University of Manitoba is the sum of $300,000, upon which interest at the rate of 5 per cent has been deducted. But it may be asked, why should Manitoba or any other province receive compensation from the Dominion of Canada in respect of lands that are held by the Dominion, and are not administered by the province? Well, the principle upon which we are proceeding to-day was adopted by the late administration in 1905, when it fixed the financial terms for Alberta and Saskatchewan. Therefore, I do not suppose that any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House will be disposed to quarrel with that principle to-day. In fact it has already been recognized so far as Manitoba is concerned, because to-day, before the Bill passes, Manitoba is receiving, or would receive, $100,000 annually, in respect of these public lands, or as an indemnity for the lack of them. But I would like to point out the very great revenues which other provinces in Canada are receiving from their public domain to-day. The amounts that I am giving to the House have been taken from the very valuable yearbook or handbook, published by Mr. J. Castell Hopkins, and I am quoting from that handbook for the year 1911. According to that authority New Brunswick received in the year 1910, for what is termed territorial revenues, the sum of $494,491.64. In the same year the province of Nova Scotia received from its mines, $629,010, and from its Crown lands, $33,600, making a total received by the province of $662,610, from public domain which is not possessed by the province of Manitoba, or by the province of Alberta or Saskatchewan. The province of Quebec, in the same year, received in respect of its lands and forests $1,150,747, and from its mines, fisheries and game the sum of $182,132, a total of $1,332,897, from its public domain. In the same year the province of British Columbia received from timber leases and licenses the sum of $2,325,000, and from land sales and revenue $887,600, a total of $3,212,600. In the same year according to the authority, the province of Ontario received from its lands, forests and mines, $2,951,428. I have no doubt that in every one of these cases some expenses and costs of administration must be deducted, and I am merely pointing out that the province of Manitoba, and the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, in being deprived of their public domain, which is being administered by Canada and for the benefit of Canada, so far as any revenue is concerned, are certainly entitled to some consideration in respect of subsidy for the withdrawal of those lands.

It is upon this principle, the principle acted upon in 1905, that we proceed to-day when we ask parliament to sanction this increased allowance to the province of Manitoba. Now, it may be asked, Why should we give compensation at all? Why should we not permit Manitoba to retain its swamp lands? Why not hand over to the province all the Crown lands within the enlarged boundaries and thus place the province in the same position as the other provinces of Canada except the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan? Well, it has been thought best—and I apprehend there is good reason for the conclusion—that the matter should be dealt with at one and the same time so far as Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan are concerned. But the delay that will be involved in carrying out such an arrangement is surely no good reason why there should be delay in doing that jus-

tice to Manitoba which she has long claimed. It is for that reason that we think it is no more than right, in the first place, to put Manitoba upon the same financial basis and to accord to her the same financial terms as those which have been already accorded to the sister provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. Because, I repeat once more, these three provinces stand in a different category from the other six provinces of the Dominion. The other six provinces have their natural resources, their public domain, mines, minerals and other assets of that kind; these three provinces have not those assets. Having in regard these considerations our policy and our proposal is, in the first place, to put Manitoba upon the same just and fair basis as that which has already been granted to Alberta and Saskatchewan, and then to take up, at the earliest opportunity, the question of the terms upon which the natural resources of all three prairie provinces shall be handed over to the administration of these provinces. And I would like to repeat what I have already said in speaking upon the resolutions in that regard, that when we do come to consider that proposal I think it will be just and necessary to give some consideration to the maritime provinces whose boundaries cannot be enlarged by reason of their natural situation, to call them into our councils and give to them a just voice as to the terms upon which these lands shall be handed over, and especially with regard to what compensation, if any, should be given to the three maritime provinces by reason of the transfer of these lands to the governments of Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan.

Now, what else do we propose so far as Manitoba is concerned? We propose to increase the annual allowance on account of debt from $178,947.65 to $381,584.19. Alberta and Saskatchewan each receive an annual allowance on account of debt of $405,375. We have made certain just deductions in the case of Manitoba which have already been fully explained to the House upon the resolutions. Why should there be any discrimination between Manitoba on the one hand and Saskatchewan and Alberta on the other in this regard? Shall the accident of the date of the establishment of these provinces make any difference in that respect? My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) declared with a great deal of earnestness that inasmuch as Manitoba was constituted in 1871 and Alberta and Saskatchewan were not constituted until 1905, Manitoba had no just and reasonable claim in this regard; because, he said, Manitoba is an old province in this confederation, established forty years ago. I would submit two or three considerations to my hon. friend from St. John and to the members of this House. In the first place, these three provinces differ from all other provinces in Canada in this respect—that they are not provinces which originally constituted this confederation and they were not sovereign provinces at the time of confederation, but brought in afterwards. Each one of these three provinces has been carved out of territory that was added to this confederation shortly after 1867. Therefore, so far as that is concerned, and except for the accident of dates, Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan are precisely in the same category.

But my hon. friend from St. John declares that the circumstance to which I have alluded, that accident if I may so call it, constitutes a valid reason which should prevent us to-day from giving to the province of Manitoba the same consideration in respect of debt allowance that was given in 1905 to Alberta and Saskatchewan. I am bound to say that I do not so regard it. Every one of us knows, who has been familiar with these transactions, that Manitoba in 1905 pressed her claim to have her boundaries extended as far west as Regina. We know that the government of that day did not see fit to entertain that claim. But suppose that claim had been entertained, suppose the boundaries of Manitoba had been extended as far west as Regina or further, would my hon. friend from St. John say that no increased allowance in respect of debt should have been granted to Manitoba in that regard? Surely he would not say that. Manitoba is having her boundaries extended to-day. The debt allowance is based upon the consideration of population in the case of Manitoba as in the case of Alberta and Saskatchewan. Manitoba in 1905 wanted her boundaries extended. Would my hon. friend from St. John be prepared to say that if the territory so far west as Regina had been constituted into a province it would have been quite right to make for that province a special, generous debt allowance, such as was granted under the Act of 1905, but that if the same territory had been added to Manitoba, no such consideration should have been given to Manitoba by reason of the population within that added territory? It does not seem to me that the argument of my hon. friend is consistent with the attitude taken by his leader in 1905 and by the government of which he was at that time, or very shortly after, a member. So we have come to the conclusion that the debt allowance of Manitoba should be placed exactly upon the same basis as that which was adopted in 1905 with regard to Alberta and Saskatchewan when they were constituted into provinces.

Now, so far as the terms of the Bill are concerned, hon. gentlemen on both sides

of the House, are, no doubt, familiar with them. Sections 1 and 2 are of a formal character. Section 3 sets out the boundaries, sections 4 and 5 deal with the financial terms and set forth in considerable detail the items of increased allowance which we propose to make to the province of Manitoba by the Bill. Section 6 provides that the Crown lands and all the public domains shall continue to be vested in the Crown and administered by the government of Canada for the purpose of Canada, subject to the provisions of any Act of the parliament of Canada.

Section 7 deals with the rights and properties of the Hudson's Bay Company. Section 8 provides that the province shall continue to be represented in the Senate of Canada by four members, provided that such representation may, after the completion of the decennial census of June, 1911, be increased to 6 by the parliament of Canada. Section 9, the last section, provides that the Act shall not come into force until proclaimed by the Governor in Council, and that such proclamation shall not be made until the legislature of Manitoba shall have assented to the provisions of this Bill.

I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, submit the Bill with every confidence to the members of this House in the hope and in the expectation that it will receive their approval; and in the confidence that they will regard it as no more than a simple act of justice to the province of Manitoba in respect of claims of long standing, which some of us at least think should have been considered, and should have been regarded, and should have been granted long before this date. So far as the arrearages are concerned, on which the argument of my hon. friends opposite principally spent itself in the debate of a few days ago, I say that inasmuch as the province of Manitoba had every reason to ask that its boundaries be extended in 1905, and inasmuch as these boundaries, exactly as they are proposed to-day, were defined by resolution of this House on the 13th of July, 1908, parliament is doing no more than a simple act of justice when it declares that these terms shall take effect and date, not from to-day, but from the 1st day of July, 1908.

Hon. Wm. PUGSLEY (St. John City). I do not think that any one in this House will be disposed to admit that the right hon. gentleman who leads the government has made out good ground for, in effect, making the provisions in respect of these financial terms to be granted to Manitoba, retroactive, and giving the province a lump sum of about $2,000,000 to represent what would have been the increased allowance from the 1st of July, 1908, supposing the same terms had been arrived at at that time. Now the only ground stated by my right hon. friend is, that this parliament—I think it was this House, not the parliament—passed resolutions in favour of extending the boundaries of Manitoba in 1908. Now, Mr. Speaker, that was not the conclusion of the bargain. That was an effort on the part of this parliament to extend the boundaries upon certain terms, which were not agreed to by the province of Manitoba; that is all. Nothing was carried to a conclusion, nothing became binding upon the Dominion and the provinces, but everything remained uncompleted until the present time. Now upon what theory does my right hon. friend date this provision back to the 1st July, 1908? He says to-day we are now giving these improved financial terms to Manitoba as a part of the plan for the extension of the boundaries, and because Manitoba is assuming jurisdiction over this added territory. That is one of the grounds which my right hon. friend puts forward for giving to Manitoba these improved financial terms. Well has Manitoba during these four years been charged with anything in connection with the administration of the government in the added territory? Not at all. Has she been called upon to bear any burdens? Not at all. Has she built a courthouse, has she erected a public building, has she built a road, has she established a school district, has she incurred one single dollar of liability in the added territory? Not one. Yet my right hon. friend is asking this parliament to vote $2,000,000 of the money of the people of Canada to the province of Manitoba absolutely without a particle of consideration. It does seem to me that it is utterly impossible to justify that provision of the Bill.

Now then my right hon. friend puts it forward as a ground for the passing of this Bill that this parliament passed certain resolutions in 1908, and therefore, because Manitoba did not accept the terms, and this government is now asking parliament to grant new and more favourable terms, which are now to be accepted, the whole arrangement should date back, and Manitoba should get compensation for the four years delay. Well, my right hon. friend has placed upon the order paper resolutions for the extension of the boundaries of Ontario and Quebec. The resolutions, providing for these extensions were also passed in 1908, and what compensation does my right hon. friend propose to give to the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, because those resolutions were not carried into effect in 1908, and Ontario and Quebec have not had the use of the lands which would have been given them in 1908? Does my right hon. friend propose to apply the same principle to these provinces? He could, with just as much reason. But he could not do it at all, because there is no reason upon which he could found such a proposition in re-

spect of either Ontario or Quebec; and what reason can be advanced for giving financial terms to Manitoba to date back to 1908, which cannot equally be urged in favour of Ontario and Quebec? Can we suppose that the people of Manitoba would ask for anything out of the treasury of this country to which they are not fairly entitled?

Now then my right hon. friend has called attention to the next provision of the statute in relation to the allowance which he says is by way of compensation for the province not getting these lands. He also dates that back to 1908. I think this is the first time that it has been put forward seriously that a money allowance is by way of compensation for lands. That is not the way in which it was put when the $100,000 was first allowed to Manitoba; it was put as being in lieu of lands; in other words, because the province was not given the lands from which it would have a revenue; therefore it was desirable to give it a money grant to enable it the better to carry on the administration of the affairs of the territory. But it was never recognized that the province of Manitoba or any other province of Canada is entitled to the public lands. Those lands, the land in the territories, the land in Prince Rupert's land, the land of all the territories, was bought by the original four provinces of Canada, by Quebec, Ontario, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, I do not think Prince Edward Island was then a member of the confederation.

Mr. BORDEN. Does my hon. friend say it was never put forward by way of compensation?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think not.

Mr. BORDEN. I will read to him what his own leader said in 1905:

> But I frankly admit, and we must all recognize, that the provinces in the west, in being deprived of the public lands, are deprived of a valuable source of income. And in that way they complain that they are put on a footing of inequality as compared with the older provinces of the Dominion. Realizing that fact, it is the duty of parliament to make ample, even generous provision which will compensate the provinces for the retention of the lands.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think a reading of the whole of the remarks of my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition, made at that time, bears out what I say.

My right hon. friend did not put it that the province was entitled to the public lands, but he put it that inasmuch as the provinces were not going to have these lands as a source of revenue, it was proper to give them money which would take the place of the revenue that they would get from the lands. That is the way in which it was put in the statute thirty years ago when $100,000 per year was granted; it was for want of public lands and not as compensation for lands. I say again, and I say it with confidence, that it has never been recognized by parliament that the provinces were entitled to these public lands. They are the lands which belong to the Dominion of Canada, which belong to New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, just as much as they do to Manitoba, Ontario, or Quebec, and the matter must, it seems to me, be dealt with from that standpoint. As I have said, they were bought by the money of the people of Canada and the people of Canada have the right to be considered, and the various provinces have the right to be considered, in the disposition which shall be made of these public lands. I grant that in the case of Ontario and Quebec there is an exceedingly strong argument in favour of the placing of the public lands in the control of the provincial governments just as the lands in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec as now constituted are under the control of the provinces, but at the same time, in connection with the placing of the land under the control of the provinces, the rights of the other provinces are entitled to be considered. So, I say that in the case of Manitoba, we have the right to deal with the matter from the standpoint that the province of Manitoba has no claim to these lands in the territory which is to be added, but it is a question as to what amount of revenue from the Dominion treasury shall be granted to the province by reason of the fact that it is not to get these lands as a source of revenue. What I especially object to is that the government to-day is picking out one of the provinces of Canada and proposing to accord to it special treatment without paying attention to the rights of the other sections of Canada. I am not opposed to treating Manitoba not only fairly but generously, I am not opposed to giving Manitoba, out of the Dominion treasury all the money which is needed to enable it reasonably to carry on the administration of affairs within the province. I think it is the duty of the Dominion, as far as possible, to give such aid to all the provinces of Canada as will enable them fairly to discharge the duties devolving upon the governments of the different provinces. It is one thing for the great family of provinces to sit down together and consider what is right and fair to all and it is another thing for the government to pick out a certain province and bestow upon that special favour. The only argument which I have heard from the right hon. leader of the government and the only argument that I heard from the hon. Minister of Finance a few days ago, when proposing the resolutions upon which this

Bill is founded, was that they wanted to put Manitoba upon the same basis as Alberta and Saskatchewan. It was not argued that this is fair to the old, original provinces of Canada, it was not argued that this is treating New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, British Columbia, Ontario and Quebec fairly, but the argument was that, having in 1905 made certain financial arrangements with Alberta and Saskatchewan when they were created, Manitoba, lying side by side with the province of Saskatchewan, and being one of the three prairie provinces, should be put upon the same footing as Saskatchewan and Alberta. I think there is, notwithstanding what my right hon. friend said, a wide distinction between making provisions for a new province and altering the financial terms as between the Dominion and a province, where this province has been a long time a member of the confederacy. Under the terms of the British North America Act it is provided expressly that when Manitoba came into the union, and it was the same when British Columbia came in, the same, I think, with Saskatchewan and Alberta, the terms of the British North America Act should be applicable to the new provinces. When Manitoba came in financial terms were arranged, a certain debt allowance was made, certain provisions were made by reason of the want of public land and also provision was made for giving to the government of Manitoba a large area of what are known as swamp lands. These terms were altered at different times, but in 1885 the whole subject was gone into and there was a re-adjustment of the debt allowance as far as all the provinces of Canada were concerned. These provisions will be found in the statutes of 1885 and they are re-enacted in the Revised Statutes of Canada 1906, chapter 28, page 322. It is provided by section 5 that:

In the accounts between the several provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and British Columbia, respectively, and Canada, the amounts payable to and chargeable against the said provinces respectively, in so far as they depend upon the amount of debt with which each province entered the Union, shall be calculated and allowed as if—

(a) In the case of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec respectively, the sum fixed by the one hundred and twelfth section of the British North America Act, 1867, was increased from sixty-two million five hundred thousand dollars to seventy-three million six hundred and eighty-eight dollars and eighty-four cents;

(b) In the case of the province of Nova Scotia, the amount fixed by the one hundred and fourteenth section of the said Act was increased in the same proportion;

(c) In the case of the province of New Brunswick, the amount fixed by the one hundred and fifteenth section of the said Act, was increased in the same proportion; and

(d) In the case of the province of British Columbia, the amount upon which it was to receive interest fixed by or under the terms and conditions on which the province was admitted into the Dominion was increased in the same proportion.

Then provision was made in the case of Nova Scotia by which the increase was to be based upon the allowance fixed in the year 1869. In the case of Manitoba, it was provided, by section 9 that:

The capital sum on which the province of Manitoba is entitled to receive half-yearly payments of interest at the rate of five per centum per annum, as fixed by the Act passed in the thirty-third year of Her late Majesty Queen Victoria's reign, chapter three, and as readjusted or increased by any subsequent Act, shall continue to be calculated on a population of one hundred and twenty-five thousand, at a rate per capita as ascertained by dividing the sum of five hundred and fifty-one thousand four hundred and forty-seven dollars, by seventeen thousand, which was the estimated population of the province under the said Act, thirty-third Victoria. chapter three, the said sum of five hundred and fifty-one thousand four hundred and forty-seven dollars being the amount of capital on which the province was entitled to receive interest under and by virtue of section twenty-four of the Act hereinbefore last cited and the Act thirty-sixth Victoria, chapter thirty.

Then subsection 2 provides for certain charges with respect to local works. Section 10 provides that this shall be a settlement with Manitoba in respect of everything which had been put forward up to the 10th of January, 1885. It says:

The grant of swamp lands and the grant of lands not exceeding one hundred and fifty thousand acres as an endowment to the University of Manitoba, authorized by part I of the Manitoba Supplementary Provisions Act, and the payments to the province of Manitoba hereinbefore authorized, shall be made as a full settlement of all claims made by the said province for the reimbursement of costs incurred in the government of the disputed territory, or the reference of the boundary question to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and all other questions and claims discussed between the Dominion and the provincial governments, up to the tenth day of January, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-five.

That was, as I have said, a re-adjustment of the debt account, as between all the provinces of Canada, and it was supposed they were all put on a fair and proper basis.

Mr. MEIGHEN. What are you quoting from?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, chapter 28.

Mr. MEIGHEN. That is simply a transcription of the Act of 1885.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I presume so, and it is carried forward in the revised statutes. Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if Manitoba wants more money to enable her to carry on the affairs of government, and to properly develop her territory, we ought to do the same as was done in 1885; we ought to readjust the debt account as between the different provinces. We should endeavour to treat all fairly. It seems to me further, that we should try to make an end of the matter as between the different provinces; we ought to have it embodied in the British North America Act, and make it as nearly final as it is possible to make it. Picking out first one province and then another and dealing especially with it, and so tinkering from time to time with the constitution is exceedingly unsatisfactory, and is likely to cause great discontent as between the people of the different provinces. I want to know why my right hon. friend and his colleagues do not consider the whole question now. Take the case of British Columbia. British Columbia is not nearly as favourably situated as Manitoba will be when this Bill passes. British Columbia is growing with equal if not greater rapidity than is Manitoba, and there is no reason in the world why British Columbia should not receive equal treatment. But my right hon. friend may say: we will deal with British Columbia by itself; the government of British Columbia has demanded that a commission in the nature of arbitrators shall be appointed to deal with the claims which that province is putting forward; the government of British Columbia has demanded that there shall be appointed three commissioners, one to be chosen by the federal government, one by the government of British Columbia, and the third to be appointed by the commissioners so chosen, and, as appears in the press despatches, the federal government has consented to leave the case of British Columbia to that arbitration. I submit that is exceedingly unsatisfactory. What is to be done in respect to the claims of the other provinces of the Dominion? Are there claims to be dealt with by a commission; are they to have similar special treatment? We have had no intimation so far as to what treatment is to be accorded to the three old provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island. The people of these provinces have borne the burden connected with the development of conferedation, the building of the Canadian Pacific railway and the construction of other public works for the benefit of the whole country. They have borne their share of the burden cheerfully with the rest of the people of Canada, but I do not observe any indication on the part of this government that their special claims are to be considered. Is there to be a commission of inquiry as to what claims they have on the public treasury? We have no announcement as to that, but what the government is doing to-day is picking out the one province of Manitoba, giving to it special treatment, and proposing to pick out British Columbia, and through the medium of a commission, accord to that province special treatment as well. In considering this question of debt account, it might be well to deal for a few moments with the basis upon which the debt account of the provinces was provided for by the Act of Confederation. In the case of the four original provinces, the debt account was something tangible; it represented something. In the case of Ontario and Quebec, the two original provinces, they had actually expended at the time of confederation, sixty-seven million dollars, for which they were in debt, and this was afterwards discovered to amount to seventy-three million dollars. They had built the great canal system of which Canada is so proud, and which was even then a great system, although it has since been vastly improved; they had built other public works and they had incurred this indebtedness actually. The province of Nova Scotia at the time of confederation had built a line of railway from the city of Halifax to the New Brunswick boundary and it had constructed the Windsor branch and other portions of what is now the present Intercolonial railway system. Nova Scotia went into the Dominion with a debt account of eight million dollars, which was actually expended upon public works, and all of which were to be passed over to become the property of the Dominion. After confederation in 1869, it was discovered that between the time of the Quebec conference and the coming into force of the Act of Union, the province of Nova Scotia had expended a very considerable sum which had not been taken into account when the debt was fixed at eight millions, and subsequently the debt account of that province was increased from eight millions to over nine millions. At that amount it remained until 1885, when there was a general pro rata increase of debt allowance among the different provinces of Canada by the statue to which I have referred. But, that debt amount did not represent paper as this allowance to Manitoba does. That amount was allowed to the province of Nova Scotia because Nova Scotia had actually gone into debt, and constructed public works to that extent, which were transferred to the federal government. But in the case of Manitoba the Bill itself recites that whereas Manitoba had no debt when she went into the union, therefore, it is pro-

posed to fix her debt allowance in the vicinity of eight million dollars. When New Brunswick entered confederation her case was about the same as that of Nova Scotia. New Brunswick had incurred a very large indebtedness for public works, the most important of which was the European and North American railway, now part of the Intercolonial railway extending from St. John to the Nova Scotia boundary. New Brunswick had also built the road from Painsec Junction to Shediac, and all upon the credit of the province, and for which the province had gone into debt. At confederation that railway was passed over to the Dominion; it was charged up against our debt allowance of seven million dollars and to-day New Brunswick is not drawing one single cent out of the treasury in respect to that public work, but on the contrary the treasury of Canada is deriving a large revenue from the railway between St. John and the Nova Scotia boundary. I repeat what I said the other day, that that part of the Intercolonial between St. John and Halifax which was built by these two provinces, and which forms part of the debt account which is charged up against the provinces with interest at the rate of five per cent, is one of the most remunerative pieces of railway property in the Dominion. The result is that so far as New Brunswick is concerned, although its debt account was taken at seven million dollars, we have only been drawing interest on five or six hundred thousand dollars which was the difference between the actual expenditure and the allowed debt account; whereas, it is proposed to-day to give to Manitoba interest to the amount of some four hundred thousand dollars annually as against between twenty-five thousand and thirty thousand which the province of New Brunswick receives. And yet the province of New Brunswick has at the present time a population of 350,000 as against 460,000 in Manitoba. I mention these things for the purpose of showing that it is grossly unfair to attempt to justify the increase in the debt account of one province by comparing its position with only two provinces of Canada and leaving out of the question altogether all the other provinces constituting the Dominion. My right hon. friend says that the reason he compares Manitoba with Alberta and Saskatchewan is that these provinces have no natural resources. But, this question of natural resources does not come into the reckoning so far as the debt account is concerned. We have no right to consider the question of lands when we are dealing with the debt account and deciding whether or not we should put on an additional debt allowance of four million dollars when Manitoba had no debt at the time of confederation. In giving Manitoba interest on an additional four million dollars, amounting to some four times as much as the province of New Brunswick has been receiving, the question is whether we have treated Manitoba in the past fairly in relation to all the other provinces of Canada, and not simply in comparison with the two provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. Of course when you are dealing with the question of allowance in lieu of lands then the argument is different, and you have the right to contrast the position of Manitoba with the position of Saskatchewan and Alberta. But, when you are dealing simply with the debt account which has nothing to do with the public lands it is not right to simply pick out two provinces and compare their position with that of Manitoba. We have a right to look to the position of all the provinces of Canada, and to consider as to whether upon the whole, looking at the way in which all the provinces of Canada have been treated with regard to this debt account, Manitoba has been fairly and properly treated.

I argued the other day that in dealing with this question we ought also to deal with the claims of the other provinces not only with reference to financial matters but also with reference to the question of representation. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) seemed impressed to a certain extent, I do not know how far, with the reasonableness of that contention, but he said: We will deal with that by and bye. Although we are giving to Manitoba this large amount of money in lieu of public lands, and taking back from her the swamp lands, yet in the sweet by and bye we are going to propose to parliament a measure which will enable us to hand over to those three provinces all their lands and timber and minerals and other natural resources, and he says that will be the time to deal out justice to the maritime provinces ! As a representative of one of the maritime provinces, I declare that in my opinion now is the time to deal out justice to the maritime provinces, because this government is asking parliament to make great constitutional changes with regard to several of the provinces. We are asked to extend the boundaries of the province of Manitoba beyond what those boundaries were when she became a member of the confederacy. The government are asking parliament to alter the terms of the Union so far as Manitoba is concerned, and therefore to alter the constitution in relation to that province. In regard to Ontario, they are asking parliament to alter the constitution because when Ontario came into the confederacy under the terms of the British North America Act it was a province with a limited area.

My right hon. friend and his colleagues are asking parliament to alter the constitution of Ontario in reference to its boundaries, and to add something like 200,000 square miles to the area of that province. He is also asking parliament to do what he knows in law will be in effect to hand over to the province about 200,000 square miles of land which to-day is the property of the whole people of Canada. He is asking us to do the same thing in respect to the province of Quebec. If ever there was a time when the voice of the smaller provinces should be heard, when the voice of the people of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, which went into the union upon certain terms, should be heard, that time is now. The people of these provinces have a right to claim that their representation should be attended to. My right hon. friend knows as well as I do the intense feeling of dissatisfaction which exists among the people of the lower provinces at the loss of representation. As a result of the census which has just taken place, New Brunswick will lose two more representatives, Nova Scotia will lose two more, and the province of Prince Edward Island, which refused to come into the Confederacy unless it had a representation of six members, will find its representation, as a result of the last census, reduced to three. As each decennial census takes place, with the wonderful development of the province of Quebec, with the growth of its great cities, particularly of Montreal, with the establishment and growth of scores of manufacturing towns throughout that province which are rapidly progressing, the maritime provinces, notwithstanding that we may get some increased prosperity, and we are all looking forward hopefully to it, must fall behind in representation. The Fathers of Confederation, seeing that that might possibly take place, put in the Act, subsection 4 of section 51, a clause which they thought would be a safeguard against any decrease in representation and they provided that unless the population of a province relatively to the other provinces of Canada (and the Act speaks of the four provinces) falls below one-twentieth, there shall be no loss of representation notwithstanding that Quebec may have increased more rapidly than any one of the original provinces of the confederacy. Owing to the rapid development of the northwest and to the bringing in of portions of those territories, and their creation into provinces, with a rapid increase in population, the benefit of that safeguard has been swept away from us. Therefore all we can look forward to in the future is that there shall go on, as each decennial census takes place, a decrease in the representation of these provinces in the House of Commons.

Now I submit, Mr. Speaker, and submit it will all deference to my right hon. friend, that if he has in mind the making of some change in the British North America Act which will prevent this loss of representation, there never was a time when it could be done so well as now, and there never will be a time when it should so well be done as now. Let me beg of him that instead of passing this measure into law, instead of dealing with the boundaries of Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec at this time, to allow this Bill to stand over, to call a conference of the premiers of the different provinces, and submit to them these important questions. Let him submit to that conference the question of the financial claims of the different provinces, and the question of representation, let him get the family of provinces composing this great nation together, let them talk these matters over with a view to arriving at some basis which will give satisfaction to the whole of the people of Canada which will make our people united, which will establish for ever peace and harmony among the different provinces and among the people composing those provinces. If my right hon. friend does that I think he will have taken a step which will redound to his credit, and which will infinitely redound to the advantage of all the people of Canada. There is another very great objection to this Bill: It can only be considered by this parliament in connection with the order in council which was passed by the government not long ago and which was recently read in this House by my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden). Hon gentlemen will find that order in council in 'Hansard' beginning at page 3972. It provides that the province of Ontario shall be given a strip of land about 240 miles in length and about 5 miles in width from the western boundary of Ontario through the province of Manitoba to the mouth of the Nelson river, and then extending for ten miles up the east side of the Nelson river, or upon the Nelson river and Hudson Bay and I am sure that my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) will agree with that view, that if we adopt this Bill we also agree to the terms of the order in council which was brought down by the right hon. gentleman as giving the settlement which has taken place between the governments of Ontario and Manitoba and this government, in respect to boundaries. It seems to me that that provision has many objections. To begin with it is projecting the ownership of one province into the territory of another. It is not merely giving a right of way for a railway, because the right of

way for a railway need not be over 200 feet wide, but, for some reason or other which has not been explained to the House, it is giving Ontario a strip of land in the territory of Manitoba 5 miles wide and about 240 miles in length. Because if hon. gentlemen will look at the map, they will see that that land extends for about 240 miles from what will be the western boundary of Ontario to the mouth of the Nelson river. It comprises about 768,000 acres of land which is not the property of Manitoba —it is proposed to pay in lieu of it—but the property of the Dominion of Canada. What warrant is there for my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) to give away 768,000 acres of the land of the people of Canada to one province without compensation to the Dominion treasury, and without consulting the other provinces? And bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, this land is not to be selected by the Minister of the Interior of this government, it is to be selected by the government of Ontario which can put its surveyors and engineers in there, and let them examine as to the mineral deposits; and we know that Providence has been marvellously generous, so far as minerals are concerned, in our great northern land. Furthermore the province of Ontario has five years within which to select that land. And, Sir, although it is put forth in the recital of the order in council that this is in some way for the purpose of encouraging the extension of the Ontario government railway to Hudson bay, the only condition attached to the grant is that the province is to make a selection within five years. The moment it does so, that land becomes the property of Ontario for all time to come and the province need never build one mile of railway. Now I ask my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) how he can justify that? Surely, if the government of Ontario want to build a railway up to Hudson bay, and it has the power to do so, the government ought to have stipulated that the province must begin the construction within five years, or ten years, or 100 years if it is thought 100 years would be reasonable, and I am not sure but what it would be. I am not sure that it will not be 100 years before the government of Ontario ever thinks seriously of building a railway from Cochrane—named after my hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) and well named after him too, because it is a good, thrifty town. In view of the Hudson bay railway being built, in view of connections being made between the city of Winnipeg and the Hudson Bay railway, I do not think that for a great many years to come the province of Ontario will find very pressing need of extending its own railway in that direction. And Sir James Whitney has been shrewd enough to stipulate that the grant shall be made to the province absolutely free of any condition whatever, and all that Ontario will have to do, will be simply to select its land somewhere within 50 miles of the shores of Hudson bay, select its 768,000 acres, and its 10 miles along the eastern shore of the Nelson river, and then that land will become the absolute property of the province without its building a single mile of railway. This is the condition of sale set out in the Order in Council to be found on page 3974 of 'Hansard':—

A period of five years be allowed to the government of Ontario within which to select and designate the said lands intended to be transferred as aforesaid, and to notify the location thereof to Your Royal Highness's government, and that this order shall cease to be effective if such location be not made and duly notified within the said period.

That, as I have said, is the sole condition which is attached to the grant to the province of Ontario. Now, Sir, I do not wonder that Sir James Whitney, in his desire to soothe the ruffled feelings of the people of Ontario—I would not like to say in his desire to humbug them, because I would not want to use offensive language —has stipulated that the government shall not be obliged to build the railway, because no man can know better than the Ontario Premier that the government of that province has no power under the British North America Act to build a mile of railway outside the territory of Ontario.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is absolutely provided for by the terms of the British North America Act. In subsection 10 of section 92, of that Act, are set out the works which are assigned to the provinces:

Local works and undertakings other than such as are of the following classes——

Lines of steam or other ships, railways, canals, telegraphs and other works and undertakings, connecting the province with any other or others of the provinces, or extending beyond the limits of the provinces.

Any railway which extends beyond the limits of the province, is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Dominion parliament. But, then it may be said: This parliament can authorize the government of Ontario to build its railway in the territory of another province. I doubt that, Mr. Speaker. I do not think there can be any ground for that contention, because while I think parliament might authorize a company to build a railway there, and undoubtedly it could, yet the government of Ontario cannot construct a railway without public money; and I think it goes without saying, that this parliament could not empower the province of Ontario to expend the public moneys of that province in the construction of a railway which the legislature of Ontario itself could not authorize.

It would be a most anomalous proposition that this parliament should authorize the government to pay provincial money for the construction of a public work which the legislature of the province itself could not authorize. I take it that there can be no doubt whatever that the government of Ontario would have no power to construct a railway outside of the limits of the province of Ontario as is proposed by this order in council. So, I believe, Sir James Whitney has acted wisely in insisting that he should get this grant of over 760,000 acres and this waterfront upon the Nelson river and Hudson bay without being bound to build what he knows that his government cannot build, a railway through the territory of the province of Manitoba. It may be said that it is intended that this would be to enable the province of Ontario to give a grant to a railway company to build such a line. That is not the order in council; it is that the grant shall be made to the province of Ontario or a public commission or public corporation for that purpose. It is a grant to the province of Ontario, the road must be built out of the public money of the province of Ontario; and, as I have said, it seems to me there is no authority for the government of Ontario to build such a line of railway. I would ask my hon. friend the Minister of Railways if he has had a report yet as to where, in case the terminus of the Hudson Bay railway is to be upon the Nelson river, as to which side of the river these terminals should be constructed?

Mr. COCHRANE. Judging from the report that was in, on the west side would be best—the far side from here.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman says 'Judging from the report that was in,' the west side would be best. It does seem to me that until that matter is positively determined, it might hamper most seriously the operation of this government in connection with the construction of the Hudson Bay railway to give away to a provincial government some ten miles of waterfront which it might or might not utilize for railway terminal purposes.

Mr. COCHRANE. We would take good care of that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman cannot 'take good care of that,' because he and the government have bound themselves, and when we pass this Bill parliament will have bound itself, in good faith to give to the government of Ontario ten miles along the eastern shore of the Nelson river, whether that is or is not the best place to establish terminals in connection with the Hudson Bay railway. In saying that 'they will take care of that' he is simply saying that they will break faith with the province of Ontario, to which, in order to induce them to become a consenting party, they have arranged to give this land.

Mr. BRODER. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) mean to say that the Dominion cannot run a road where it likes?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Undoubtedly it can, but it is not proposed that the Dominion shall build the road. It is proposed that the Ontario government shall build it.

Mr. BRODER. I understood the hon. gentleman to argue that if the province owned this it might hamper the Dominion's right to get the port.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What I say is that the Dominion might build, but that if this land is given away to Ontario and it turns out that this is the place where the terminals should be, then the government, in connection with the Hudson Bay railway, must settle with the province of Ontario before they can fix their terminals there.

Now, I did not intend to take up so much time; I regret that I have spoken at such length upon this subject. But it is one of a great deal of importance, one, I think, of vast importance. I think we ought not to deal with the matter by piecemeal. We are brought to-day by this Bill, face to face with very important changes in the constitution of several provinces. We are called upon to consent to the enlargement of the boundaries of the provinces. Important questions are raised. It does seem to me that the only satisfactory way in which these questions can be dealt with is to treat all the provinces of Canada as being interested in them. All the provinces to-day are interested in the public lands. All the provinces, of course, are interested in the amount of money that is given by way of subsidies. The only satisfactory way in which to deal with that is to call together the Premiers of the different provinces, just as was done in 1906, and ask them in consultation with this government to take up all these questions, all questions which are outstanding between these provinces, and reach a settlement upon some broad national basis which will relieve all grounds of dissatification and cause all the people to feel that complete justice has been done to each province and to the people of Canada as a whole.

Mr. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Portage la Prairie). Mr. Speaker, this is the second day that this very important measure has been brought to your attention and the attention of the House. On each occas-

ion, the case for the opposition—if it can be said to have a case as an opposition—has been entrusted to the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley). He, on each occasion, has made a rather prolonged address, and I think I detect in that circumstance, alone as well as in the evident absence of enthusiasm among hon. gentlemen opposite, that they are suffering severe disappointment from their party point of view, at the course adopted by the government in this matter. So far, nothing has been urged against the Bill, except merely on the ground of its financial terms; and the point pressed over strenuously by the hon. member for St. John is that the financial terms now granted to Manitoba are such a variation from those heretofore existing and such a variation from what he calls 'the compact of confederation,' that they should not have been entered into until a conference of the provinces was called and the consent of all obtained. The hon. gentleman in this connection, occupies a position different from that of most hon. gentlemen opposite in that he came to this House sometime after the celebrated year 1905, when the very opposite position was taken by the government which he afterwards joined. In that circumstance, perhaps, we find an explanation of the fact that he has been twice put forward to urge opposition to this measure.

Now, what principle is at the bottom of the financial terms proposed? The first item of the terms is the $190,000 for local government and for buildings. To that the hon. gentleman makes no objection. Nor does he make any objection to the subsequent clause providing 80 cents per head of population based on the last decennial census—which, I believe, is approximated to every five years (between the two decennial censuses); neither of these items alter any subsisting rule and to them hon. gentlemen opposite lay no objection whatever. Nor do they urge that in respect of them there is any variation from any original understanding nor any reason or ground why they should not be accorded to Manitoba.

But they say, coming to the next two, that there is a radical change, and a change of such consequence to the older provinces that before it is made, reference should be made to a provincial conference. Now on this point the hon. gentleman argued, in the opening part of his address, that inasmuch as any enlargement of the territories takes place now and did not take place four years ago, Manitoba has not suffered, has not during that time expended any money for increased administration, and consequently is not entitled to arrearages on that ground. Now had the Prime Minister or any one else argued that so far as a claim to increased financial terms is based on the fact that at this date we are increasing the territories and necessarily the administrative responsibilities of Manitoba, so far as that claim is concerned, there could in my judgment be no claim to arrearages, but I do not so understand the Prime Minister to argue.

But the claim to increased advance has another footing and a much stronger footing. It is that there are other provinces in the confederation which were in a like position relative to Canada, who are in the same position, in every sense of the word, and particularly in the one sense that they are on a financial basis in regard to subsidy instead of getting their moneys from the administration of the natural assets of those provinces. It is on the claim of equality with those provinces that we based the claim to arrearages, so far as I understand it, and on no other. I want to state here that no reason can be advanced by any hon. gentleman that Manitoba is at this time, and was not in 1905, entitled to equal financial terms, man for man, to the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. They were in a like position, they had equal responsibilities, they shared equally in the burdens of confederation, they shared equally in the profits of confederation, they shared equally in its advantages; in every respect they were at that date in the same position, and the circumstance that one province was older than another and had come into confederation sooner, has nothing whatever to do with the position of that province as regards its demands on the federal treasury. So that inasmuch as the address of the hon. gentleman attempted to show that we could not found our claim to the $2,000,000 arrearages on the fact that we are taking under our wing and administration additional territory, that is correct. But the hon .gentleman did not attempt to argue that on the other ground we are not entitled to arrearages, and that we could not set to work at this or any later date and alter the terms of the three provinces until first of all we had put them on a footing of equality. So it is on the argument of equality and on no other that this claim to $2,000,000 arrearages is based, and that argument is an insuperable one.

Now the other two items that constitute the better terms is this: We have heretofore enjoyed an allowance in lieu of public lands, that is to say, by virtue of the fact that Manitoba has all along been denied the administration of the public lands and minerals, she has received from the confederation a grant on a certain basis. The hon. gentleman, as I understood him, contended that before an alteration should be made in the principle of that grant, before an increase should be made in the grant of money in lieu of public lands, the other provinces should be consulted. In the first place, the argument is

completely taken out of his mouth by his own leader, not when the hon. gentleman was not a member of this House and of the government, but when he was a member, because in 1908, when an enlargement of Manitoba's boundaries was under consideration, the right hon. gentleman then leading the government distinctly set it down at that time an increased grant in lieu of public lands could be made and should be made then and and there without any reference to the other provinces whatever. The right hon. the leader of the government argued that in 1908, in this House, and stated that the policy of his administration, which means the policy of the hon. member for St. John, was to take into account that fact and that the government should discusss with Manitoba's members on what basis the enlarged grant should take place, and no suggestion whatever was made of a conference of the provinces for that purpose. Now it is quite clear that from time to time in this country, so far as these provinces are concerned that receive money in lieu of revenue from public lands, adjustments must be made and have been made all along, have been made periodically since confederation, and at no time save one, so far as I am aware, have they been preceded by any conference of the provinces. The public lands of this country, the assets of every character of Canada, increased with our population and increased in value; as Canada becomes greater and more populous our public lands become of greater value, and so with the advance of time the revenues of those provinces which enjoy the administration of the lands increase, and consequently an increased allowance must be made to the provinces which are on another footing. Year by year ever since confederation that principle has been followed, adjustments have been made from time to time, and there is no reason why they should not be made now in respect of Manitoba, especially as it has already been made in respect to Alberta and Saskatchewan. So that on the plain principle of common justice relative to the other provinces we are entitled to an increased grant from time to time in lieu of public lands, until the time comes when these public lands are ours. Now the other is the ground upon which the hon. gentleman chiefly based his objection.

Mr. CARVELL. Suppose the time should come in the next two or three years when these lands will be surrendered to the provinces, would the hon. gentleman consider that this allowance in lieu of land should be discontinued?

Mr. MEIGHEN. It has been my habit in public life to cross bridges when I come to them. I apprehend that one will soon be reached, and then I propose to give it as earnest consideration as I give to other questions. The chief point against which the attack of the opposition is directed is the other item of increased advance, namely, allowance in lieu of debt. Now, I may be pardoned if I trace the history of this allowance, and the reason for it. It has been done at different times in this parliament, but not very fully in this debate. When the four provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario and Quebec formed confederation in 1867, Upper Canada, comprising the latter two, was burdened with an indebtedness of some $67,000,000. That indebtedness was incurred for similar purposes as the other provinces have incurred indebtedness, which the other provinces incurred since that time, and have to bear themselves. Now I have stated that very briefly, and I do not intend to particularize, just what that money was expended for. But I say it will be clear to every member of this House that in the main that indebtedness which at that time burdened the provinces of Upper and Lower Canada and burdened the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, was in the main incurred for those public works, for those public purposes that otherwise would have had to be borne, and have been borne since in the case of the other provinces, by the local exchequer.

Recognizing that, the fathers of confederation came to an understanding. I should have stated that the debt that was at that time carried by New Brunswick was some $7,000,000, and that the province of Nova Scotia carried a debt of some $8,000,000. It was figured out by the framers of the Quebec resolutions, and then by the framers of the British North America Act, that the debt of Ontario at $67,000,000 was greater per capita than the debt of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick at $8,000,000 and $7,000,000 respectively. It was proposed that United Canada should take over these obligations and relieve the provinces and in order to reduce the per capita debt taken over by United Canada to the same basis in the different provinces $5,000,000 of the debt out of $67,000,000 was left standing on the shoulders of the two provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, and in the ultimate a debt of $7,000,000 for New Brunswick, $8,000,000 for Nova Scotia, and $62,000,000 for Upper and Lower Canada was assumed by the confederation under this agreement in 1867. It was fixed at these figures in order that the debt assumed from the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario and Quebec, would represent in a word $25 per head of the population. When, therefore, these four provinces came in, Canada assumed a per capita debt of $25 per head. Later on other obliga-

tions from the provinces were assumed by the confederation and the per capita debt was enlarged to $32.43 per head. At the time that was done a rearrangement among the provinces of the debt allowances was made in order to adjust that of each to the changed circumstances. We have thus proceeded on the assumption from confederation, or from a date prior to confederation, that the per capita debt of the provinces, which was found to be $32.43, should form the basis of a system of allowing to new provinces who might join later and thus share in the national burden, a compensation from the federal treasury when such provinces at the time of uniting had themselves no debt for the union to assume. So when new provinces were brought into confederation, by virtue of the Act of Canada alone, by virtue of the Act of this House, and it was found that these provinces, or territories then erected into provinces, had a less debt than $32.43 per head, or no debt, allowance had to be made in respect therefor. Manitoba came into confederation without any debt at all. Her debt, at the time she entered confederation, was nothing, and consequently it was assumed that the debt allowance to be made by Canada should be on the full basis of $32.43 per head of the population. The same principle applied when Alberta and Saskatchewan entered the confederation.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is not my hon. friend mistaken? It was not on the actual population of Manitoba, but on an assumed population of 125,000, was it not?

Mr. MEIGHEN. I think that in the first place it was on a population of 17,000, but afterwards, in 1885, it was increased to the figures stated by my hon. friend. But, the point will not help my friend: it rather assists the argument that I hope to advance. In the case of Alberta and Saskatchewan, however, the population was figured, when they came into confederation in 1905, to be 250,000 in each province. That 250,000, multiplied by $32.43, amounted in the aggregate to $8,107,500, and that was the capital allowance made in lieu of debt made to Alberta and Saskatchewan. Manitoba had come in in the earlier years at a time when her population was very sparse indeed, and the allowance in lieu of debt had necessarily to be figured on a smaller amount of population. Later on, as Manitoba advanced in population, that allowance was increased, as the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), who has just interrupted me, says. But, what I want to point out is that a distinction between the allowance in lieu of debt has to be made by virtue of the fact that when new provinces come into confederation they thereby assume a share of the liability of confederation proportionate to their population, whereas, if they had remained out of confederation they would have had no share in that liability. Parliament set to work to do away with that obvious unfairness and the way it adjusted it was this, and it seems to me that if not exactly right the arrangement was conceived in a spirit of fairness and at the time approximated thereto. Parliament has made a grant to each such province of five per cent yearly on its debt capitalization; that is to say, each province has entered confederation on a capital debt allowance represented by its population multiplied by 32·43, and five per cent per annum thereon has been granted as a subsidy in lieu of debt to each of these provinces. As we apprehend the ground work of this allowance in lieu of debt, we will come to more clearly understand this legislation in the case of Manitoba and whether or not a re-adjustment should take place in this case or any other without a conference of the provinces. While the debt allowance was conceived in a spirit of fairness, and with an effect approximating thereto at the time, it will be seen that with the unequal advance of population in each of the provinces an unfair condition is certain to result. Had it turned out to be the case that each province had remained at the population it had when this debt allowance was made then the conditions should always have been fair and just between them. Had it even transpired, as may possibly have been expected, that each province would advance proportionately in population, that is to say, that the advance would be at the same ratio in each, then likewise, the allowance in lieu of debt might have been said to have been on a permanent basis and have remained permanently fair between them. But, such has not been the case. Manitoba was taken in with a very small population. It advanced rapidly. Manitoba came in with about 15,000 of a population, and she has to-day nearly 500,000. She bears the proportion of the national debt of this country that her present population bears to the population of Canada; that is to say she carries the burden now that her population bears to the whole population of Canada and not the burden that the population when she came into confederation bore to the whole population then. So it will be seen that with the unequal advance in the population of the provinces of this country a distinctly disjointed state of affairs arises in so far as this allowance in lieu of debt is concerned. I need only remark that if no readjustment is to be made in lieu of debt, as the right hon. leader of the opposition argued in 1908, and as the hon. member for St. John argues now, and as the now loyal opposition in 1908 distinct-

ly said to the province of Manitoba, in these words: 'We will not even discuss this question with you in regard to your allowance in lieu of debt—if that position is to be taken, it would mean that the province which came in and opened its arms to confederation in its younger life, came in when its population was sparse, would be at a disadvantage and its tax-payers would be suffering a very decided wrong when its population had advanced out of proportion to that of the older provinces. No argument that is rooted in right, or fair-play can be advanced that this allowance in lieu of debt is part of the compact of confederation and would be subject to no readjustment at all.

In my judgment—I argue this from a conviction that it is right—the allowance in lieu of debt—that constituent of the subsidies by the Dominion to the provinces—is just as much and just as necessarily subject to readjustment as is the allowance in lieu of land. That is to say, that as the provinces increase in unequal degree and in unequal proportion in their population, a readjustment must necessarily be made on the basis of that increase, and that, I submit, can be fairly made as has been done in the past, by this parliament without conferences. The right hon. the leader of the opposition, and I think the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), will recognize the truth of what I say when I say that the principle I now argue for, of a readjustment from time to time of the allowance in lieu of debt has been recognized by the House before, not once, but five times, without any reference to a conference with the provinces. The allowance to Manitoba itself, in lieu of debt has been increased in 1871, in 1873, and up to 1885. The allowance in lieu of debt has been adjusted by this House from time to time as population advanced in unequal measure. And never, that I have heard, has objection been raised to it, because it was not preceded by a conference with the provinces. Why, that very Act of 1885, from which the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), quoted, whereby the allowance to Manitoba was increased by a very substantial amount at that time; was not preceded, so far as I have been able to find out, by any conference with the provinces. If the present Bill is in any way a violation of an infringement of the compact of confederation, the Act of 1885, was certainly the same. The Act of 1885, purported to put the subsidy to be granted to Manitoba on a footing that would, up to that time, do justice to the province of Manitoba. The government of the day thought that justice to Manitoba was not being done by virtue of the tremendous increase that Manitoba's population had undergone, and the larger share she bore of the obligations of Canada, and the parliament in 1885, finding that to be the case, thought it would do justice to Manitoba. All that is asked at the present time is that this parliament of 1912, should do the same justice to that province.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In 1885, was it not simply a proportionate increase among all the provinces, Manitoba included?

Mr. MEIGHEN. The Act I read, and I am sure it is correct, is an Act respecting Manitoba alone, and the Act is headed: An Act to Increase the Subsidy to Manitoba and adjust all claims up to date.

Mr. CARVELL. Was not that in 1884 and not 1885?

Mr. MEIGHEN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) told me it was in 1885.

Mr. CARVELL. There are two Acts, one in 1884 and one in 1885.

Mr. MEIGHEN. That only adds strength to my argument.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was quoting from the chapter in the revised statutes which, as I understand it, is the statute under which the provinces were increased proportionately.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I asked the hon. gentleman and he told me that it was a transcript of the Act of 1885.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I thought it was. It says it is subject to all claims up to the first of January, 1885, so that it may have been in 1884.

Mr. MEIGHEN. If it was adjusted in 1884 and also in 1885 it will hardly be open to the hon. gentleman to argue that no adjustment must take place without conference. The Act of 1885 is entitled an Act for the final settlement of the claim made by the province of Manitoba on the Dominion, and it proceeds to deal with the matter section after section. The first section grants the swamp lands to the province; the second section grants this one hundred and fifty thousand acres of university lands, the third section increases the indemnity for want of public lands, which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) now argues should never be done unless you call a conference of the provinces. The next section was a readjustment of the per capita allowance of the province, out of a sense of justice by this parliament, and so on all down the line. Therefore, Manitoba's subsidies were revised in 1885, and revised in deference to the fact that Manitoba's population had increased so as to bring about an injustice to herself in the

subsidies she was then receiving from the Dominion treasury, and which were altogether less than she was entitled to receive on account of her population. At that time Manitoba was bearing her share of the obligations of Canada; she was paying her share of the public debt of Canada in proportion to her then population and not in proportion to the population that she had in 1870, when she entered the family of provinces. If there is any fault in my reasoning which I am unable to apprehend myself, I would be glad to have it made known to me now. I say that the allowance in lieu of debt, the allowance in lieu of public lands, and the other allowances are all on the same footing, and that they have from time to time been adjusted by this parliament without conference, and solely out of consideration for the existing circumstances. I say that the very circumstances that demanded their readjustment in days gone by, demands with louder voice their readjustment now. And, there is an added reason for their readjustment now, in that, in the case of the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, this principle has been recognized and since then the taxpayer of Manitoba has borne an undue share of the burden relative to the taxpayer of Saskatchewan and Alberta. Every reason that existed in 1885 exists now, and to-day we have the plainer, the clearer, the more specific reason in the fact that this parliament recognized that right of Alberta and Saskatchewan to subsidies in 1905 to which in all justice we are entitled as being exactly on the same footing in confederation.

I think I have covered each and every item in the proposed rearrangement. The arrearages are dated back to 1908 by way of compromise, as I understand. In so far as our right to equality is concerned, they could with all justice, date back to 1905. But it is quite true that we have not been carrying during these years the burden of the extra administration of the northern lands, and consequently I think it was only fair to make a deduction from these arrearages and that a fair compromise was struck in selecting the first of July, 1908, about which date parliament recognized the right of this province to a readjustment of its terms and of its territory.

As to the allowance in lieu of debt, it is justified by all the reasons that have justified this parliament in days gone by in making similar readjustments and it is further justified by the action of this parliament seven years ago.

The justice of the allowance in lieu of lands is admitted by the right hon. gentleman himself who in 1908 clearly placed his government and his party in the position of being ready to make an increased allowance to Manitoba in lieu of public lands. As to the other features of the arrangement there is no objection. So unless hon. gentlemen opposite can find some graver objection to this Bill than objections to its financial terms I fear they are not going to gain much capital in the country on that ground.

What is the cry of the Liberal opposition in the legislature of Manitoba? The provincial opposition represents in miniature the opposition in this House, they stand on the floor of the local House to-day and say that Manitoba is not getting nearly enough and that they are going to appeal to the people of Manitoba on the ground that the rights of that province have not been adequately acceded to by the parliament of Canada. And, perhaps not on exactly the same grounds but on a similar one, an hon. member of the local opposition, Mr. Molloy, has stated on the floor of the local legislature in language that carries us back very closely to 1885, that until justice is done to Manitoba and the west the cry of secession and the demand for secession will increase with emphasis until it cannot be denied and yet his friends in this parliament are endeavouring to stir up jealousies among the provinces on the ground that Manitoba is getting too much.

Mr. OLIVER. Was Mr. Molloy in the local House dealing with the question of better terms for Manitoba when speaking in that way?

Mr. MEIGHEN. I said that he made this statement on the ground that Manitoba and the west were not being properly treated in the confederation.

Mr. OLIVER. It had nothing to do with this subject at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I do not know how much reference Mr. Molloy had to this subject, but I know that the member for Lakeside stood beside Mr. Molloy and doubtless received his applause when he said that he would not be satisfied with the terms granted to Manitoba by this Act but would fight on for better terms. That is to say the opposition in that province is conducting what they believe is a vigourous campaign at this very hour against this Bill on the ground that it does not do justice to our little province and the opposition in this House, professing the same principles, ready to link arm in arm with the local opposition in the same campaign, resist the Bill because it is unjust to all other provinces in confederation.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton). My hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) dealing with the subject of the Bill before the House, made the point as he sat down, that the financial terms of the Bill must be fair and reasonable, because the opposition in Manitoba were complaining that those terms were not sufficiently liberal to the province, while the opposition in this parliament, were complaining that the terms were too liberal. My hon. friend is under the impression that a great many other people are under, that it is not possible for a bargain to be bad for both parties to it, just on the same principle as some people are under the impression that no bargain can be good for both parties to it; that under normal conditions, a bargain must be good for one of the parties, and bad for the other. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I hold very strongly to the view that there are three kinds of bargains. One in which both parties to the bargain benefit, another where one of the parties benefits, and the other loses, and a third, where both parties are at a disadvantage as a result of the arrangement. It is my judgment that the arrangement embodied in this Bill, as between the province of Manitoba and the Dominion at large, is one of the latter class; it is not fair to Manitoba and it is not fair to the rest of the Dominion. Take for instance, and only as an illustration, the very simple provision in regard to the access of the province of Ontario to a port on Hudson bay. The provision is in the first place, very remarkable. It is not unreasonable on the face that the province of Ontario should desire to have a port on Hudson bay. On the other hand it is not unreasonable that the province of Manitoba, whose trade must furnish the reason, and to all intents and purposes the only reason, for the existence of such a port, would desire to have provincial jurisdiction over that port. I do not intend to trouble the House with a discussion of the claims of Ontario, but as a western representative, looking at the matter from a western point of view, I am at a loss to know on what reasonable ground, except the desire for acquisition of territory, the province of Ontario has for the claim that it made. If it is asserted that the province of Ontario requires, or desires, a port on Hudson bay at the mouth of the Nelson river, as an outlet for the trade of the province, or as a tributary to that trade, I can only say, that inasmuch as the railway connection of such a port with the present railway system of the eastern provinces, and of the province of Ontario at Cochrane, would involve the construction of a road some 800 miles in length through a territory which, at the present time, is not productive of traffic, the construction of such a road is an enterprise that it does not seem to me comes within the range of possibility so far as Ontario is concerned. It is not only that the road would be 800 miles in length, but even that is a matter for consideration even to the province of Ontario, but it is a fact that it would run in a direction to which the outbound traffic of the present productive portion of Ontario would never go; and in all human probability the traffic originated at that point which will find its ultimate market in the province of Ontario, would be so limited as would never warrant the construction of such a road. Notwithstanding this fact, under this very remarkable arrangement the province of Ontario is given proprietary rights in a strip of territory running through the proposed extension of the province of Manitoba and abutting on the proposed port of Nelson. If there is any value in that country at all, it is in whatever locality is fixed upon as the ultimate port is reached by the Hudson Bay railway to be constructed from the Saskatchewan river. If there is any value in that territory it is in the ownership of the town site at that port, which the government proposes under this Bill to hand over to the province of Ontario for the benefit and profit of that province without requiring any consideration from it for the proprietary rights given. It is true there is some mention of the possibility of the construction of a railroad, but I have pointed out, Mr. Speaker, how absurd such a possibility is, and there is nothing in the Bill, and there is nothing in the explanations that have been made, that indicate in the most remote degree the intention of the province of Ontario to build a railway to that point. Why is this grant made? Is it done for the purpose of satisfying public opinion in the province of Ontario? No, it is to be for the purpose of strengthening the partisan position of the government of Ontario. This government sees fit to hand over to the government of Ontario the only piece of property of serious value in the proposed to be added territory, hand that piece of valuable property over to Ontario without rhyme or reason, without consideration of any kind whatever, simply as a partisan measure for the purpose of strengthening the partisan government in that province. In regard to the position of Manitoba, if that province is entitled to the jurisdiction over that territory and has to assume the responsibility and cost of administration within that territory, surely the province of Ontario has no claim, right, title or interest in the proprietorship of the only particularly valuable piece

of land, so far as we can see at present in that whole area.

It is true that it would either be the property of the Dominion or of the province of Ontario, it would not be the property of the province of Manitoba under the arrangement made in the Bill. But I submit that if this piece of valuable property is to be taken from the Dominion and handed over to one of the provinces, surely in common justice it should be handed over to the province within whose provincial jurisdiction it is situated, and the province whose trade is the one thing that will give it value. If the province of Ontario is to receive the benefit financially of the ocean port created by the trade of the province of Manitoba, while that port is within the jurisdiction of the province of Manitoba, it seems to me to be an arrangement that can neither be satisfactory to Ontario nor to Manitoba nor to the Dominion. If it is right that the province of Ontario should have a port on Hudson Bay, then it was right that the boundaries should be so adjusted that the province of Ontario should exercise jurisdiction over the port that it was entitled to. It should exercise provincial jurisdiction over that port. It was an easy matter to arrange the boundaries so as to meet that condition. If the easterly boundary of the province of Manitoba had been extended eastward, north of the English river where it does not interfere with the present province of Ontario, if it had been extended easterly to longitude 53½ west, there would have been a straight easterly boundary between Ontario and Manitoba north of the English river that would have given to Ontario the south side of the Nelson river at the proposed port of Nelson, it would have given that province the jurisdiction over the port that presumably it is entitled to have. I say that when the province of Ontario does not get jurisdiction over the port that this Bill says it is entitled to, and the province of Manitoba does not get the port over which this Bill gives it jurisdiction, it seems to me to be an absolutely fixed conclusion that the arrangement is neither fair to Manitoba, nor to Ontario, nor yet to the Dominion.

In regard to the subsidy again, I say that it is not only possible, but it is a fact that the subsidy arrangement can at the same time be unfair to Manitoba and unfair to the sister provinces. On what grounds is it claimed that the debt account of Manitoba should be increased by reason of the increase of population? What is the population of Manitoba? 455,614. The province of British Columbia has a population of 392,480, and it gets an allowance on debt account, so I am informed, on a population of 60,000. That is to say, the province of British Columbia with a much larger area than the enlarged province of Manitoba, with a population nearly as large, will receive a subsidy on debt account on one fourth as many people as the province of Manitoba will under this arrangement, while she has a population very nearly equal to that of Manitoba. Is that fair to the province of British Columbia? If justice is to be done, this Bill should have contained provisions for an increase of subsidy on debt account to the province of British Columbia as well as to the province of Manitoba. I followed what my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) said about the right and propriety of increasing the allowance on debt account to the various provinces proportioned to the increase of population. In taking that position he was following the position that I myself took in the debate on the presentation of the resolution. I quite agree, as a representative of the western country, where the population has increased rapidly, and in the nature of things must increase very largely over the present population—it is elimentary that an arrangement whereby the subsidy on debt account is fixed on a certain low basis of population, is not fair to those provinces as they increase largely in population. Even at the present time, take the provinces of Saskatchewan, Alberta, and Manitoba with the proposed increases; they are getting an allowance on debt account for 250,000 when the population ranges from 375,000, in the case of Alberta, 392,000 in the case of British Columbia, 455,000 in the case of Manitoba, and 492,000 in the case of Saskatchewan. Now, if there is to be a readjustment of the debt account of the province of Manitoba because of increase of population—I do not for an instant say there should not be such a readjustment,—I say there is absolutely the same ground, and a very much stronger ground, for readjustment in the case of British Columbia, an absolutely stronger ground even to-day; there are stronger grounds to-day for an adjustment of the allowance on debt account in respect to Alberta and Saskatchewan. What we contend is that when the government undertakes to deal with this question of debt account they should deal with it having due regard to the rights of all the provinces, and not, as my hon. friend from St. John has said, pick out one province to be dealt with as a matter of special favour and special right, and ignore the conditions and the position of the other provinces.

Mr. BRADBURY. Did the hon. gentleman think that way when he was arranging with Alberta and Saskatchewan? Why

did he not give a consideration then for the debt account to the other provinces?

Mr. OLIVER. The debt accounts of Alberta and Saskatchewan were fixed at the time those provinces entered confederation on the basis of the then estimated population, just as the present debt allowance to the province of Manitoba was fixed under the then estimated population.

Mr. BRADBURY. What about British Columbia?

Mr. OLIVER. It was fixed exactly the same way, on the then estimated population. It was perfectly right according to the conditions as they then existed.

Mr. MEIGHEN. My hon. friend's point is that there was an unfairness toward British Columbia, which was altogether wrong, existing in 1905, when the arrangement was made with Alberta and Saskatchewan. Why was it not corrected?

Mr. OLIVER. I was not dealing with British Columbia as connected with Alberta and Saskatchewan. The late government dealt with Alberta and Saskatchewan as new provinces coming into the confederation, and they gave those provinces an allowance on debt account which was based on the then estimated actual population of these provinces, which is exactly what was done with British Columbia and what was done in the beginning with Manitoba. But, from time to time, as my hon. friend has stated, the debt account of Manitoba was increased with the increase of population until the readjustment of 1885, when an estimated population of 125,000 was taken. But, a very large increase in population has taken place since that time, an increase that was not expected, that was not looked for, that was not hoped for, and that never would have occurred if my hon. friends had not given place in 1896 to a more capable administration; and had it not been for that increase in population this allowance of debt account would not have been so far behind the requirements as it is now. But, we are facing in this matter, a new condition, a condition which has arisen since 1905, a condition that requires to be dealt with, that this government is dealing with in one way, but that we say should not be dealt with in that way, but should be dealt with in a more comprehensive way, in a way that would do justice not only to Manitoba but also to Alberta, Saskatchewan and British Columbia, to say nothing about the eastern provinces. For the purpose of argument I am leaving the case of the eastern provinces to be dealt with by other members. It is not only the fact that Saskatchewan to-day, according to the last census, has a population twice as great as the population on which it is receiving allowance on debt account, but that population, and the population of Alberta, are increasing, as the census returns show, more rapidly than the population of any other province in the Dominion. Therefore, if their allowance on debt account to-day is below what it ought to be, if their debt account is to remain at the present figure, it is going to be still further and further below every succeeding year. When the government undertakes to deal with this question of debt account in regard to Manitoba on the plea that it wants to do justice, we ask that it shall do justice by other provinces as well as Manitoba.

Again, let me repeat what I said on a former occasion, that the simple statement of area, of population and of subsidy figures, does not establish an equality of treatment. To-day the part of Manitoba that is effectively occupied, on which the provincial government is required to expend money in enforcing its jurisdiction, is less than half the present area of the province. The present area of the province is some 73,000 square miles. Everybody knows that the population of the province occupies less than the south-west half of the total area. There is a part of the present province of Manitoba—I speak of the north-eastern portion—which is as little known to the government of Manitoba as the Congo is in the interior of Africa.

Mr. BRADBURY. What portion of the northeastern part of Manitoba ?

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend is more familiar with the geography of that country than I am.

Mr. BRADBURY. I think I am.

Mr. OLIVER. I say that over the greater portion of that area northeast of Lake Winnipeg the provincial government exercises no more jurisdiction than it does over the Congo Free State.

Mr. BRADBURY. It is a very small area.

Mr. OLIVER. It is not a small area. My hon. friend can see on the map that this is not a small area. This is a statement of fact, and I want to compare that condition with that of Saskatchewan which is effectively occupied by population requiring the administration of the provincial government from the boundary line to a point north of Prince Albert, a distance of not less than 300 miles. There is more territory at present effectively occupied in the province of Saskatchewan than the total present area of Manitoba. Everybody knows that. What is true of Saskatchewan is true in a still greater degree of Alberta. There is a much greater area in Alberta effectively occupied and requiring provincial expenditure and administration than there is in the whole province of Manitoba. Yet, from the Dominion treasury the prov-

inces of Alberta and Saskatchewan are to get only as much as the province of Manitoba is to get under this arrangement. We do not complain of that if it is the arrangement that exists because of having been entered into years ago, and it is considered not desirable to disturb it, but when this government undertakes to disturb that arrangement and disturb it in the name of justice and fair play we ask for justice and fair-play all round. Let it be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that in the province of Manitoba between one-fourth and one-third of the population is in the city of Winnipeg. The cost of provincial administration in the city of Winnipeg is trifling compared with the cost of administration in connection with a like population in the agricultural portions of the country. It is a fact that outside the city of Winnipeg the province of Manitoba has not increased seriously in population in the past few years, or at any rate, has not increased in comparison with Saskatchewan and Alberta. Its increase is in the city of Winnipeg. Does this government tell us that, because of an increase in population in the city of Winnipeg, where there is no practical increase in cost to the provincial government in the matter of administration, the province of Manitoba should have an increased allowance on debt account when the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, whose cost of administration is increased stupendously by a similar increase of population, should have no consideration on debt account? If there is to be justice and fair-play in this matter we ask for justice and fair-play. We are prepared to accede to an arrangement for an increased debt allowance to the other western provinces including British Columbia, having regard to the physical conditions which lay immeasurably heavier burdens upon the administration in those provinces than are laid upon Manitoba, or will be laid upon that province by this addition of territory.

In regard to the increased subsidy on land account, there are matters that have to be considered in that connection that are aside from and, in my judgment, far above in importance the mere matter of the amount of money that is to be paid.

First of all, let us clear away some little misapprehension which I think exists as to the amount of increase of subsidy on land account that the province of Manitoba is to receive. At present the subsidy of the province, (as shown in the estimates this year) is $833,838, but there must be added to that the amount that is derived by the province from the sale of swamp and university lands, which, according to the statement of the Minister of Finance, is $149,230, and this brings the total amount that the province of Manitoba is to-day realizing from subsidies received from this Dominion to $983,068. Under the arrangement proposed by the Bill the province will have $190,000 for civil government, $364,491 per capita, $562,500 on land account, and $381,584 on debt account, a total of $1,498,575, against $983,068 that it is now receiving, or a difference of $515,507. But let me remind the House that under the arrangement that was offered to Manitoba by the Liberal government, there was to be an annual payment of $200,000, so that if that is deducted, the advantage of cash that comes to the province of Manitoba on land account over and above what would have come to the province under the offer made by the Liberal government is, $315,507. That is, the province is better off in cash by reason of this arrangement over and above what it would have received, had the offer of the late Liberal government been accepted, by $315,507, but it is worse off by eight million acres of swamp land, according to the estimate given by the Minister of Finance.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). Did the late government offer $200,000 annually?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes. I cannot give the exact date, but the offer was made some time last spring. I suppose my hon. friend (Mr. Sharpe) does not suggest that no such offer was made.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). Well, I never heard of it.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend is not well-informed in matters concerning his province.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). The only offer I ever heard of was one of ten thousand per year.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend is behind the lighthouse altogether. The proposition made by the late government was discussed in the legislature of Manitoba and was rejected there, so that it is a matter of record. The condition now is: that this offer by the present government is $315,000 better in cash and eight million acres worse in swamp lands than the offer of the Liberal government. I think it will take all the gymnastic ability—I mean gymnastic ability in figures—of the Minister of Finance to explain how $315,000 in cash each year is better for the province than an asset of eight million acres of land, some 880,000 acres of which have been sold at a net profit to the province as we are informed, of $2,684,601.

Mr. BURNHAM. May I ask a question?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. BURNHAM. Are there any other objections to this Bill than the financial and geographical?

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend (Mr. Burnham) will have to think that out for himself; I am not making any other objection just now. I was trying to show that it will require all the ability of our friend the Minister of Finance to prove to the people of Manitoba, or of this country, or to prove to this House how the province gains financially by exchanging $350,000 a year in cash for eight million acres of land which, on his own showing, appears to be worth three dollars per acre or twenty-four million dollars and twenty-four million dollars at five per cent interest would amount to $1,200,000 a year against the $315,000 cash which this government offers. That is how this bargain figures out now as compared with the offer made by the Liberal government less than a year ago.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Where does my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) get the three dollars an acre?

Mr. OLIVER. From the statement of my hon. friend (Mr. White) in the House the other day.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). The statement I made in the House was not my statement but the statement of Mr. Young, chief geographer, and I said so. The statement was :

The unsurveyed area in the province is estimated at 12,900,000 acres. This is largely unexplored. It is thought that thirty per cent. (4,870,000 acres), may be swamp. This land will be of considerably less value than the swamp lands already referred to.

My hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) may put any price he likes on that land, but I do not want him to give the price he mentions as coming from me.

Mr. OLIVER. All right. The particular statement of my hon. friend (Mr. White) to which I was alluding, reads as follows on page 3926 of 'Hansard':

The total acreage sold is stated to have been 838,484·16 acres; the amount received for them is $3,137,399.30. Dominion deductions from provincial subsidy with respect to surveys of swamp lands, &c., amount to $211,942.95; provincial expenditure on account of swamp lands, proportionate estimate $240,854.60. These two make a total of $452,797.55 leaving the net amount received by the province from swamp lands at $2,684,601.75. Five per cent. of this amount is $134,230.08, which I deduct, as I have previously explained. That would give an average of about $3 an acre for the swamp lands already sold by Manitoba.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I don't like to interrupt my hon. friend but I am sure he wants to be fair.

I stated that with regard to some of the lands already sold. That is a matter of record. These other items with regard to the balance are estimates of Mr. Young's. I do not know the value. My hon. friend may put any value he decides on them, but do not let him quote me in connection with it because I do not know their value.

Mr. OLIVER. It must be admitted that the value of these swamp lands is a matter of estimate. The fact is that of this large area of upwards of two million acres which was in the hands of the province of Manitoba beginning some time in 1885, and coming down to the present time the portions sold from time to time, realised an average of $3 an acre. That is established. It must surely be admitted that with the appreciation in the value of lands which has taken place within the last few years that the price of $3 an acre received during the past 20 years, was below what the land would now realize.

I find in the report of the Department of Provincial Lands of Manitoba, for the year ending December 31, 1910, a statement in regard to the value of these lands.

Land sales, $73,729.35. There were sold during the year parcels of land representing 142,535·10 acres for the sum of $737,395.26. The prices obtained ranged from $3 to $19 per acre, and the average was $5.17 per acre. The progressive policy of the government of the province in draining, from time to time, large areas of swamp lands, is responsible largely for the splendid revenue of the department, as lands which, prior to being included in a drainage district, were practically unsaleable, and were held at $3 and $4 per acre, are now selling at from $6 to $12 per acre. In view of the steady demand for these reclaimed lands, the different municipalities wherein they are located are benefited to a very considerable extent owing to their being able to collect taxes from the date of sale on hitherto non-assessable lands.

Mr. BRADBURY. Does the hon. gentleman realize what it costs to drain these lands?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes. I have here also, bearing on the value of these swamp lands, a copy of a statement issued by the provincial government of Manitoba in London, England, on the occasion of the sale of the telephone bonds of the province in London. In a statement of the value of the assets of the province the following appears:

Public buildings—Deferred payments due on provincial lands already sold, unsold lands, estimated at 7,053,000 acres, of a value of £5,039,082.

I shall accept my hon. friend's statement that he did not say that the unsold lands of the province of Manitoba were worth $3 an acre, but he did say that the lands

that have been sold realized $3 an acre, and I produce the evidence of the government of Manitoba that as these lands are reclaimed they are worth from $6 to $12 an acre, and there is every evidence that the greater part of those lands can be reclaimed, and reclaimed, on the evidence of the government of the province of Manitoba, at a reasonable expenditure. So I think I have placed before the House ample evidence in support of the assumption that I make of a value of $3 an acre for the undisposed-of swamp lands of the province, to which the province is absolutely entitled. I repeat that in the present condition of land values, in the west, in the present buoyant condition of the money market, no one will question for a moment, that if the province of Manitoba saw fit to offer to-morrow, the right to the swamp lands of the province they could get in cash $3 an acre and no questions asked. There is no manner of doubt about that. That may be a speculative value, but it is a realisable value, and we are dealing with facts and figures. It is property that belongs to the province of Manitoba to-day, that the province is entitled to dispose of, as it pleases, when it pleases, and if it has not seen fit to dispose of this swamp land more rapidly than it has, the reason is found in the statement contained in this report of the provincial government that by the application of drainage works to these lands, their value is stupendously increased.

Mr. MORPHY. What does it cost per acre to drain these lands?

Mr. OLIVER. Drainage in Manitoba is like anything else, in this world, it varies according to the circumstances; but I can tell the hon. gentleman that the province of Manitoba has sold a very large proportion of the 880,000 odd acres which they have sold without any drainage, or any cost of drainage.

Mr. MORPHY. Is the hon. gentleman aware that in the county of Essex in Ontario, we spent $3,000,000 in drainage?

Mr. OLIVER. Quite likely, I have no doubt that in Essex there has been $3,000,000 spent in drainage.

Mr. CURRIE. How much have they spent in Manitoba on drainage?

Mr. OLIVER. They have spent very little so far. In regard to drainage in the county of Essex, the expenditure that has been made, has increased the value of that land 2, 3, 4, 5, 10 and 20-fold, and my hon. friend cannot deny it.

Mr. MORPHY. If you take the natural values at the time the drainage was done, it did not do anything of the kind. They increased in value later along with other lands.

Mr. OLIVER. And I say, that in Manitoba there are vast areas of lands that have no actual agricultural value, but which by the application of a reasonable expenditure, can be made the most valuable in Manitoba.

But, as a matter of fact, although the province has sold nearly a million of acres of swamp lands, their actual expenditure in drainage in regard to that law has been comparatively small. And let me point out this further—that this land has been sold at private sale and not in public competition; it was not sold at public auction, and there is a very grave question if the province received for that land anything like its value at the time it was sold.

Mr. STAPLES. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) claim that this land was not sold at public competition?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. Then, the hon. gentleman does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. OLIVER. I have very good authority for the statement I make. It has been made within my hon. friend's (Mr. Rogers) hearing on the floor of the House in the legislature of Manitoba, and has been substantiated there beyond question.

Mr. ROGERS. If the hon. gentleman will excuse me, I would tell him that when such a statement was made on the floor of the House the hon. gentleman who made it had to apologize for it.

Mr. OLIVER. There is no point in my hon. friend and myself discussing what took place in the legislature of Manitoba. He was there and I was not, and therefore I am compelled to accept his statement. But I would ask him, was one acre of that land sold by public auction, and if so, when?

Mr. ROGERS. It was not our policy to sell the land by public auction.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. ROGERS. But we were selling land in the same districts where the hon. gentleman himself (Mr. Oliver) was selling school lands and we were getting a higher price for the adjoining quarter-section in nearly every case than the hon. gentleman was getting for that which he sold.

Mr. OLIVER. I stated that these lands were not sold in competition. My hon. friend has admitted that they were not sold in competition; and they were not so sold as a matter of fact. Again I repeat, it has been stated by those who ought to know, that the actual values were not received for a large proportion of the land sold by the government of Manitoba. That is a matter, of course, that the people of Manitoba can settle for themselves.

Mr. STAPLES. If the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) desires to be fair, he should tell the House how these lands were disposed of, and the policy by which they were disposed of. He knows that an upset value was put on every acre and——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. STAPLES. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. member. I am making this statement, and I think that if he wishes to be fair——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) has the floor.

Mr. OLIVER. If the House will permit, I shall be very glad to have the hon. member (Mr. Staples) make his statement.

Mr. STAPLES. I make the statement that every acre of that land was inspected and valued; then a price was put on it, and any person desiring to purchase that land had only to look at the book, see the value placed on the parcel, and pay that price, and not an acre was sold in any other way.

Mr. OLIVER. I think my statement is thoroughly established, that these lands were sold without competition.

Mr. STAPLES. No.

Mr. OLIVER. The Dominion government has been administering certain lands in the western country in the interest of this same province—the school lands. And this parliament, in its wisdom, provided by statute that not an acre of that land should be sold except by public auction. That is the only true competition. It is by selling at auction that the value is certainly received. When the government of Manitoba sells the public property of the province, in this way, as they have admittedly done, to the extent of 880,000 acres for something over $3,000,000, they must be content to take the same criticism that would have been levelled at the Dominion government if it had undertaken to dispose of the public property in the same way. That, I think, is fair.

Now, just a word in regard to the valuation placed upon these lands. If this is to be a business arrangement let it be a business arrangement. And when we undertake to value a property that has been handed over to a province and to charge the province with that value, a reasonable valuation should be made. We find that 150,000 acres of land were handed over to the province for the benefit of higher education in the province—university lands, as they were called. They were to be farm lands and selected lands; they were not swamp lands by any means. And the Minister of Finance (Mr. White) and the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) blandly tell the House that these selected lands in the province of Manitoba are properly valued at $2 an acre—when the very swamp lands were sold, without competition, at over $3 an acre. It is a small affair; it does not matter materially; but it shows, that on the face of it, the calculations that have been made in connection with this matter are unfair calculations; on the face of the calculations there is not an attempt to do justice, but an attempt to do injustice as between the province and the Dominion.

I have said, and I think I have shown that so far as the land account is concerned, the province stands not to gain but to lose in actual hard money. But it stands to lose a great deal more than the difference in the money value between the cash subsidy and the value of the swamp lands. A great part, possibly the most valuable part, of the province of Manitoba is low and level land subject to overflow at times, but of the most valuable character both as to the quality of soil and of climate. All that is required is to get the water off and keep it off, and this acreage of land in Manitoba compares favourably, and more than favourably, with any similar acreage of land in any country in the world in actual productive value.

When the arrangement was made whereby the swamp lands were handed over to the provincial government, it was not so much to provide a source of direct revenue to the province as it was to secure the reclamation of these lands, to secure the establishment of settlement upon them, and to secure production from them, and I say, Mr. Speaker, if there are 8,000,000 of acres of swamp lands in Manitoba, the bringing of that immense area into cultivation, into production, is ten times more important to that province and to the Dominion, than any paltry half million dollars a year, whether it goes one way or goes the other. Eight millions of acres constitute one-third of the total grant that it cost to build the Canadian Pacific railway, and within two-thirds of the total area under cultivation in the three prairie provinces to-day. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the question of bringing that stupenduous area of most valuable land into production is something of the highest and greatest importance not only to this Dominion, but to the province of Manitoba and to the people who are in that province. It matters not that the government of Manitoba has not risen to its duty in that regard, that it has treated this swamp lands area as a speculation rather than as a matter of development. Some other government will be formed in Manitoba that will deal with these lands as a matter of development and not as a matter of speculation, at least we will hope so. But the fact is that the lands are there. It

is the business of the province of Manitoba to relieve the conditions of too much moisture in regard to much of the land that is already settled upon, and in doing that they reclaim these 8,000,000 of acres of swamp lands or a large part of them. These swamp lands as they stand to-day are an inducement, nay they are the financial means whereby the government of Manitoba may bring into production and into development that stupendous area; but under the arrangement that is offered for the consideration of this House, the province of Manitoba has to forego the policy of drainage under which it could reclaim that enormous area of lands, and these are to be handed back to the Dominion to remain in that condition, because the Dominion has not the responsibility for carrying out drainage, or the jurisdiction, and the province gets less than half a million dollars a year in cash. Whatever may have been the case in regard to other features of the agreement, this feature is one in which both the province and the Dominion lose and lose heavily.

But there is another feature of this arrangement and that is in regard to arrearages. The province is to get a bulk sum of $2,380,271 as arrearages on debt on land and on building account. Now on this question of arrearages it seemed, according to the statement of the Prime Minister, that because the province of Manitoba wanted an extension of boundaries many years ago, therefore, the province receiving that extension is to-day entitled to $2,380,271 of the public money of this country. My hon. friend the Prime Minister did not seem to think that this was a rule that worked both ways. The province of Manitoba has been in possession of the swamp and university lands ever since 1885. It has been drawing interest on the disposition of those lands, and has been using the proceeds as revenue during all that time, but it did not have to give any account of the money that has been spent before the present Bill goes into force. The province did not have to account for the arrearages, it is only the Dominion government that has to account for them to the province. Is not such an argument as that too childish to put before an intelligent assembly? What is this proposal to pay the province of Manitoba a bulk sum of $2,238,000 on the passage of this Bill or shortly afterwards? There is no justification of right or reason, for this proposal as between the province and the Dominion, or as between the province of Manitoba and any of the other provinces. It is the declaration of a government in power, a government with a large and hopelessly subservient majority, the demonstration of that government to the various provinces of this Dominion that whom they will they will make rich, and whom they will they will leave poor. It is a demonstration to all the provinces that if they do not come in line with this government, if they do not yoke up with the politics and the policy of the party now in power, they cannot expect to get hand-outs of this character; they must stand and see their neighbour fattened while they remain hungry. It is simply a declaration that this government pays no attention to the rights of the various provinces. What have rights to do with them? It is a declaration that the terms of confederation do not concern them. They have command of the public treasury, and they propose to use that command for partisan purposes in provincial matters whenever and however it pleases them to do so. Now I am not at present a resident of the province of Manitoba. I was at one time and I have some acquaintance with the people of that province. I have some knowledge of their attitude of mind towards public questions, and I say this to the government: That if it required an annual payment of five dollars a year to every Indian in the province —that payment to be made so long as grass grows and water runs—in order to induce that Indian to give up his rights, a payment of five dollars a piece in one year to the white people of the province of Manitoba will not have the effect of inducing them to give up their rights. Our hon. friends who hope to buy out the province of Manitoba with a bribe of $2,380,000 will find that they have deceived themselves. The people of Manitoba are not for sale at the price—

Mr. BRADBURY. Nor at any other price.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend has taken the word out of my mouth—they are not for sale at any price; and the government that undertakes to buy them, taking money out of the Dominion treasury——

Mr. BRADBURY. The hon. gentleman knows from experience that they are not to be bought.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know from experience. Does the hon. gentleman say ——

Mr. BRADBURY. Speaking of the government of which the hon. gentleman was a member. They know from experience, that Manitoba was not for sale.

Mr. OLIVER. On what particular occasion? Perhaps the hon. gentleman would enlighten us. On no occasion, and under no circumstances, did the late government undertake to offer a bribe to the province of Manitoba or any other prov-

ince. This proposal, Mr. Speaker, if I am within parliamentary rules in so saying, to my mind, is a proposal to pay the province of Manitoba $2,238,000 to which that province is not entitled under the terms of confederation or under any consideration of fair-play as between province and province. It is neither more nor less than an attempt on the part of this government to square the provincial government of Manitoba with their people because of the remarkable and atrocious position of that province in regard to their telephone transactions, whereby the province has incurred a capital expenditure of $12,000,000 on the promise to give the people reduced telephone rates, while it is proposed now to increase those rates to double, treble and quadruple what they were at the time when they took the telephone service over. It is an attempt to salve the people of the province of Manitoba over the shortcomings of their provincial government, and to salve them over because the farmers of that province have lost millions and millions of dollars by reason of the accession of this government to power.

Mr. BURNHAM. How can you salve them over with such terms?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not think they will be salved over with such terms. I say that the attempt was made, but that it will fail. I think that I have demonstrated that the proposition now before the House is one in which the province of Manitoba does not stand to gain, in which the other provinces of the Dominion do not stand to gain and in which the Dominion does not stand to gain; and particularly one in which the government that brought forward such a proposition stands discredited before the people of this country.

Mr. J. A. M. AIKINS (Brandon). It is pleasing to know that this Bill finds such favour in the sight of hon. gentleman on the other side. One ex-minister condemns it as giving too much to the province of Manitoba; another ex-minister of that administration condemns it, because it does not give enough to that province. I am delighted with the universal advocacy of the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver). He seems to have taken briefs for three provinces. He seems to have assumed that the province of British Columbia is not able to take care of itself, and, therefore, he takes the brief for that province. Are we to think that the administration of the hon. Mr. McBride has retained the hon member for Edmonton to advocate the interests of British Columbia in this House, or are we to assume that the hon. member for Edmonton has been retained by the premier of the province of Manitoba to advocate the interests of that province? Are we to assume that Sir James Whitney himself, finding that there is such an able advocate, has given his brief to the hon. member? Or is the House to assume that the McBride administration of British Columbia is better able than the hon. member for Edmonton to look after the interests of that province? And that the administration of the hon. Mr. Roblin in Manitoba and of Sir James Whitney in Ontario know how to look after the interests of those provinces?

I do not intend to go at any length into what has been said by the hon. member for Edmonton, because I am thoroughly convinced that the government of Manitoba knows more about the swamp lands of that province than does the hon. member and that it understands better than he, the financial requirements of the province. But I do desire to speak for a short time in reply to certain arguments used a few days ago by hon. members opposite in the debate on the resolution. In 1881, it was supposed that the boundaries of Manitoba were being extended eastwards as far as the line of longitude extending north from the confluence of the Mississippi and Ohio. Therefore, the Act of 1881 was passed. In introducing the Bill, Sir Alexander Campbell, then leading the Senate, spoke of this territory as:

> . . . covering an area up to a line due north from the forks of the Ohio and Mississippi, of 154,411 square miles, or something like eleven times its present area. It will be observed, by the map on the table, that on the east we do not lay down a line in the sense as we do on the south, west and north, but suggest a dotted line, as what the boundary line between Ontario and Manitoba will be, as the present government of the Dominion believe the law establishes it. . .

Now, in extending these limits, it is, of course, a matter of interest to the House to know what population is within the proposed extension; and I had a statement prepared showing that the Indian population in such places as North West Angle, Shoal Lake, Rat Portage, Rainy Lake, Rainy River, Manitou Rapids and Lac des Mille Lacs, and the white population of the township of Olver, Fort William and Neebing, Mattawan, Sibley and a number of people along the line of railway works.

He stated also that immediately after the passing of the Act, Manitoba took control largely of that territory.

A dispute arose between Manitoba and Ontario concerning these boundaries. The matter was submitted to the Imperial Privy Council, and the decision was given in these words:

> Their Lordships find the true boundary between the same two provinces to the north of Ontario and to the south of Manitoba, proceeding eastward from the point at which

the above mentioned line strikes the middle line of the course of the same river (whether called by the name of the English river or as to the part below the confluence by the name of the river Winnipeg), up to lake Suel or the Lonely Lake, and thence along the middle lines of Lake Suel, of the Lonely lake to the head of that lake, and thence by a straight line to the nearest point of the middle line of the waters of lake St. Joseph, and thence along the middle line until it reaches the foot or outlet of that lake, and thence along the middle line of the river by which the waters of lake St. Joseph discharge themselves, until it reaches a line drawn due north from the confluence of the rivers Mississipi and Ohio, which form the boundary eastward of the province of Manitoba.

And the Privy Council ordered that its finding should be carried into execution. In 1889 the province of Ontario, desiring to have the limits as found by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council confirmed by an Imperial statute, made, through a joint address of these two Houses, an application for that purpose. The recital of the Imperial Act of 1889, which was thus passed reads:

> And whereas such boundaries, as far as the province of Ontario adjoins the province of Manitoba, are identical with those found to be correct boundaries by a report of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, which Her Majesty the Queen in Council, on the 11th day of August, 1884, ordered to be carried into execution.

The Privy Council found the boundary for Manitoba extended as far east as the line of longitude which ran north from the confluence of the rivers Mississippi and Ohio. Speaking in reference to that, the Hon. Mr. Mills, in 1889, said:

> What both the representative of Manitoba and the representative of the Dominion maintained was that this meridian line was the eastern boundary of Manitoba, and being the eastern boundary of Manitoba so much of Manitoba as lay north of the Albany river remained in Manitoba under that decision. It was never argued before the Judicial Committee that if Manitoba could not claim any portion of the territory south of the Albany river, she would not be entitled to any portion north of that river. That question was not raised, and I do not see how the Judicial Committee could do anything than as it did, leave to Manitoba that portion which was uncontested, and assign to Ontario that portion west of this meridian line which they believed belonged to the province of Ontario. I am pleased that the hon gentleman has brought forward this resolution, and I trust that this will be the last time we will have to discuss the boundaries of Ontario in the parliament of Canada.

Now, Sir, as the judgment of the Privy Council determined the easterly boundary of Manitoba, which extended as far east as the line of longitude running north from the confluence of the Ohio and Mississippi, if that line was carried immediately north it would come almost to the north-east corner of the boundary of the proposed province. One wonders why was it, when the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council decided that part belonged to the province of Manitoba, it was not given to the province of Manitoba? The late administration refused it. The province of Manitoba long ago demanded that in connection with the extension of her boundary north, and if that had been given to Manitoba when it should have been given by the late administration, then no question would have arisen such as that raised by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), that the ports of Churchill and Nelson should belong to Ontario. Although the government of Manitoba made application to the late administration time and again to have their boundaries properly extended, it was refused, and that has been one of the causes whch has led to the disturbed feeling which prevails to some extent in the west of Canada. In 1908 the right hon. the leader of the opposition said:

> I am aware that the boundary we have laid down has been disappointing perhaps to both parties. Judging by what I have seen of statements made by the premier of Manitoba he expresses disappointment although I do not believe it would be possible for the government or parliament to concede in full the claims of Manitoba. I have seen some flaming articles in some newspapers stating that the rights of Ontario have been sacrificed inasmuch as the two harbours of Churchhill and Nelson have been given to Manitoba. Well, Sir, I think that the province of Ontario has enough of wealth and of territory and of glory to enable her to willingly concede to the sister province what little advantages there may be in that. Moreover, the traditions of history would seem to indicate that the Churchill and Nelson rivers should belong to Manitoba. They were the avenue of the fur trade in the olden times when the fur trade was all the trade there was, and if we were to take away from Manitoba what advantage there may be in this, I think Manitoba would be entitled to complain on sentimental grounds. At all events I submit these reasons to the fair consideration of the House and I think they will impress themselves on all those who will give this matter impartial consideration.

One would assume, when the judicial decision of the Privy Council was placed before the late administration, that they would have given effect to it. But instead of doing so they decided to give that part of the territory to the province of Ontario. You may ask now: Why is it not now demanded by the province of Manitoba? Simply because, for a dozen years the province of Manitoba was demanding it, and all that was offered them was the easterly boundary

which is offered now, and as further effort was useless with that administration they were almost obliged to accept it subject to a proper financial settlement, which they have been unable from that time until this administration came into power, to secure. Having once accepted that eastern boundary from the late administration, they could do nothing else than accept it now. Although it was thus settled by the late administration, we find the hon. member for South Wellington trying to stir up the feelings of Ontario against the west concerning it. We find only recently, on the 21st of February last, the leader of the opposition in the Ontario house moving a resolution insisting that the boundaries should be extended north to the Churchill river. Just a little previous to that the same hon. gentleman declared that it was desirable there should be no antagonism between the west and east of Canada, still he moved that resolution which would disturb the whole of western Canada. Why should that old trade route by York factory and Nelson river be given to the province of Ontario? We find hon. gentlemen on the other side of the house, for instance, the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), trying to stir up the other provinces against this settlement with Manitoba. We find the hon. gentleman who has just spoken trying to set one province against another province in the west. The policy of hon. gentlemen opposite thus appears to be to sow discord and create strife, and disharmony, in order that out of the resulting confusion they may in some way or other derive party advantage. However, I am sure that as the province of Ontario and the province of Manitoba have agreed with the Dominion on a settlement, all the efforts of hon. gentlemen to cause a cleavage between the east and the west will prove futile, because these provinces and the Dominion have agreed to settle their differences in order that peace and harmony may prevail between the east and the west.

Therefore, Ontario has no right to complain. Both political parties in Manitoba, practically accepted the eastern boundary, as laid down by the late administration and this administration. The only question for settlement was the question of financial terms, to which I wish to refer for a moment. In 1878 the University of the province of Manitoba realized that in consequence of the small income that the province was deriving it could not give much assistance to it. Therefore, the university applied to the Dominion government for a grant of land to assist it in its educational work. In 1881 another application was made to the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, and in 1884, prior to the passing of this Act of 1885, he wrote to the University of Manitoba stating that the government would make the grant. We, nevertheless, find that it is incorporated in one of the clauses in the Better Terms Act of 1885. Section 2 of that Act provides that:

> An allotment of land, not exceeding one hundred and fifty thousand acres, of fair average quality, shall be selected by the Dominion government and granted as an endowment to the University of Manitoba for its maintenance as a university capable of giving proper training in the higher branches of education, and to be held in trust for that purpose upon some basis or scheme to be framed by the university and approved by the Dominion government.

Approved not by the provincial but by the Dominion government. Before coming to this question of the basis of trust let me say that, although the grant of land was to be of fair average quality and salected by the Dominion government, no step was taken by the Dominion government to make that selection and most of the fair average land had been taken up as homesteads, given in grants or otherwise disposed of. Up to 1886 or 1887 no arrangement had been made for the selection of the land. The University of Manitoba pressed strongly that the selection should be made. They were practically told that they would have to make it themselves. Accordingly, they spent money and the province gave them some assistance to make the selection, but as the best land had been alienated, they were not able to select the first quality of land. In consequence of the delay and difficulty in making their selection of land, application was made to the Dominion government to commute the grant for a money payment. In January, 1888, a committee appointed by the university reported an interview with the Minister of the Interior which stated that with respect to the land which had come back to the government by the non-fulfilment of homestead conditions, the minister was unwilling to withdraw it from homesteading and would prefer the grant of a sum of money in commutation of said land. In February, 1888, the Minister of the Interior made a recommendation to the Governor in Council that he had been waited on by representatives of the university council and favoured a commutation as a way of settling the difficulty in procuring lands and he thought that the commutation would be an advantage, both to the interest of settlement and of higher education in the province, and, therefore, recommended the commutation and suggested legislation. But commutation was not carried out because, as was stated afterwards, the revenue of the Dominion was not in a buoyant condition. The only

amount I recollect as being mentioned by the minister or the university was $2.

Complaint has been made that the sum of $2 an acre is too small a sum on which at present to fix a price for university land. But between the 8th of March, 1882, and the 11th of January, 1891, the Dominion lands south of the Canadian Pacific railway were held by the government at a price of $2.50 per acre, while north of the Canadian Pacific railway belt, at $2 an acre. Further, with respect to the university lands there is a reversionary interest in the Dominion government, not the provincial. One of the conditions in the patent of this land is:

Provided always, that if at any time hereafter the said university shall be dissolved or shall cease to exercise its functions as a university, then, and in such case, any and all of the said lands which may remain unsold shall revert to and become revested in us and our successors as of our and their former estate therein, subject to any mortgage or pledge which may have been given by the said university; and all funds in the hands of the said university, their successors or assigns, the proceeds of or which in any way result from the sale, lease, mortgage, pledge or other disposal of the said lands, shall be immediately paid over to us, our successors or assigns.

Yet, complaint is made that the province should pay a higher sum in commutation of that land grant than $2 an acre at the date of its grant. When you consider that the reversion is with the Dominion government, that that government had the right to fix the basis of trust, when you consider the price at which the government land was selling, when you consider that land selected was not the best land or of fair average quality, when you consider that all these lands, for over twenty years, were managed by the university council, and that during all this time the province of Manitoba and the municipalities have not taxed the lands, it is impossible to understand how the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) or any one can come to the conclusion that the university's interest in the land should be valued higher than $2 per acre. I will go a little further and say that, under these circumstances, if the commutation is made the reversion should be handed over to the province of Manitoba and the basis of trust should thereafter be controlled by that province. It seems to me, therefore, after this explanation, that the House will be prepared to say that this, at all events, was a fair bargain as far as the Dominion was concerned.

The hon. gentleman who has just spoken said that these lands should remain with the province of Manitoba, because it would be to their interest to drain these lands. If they are going back to the Dominion, then, whose duty is it to drain them? Certainly the duty of the Dominion government and not the duty of the province. For whose benefit should they be drained? These lands are not held by the Crown in the interest of the province, but for the benefit of the whole Dominion, as the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) said. Therefore, the late administration should not only have looked after the draining of these lands, which were not handed over to the province, but after the draining of all other Dominion land. Certainly the duty of draining the swamp lands of which the Dominion is to have the benefit should be that of the Dominion government, and not of the province. Therefore, if the land is handed back and if the government does its duty the province will receive the benefit and so will the Dominion, when they are so drained.

The clause of the statute to which I refer the Better Terms Act, 1885, says:

The grant of land—

That is the grant of swamp land and the university land and payments authorized by the foregoing sections shall be made on the condition—

—that they be accepted by the province of Manitoba as a full settlement of all claims made by the said province for the reimbursements of costs incurred in the government of the disputed territory——

Not merely a subsidy, but:

—costs incurred in the government of the disputed territory or the reference of the boundary question to the judicial committee of the Privy Council and all other questions and claims discussed between the Dominion and the provincial government up to January 10, 1885.

Therefore, when you come to consider either commuting the value of the university land or the restoration of the other lands to the Dominion you must consider the fact that they were not given solely for the purpose of subsidies but partially to defray the expenses of the government of that disputed territory, for that disputed territory was governed for a time by the province of Manitoba; it was formed into an electoral district which sent a representative to the local legislature, until 1884 or practically 1885, when the judicial decision was given that it did not properly belong to the province of Manitoba. It is, therefore, improper to argue this question solely on the ground that the swamp lands and the university lands were given only as a subsidy to the province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, you cannot compare things which are utterly dissimilar; you cannot contrast one condition with another condition in no way identical, and, consequently you cannot contrast the position of the western provinces with that of the east-

ern provinces, their conditions are altogether dissimilar. It cannot be justly said that the conditions in Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba are at all similar to the conditions in the eastern provinces, or even to the conditions in the province of Ontario. Neither are the prairie provinces similar to British Columbia, and, therefore, what is done by the Dominion for one of these eastern provinces, or for the province of British Columbia, cannot be taken as a fair standard of what should be done for the prairie provinces which are not similarly situated and do not own their own natural resources or their lands. In what respect are the three prairie provinces similar. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver), has assumed that they did not come into confederation at the same time, but he ought to know better, for the fact is that the Northwest Territories and the province of Manitoba came into confederation on July 15, 1870. There was, no doubt, this difference: that full provincial autonomy was given to the province of Manitoba, whereas there was a limited government given to the territories, the Dominion government retaining certain control. In 1905, when Alberta and Saskatchewan were given their autonomy, the conditions then prevailing in these two provinces were similar to those which prevailed in Manitoba. True, Manitoba had a larger population and a little more settlement, but settlement was going on in Saskatchewan and Alberta in 1905. as I say, the conditions were generally identical, save that there was a greater burden of government on the province of Manitoba than on either Alberta or Saskatchewan. That being so, why was it that the Liberal government treated Manitoba in a different way from that in which they treated Alberta and Saskatchewan? Why? Because Alberta and Saskatchewan were practically the creations of the Liberal administration, subject to its will, and the province of Manitoba was not. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), has said: why do you not get all the members of confederation together in a family council and discuss the terms that are now to be given to the province of Manitoba? Let me ask the hon. gentleman why in 1905 the Liberal government did not call the family of confederation together to discuss the financial terms which were to be given to Alberta and Saskatchewan? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver), has asked why British Columbia should not be called into council now, why did not the Liberal government, in 1905, call British Columbia into conference when they were settling the financial terms for Alberta and Saskatchewan? Why is it that these gentlemen opposite now suggest that a different course should be pursued by the present administration from that which they themselves pursued under exactly similar circumstances? Their former action and their present argument are utterly inconsistent. The Dominion government was supplying the funds for the Northwest Territories from July, 1870, to the year 1905, while during that period Manitoba was allowed to look after herself and to struggle as best she could with an insufficient subsidy. During that period the Dominion government was erecting in the Northwest Territories public buildings out of Dominion funds, while Manitoba was paying for her own buildings. I therefore claim, and I do not think it can be disputed, that the conditions in Manitoba were quite similar to the conditions in Alberta and Saskatchewan in 1905 when these two provinces were created and therefore the government of to-day should have treated the province of Manitoba with the same consideration and given it the same subsidies as Alberta and Saskatchewan. And now, these gentlemen opposite complain because the increased amount of the subsidy is dated back to 1908. Well Sir, if full justice were rendered to Manitoba it might well be contended that it should date back to 1905 when the late administration should have treated Manitoba the same as they treated Alberta and Saskatchewan. But, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) has told us that the cost of administration was greater in the two new provinces than it was in Manitoba and in support of his idea he pointed to Manitoba with its large capital city containing almost one-third of the entire population of the province. I would remind the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) and his friends that the cost of governmental administration in a large city, with a new incoming population, is as great or greater than the cost of administration in rural districts, and whatever argument may be founded on that ground is altogether in favour of Manitoba. I would like to know how the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) makes out that with a smaller population in Saskatchewan than in Manitoba and with a still smaller population in Alberta, there was more settled country in these two provinces and a larger district to govern than was the case in Manitoba. I therefore contend that it was at least fair as a compromise for the government when making this arrangement with Manitoba, to have dated it back to 1908. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) tells us that the money subsidy we are giving to Manitoba is too large and in the same breath he tells us that the province of Manitoba is giving too much to the Dominion government when it surrenders these lands. I would like to know how that equation works out. If they are giving such valuable

lands back to the Dominion. surely the Dominion can give them financial compensation in lieu of that land. Well, Sir, considering the terms on the whole it seems to me that they are just and fair both to the province of Manitoba and to the Dominion of Canada.

A moment on the financial terms or subsidy. Hon. gentlemen opposite are evidently not at all agreed about them. When you hear some hon. gentlemen opposite say on behalf of the province of Manitoba that the government have not made terms sufficiently good for that province and others saying that the terms are too good for it, we may come to the safe conclusion that the government did the just and proper thing in making the terms they did. Therefore, this Bill should pass without very much more contestation.

It has further been suggested that it was wrong to give the province of Ontario a strip of land five miles wide running from the eastern boundary of the proposed boundary to the Nelson river. The property within the borders of Manitoba, the public domain, belongs to the Dominion government, and the Dominion government can do with it what it thinks proper, can give those lands as a subsidy if it likes for the construction of a railway across it or a port on Hudson bay. I am sure the province of Manitoba will be delighted if Ontario will join with it in creating such a port as there ought to be created for the whole of western Canada at the mouth of the Nelson river. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken has been complaining that we have not enough outlets for the surplus annual products of the west, and that therefore everything possible should be done to give facilities for the transportation of that surplus. Is there then any objection to Ontario building a railway through their own province to the eastern boundary of Manitoba and there being joined by a line, if you like, constructed by Manitoba, and thus forming another national line to carry out the surplus products of the west to the markets of the world? The west will be glad to have such a railway, will be glad to join Ontario in having a joint railway from a common point on such railway up to the port on Hudson bay, will be glad if on one side of the river the province of Ontario creates a splendid port there, as there should be. Let me say to hon. gentlemen and to the people of the west that assurances are given that there will be created either at Churchill or at the mouth of the Nelson river, by the Dominion government, a port which will help them to ship the western surplus products by a speedy route—through Hudson bay and Hudson Strait to the final market of Liverpool, to the great benefit of the west.

There are difficulties in the west. I hope for the consolidation of Canada, I deprecate every statement that is made by hon. gentlemen opposite or elsewhere which will have a tendency to separate the provinces or to create disunion. What we want is union, and if the present administration does what, for 15 years the late administration neglected to do, and cares for western interests, the west of Canada will not only be prosperous but will be contented. The troublesome conditions which now prevail in the west are largely the natural result and consequence of the neglect of western interest and western affairs by the late administration during the years of their power.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N.B.) Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Aikins) has discussed this subject entirely from the standpoint of its effect upon Manitoba, and has carefully avoided alluding to any other aspect of the case, or to that aspect which would appeal to any other portion of Canada, and therefore, I hope he will not consider me discourteous if I leave the track which he has trodden so carefully and try to call the attention of the House back to this proposed agreement to some extent as it bears relation to the other provinces of Canada and try to see if it is a reasonable agreement taking Canada as a whole. My hon. friend from Brandon has made a very strong appeal for peace and harmony and the union of Canada, and I heartily concur in that sentiment, but I doubt if the policy which the government is following in this case will be the best means of attaining the very much desired end to which my hon. friend has alluded. We can have no peace and harmony in this country so long as there are incongruities and unfairness existing as to the manner in which one section of the Dominion is treated as compared with others and as I view this case there is a manifest unfairness in the manner in which Manitoba has been dealt with as compared with the treatment of eastern Canada, and I think I might say of every province in Canada, but the greatest distinction probably would be between Manitoba and the eastern portions of Canada. There are perhaps three general principles upon which the Bill now before the House might be discussed. The first is the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba or its territorial expansion. To that I shall not devote much time because it is, I believe, pretty well settled that Manitoba is entitled to the amount of land she is receiving, and in fact that principle was adopted before this House four years ago. If Manitoba is willing that Ontario should have a right of way five miles wide and one-half of what may be the principal port in the Hudson bay, I have no quarrel with that, and if

Ontario is satisfied with it again I have no quarrel.

The next question provided for in this Bill is the financial arrangement which will be applicable to Manitoba in the future, and the third subdivision would be the arrearages which we are paying to Manitoba on account of what has taken place or has not taken place during the past four years. My hon. friends seem to treat the province of Manitoba as though it was a new province just entering the union, as though it had not 40 years of history and experience, as though it had not worked out its existence along the line of other provinces and as though it should be placed on an entirely different basis from other provinces that came into the union only 45 years ago. You must remember that this province became a separate entity with a legislature and government of its own in 1870, or between 41 and 42 years ago, and the other four provinces in Canada only came into the union in 1867. When the four provinces formed the union I submit that the financial arrangements, both as to the per capita allowance, as to the debt allowance, and as to all financial matters were worked out on a thoroughly fair and honest basis. There was a principle involved in all these things, and it is on account of departing from the principle that I chiefly find fault with the government for the terms of this Bill. I shall not quarrel with the amount of money Manitoba is receiving, but I do quarrel most seriously with the arrearages. I think the principle objection is the departure from the principle established in 1867.

Now we know that when the different provinces united in 1867 they received their public lands, with the minerals and all that would go in connection with them, and therefore, so far as those provinces were concerned there was nothing to adjust. The next question that came was the amount of money that would be paid to each province for government and local purposes, and that was apportioned on a population basis and divided up fairly and evenly, and each province received the amount that it was entitled to. There again you had a principle which was followed in arriving at this conclusion. We come next to the debt account. Now the debt account was not so easy of adjustment, but yet the principle was followed as my hon. friends opposite know. The debt of the old province of Canada was found to be about, I think, $67,000,000—I am speaking now in round numbers—and it was decided that the government would assume of that debt $62,000,000. Then it was found that the debt of Nova Scotia was somewhere about $8,000,000, and the government agreed to assume that debt. The debt of the province of New Brunswick was a little less than $7,000,000, it was somewhere over $6,000,000, but in order to make the debt allowance of New Brunswick compare proportionately with the debt allowance of the other provinces of Canada, they agreed to assume the debt of the province to the extent of $7,000,000. They would pay the actual debt, which was something over $6,000,000, and they agreed to pay New Brunswick five per cent interest on the difference between the actual debt and the assumed debt of $7,000,000. Now there you had a principle, you had something which was perfectly fair and reasonable, as between the different provinces, and something to which no person could find any fault. When Manitoba came into the union in 1870 it had no debt, and for some reason for which I can find no explanation, and I must say that I have investigated matters pretty carefully, it was decided that Manitoba would be allowed a debt of $472,090 estimated on a population of 17,000. The basis I understand was, that it was to be $32 on an estimated population of 17,000. But I never could see the reason of that excepting that the Dominion government said: We ought to give Manitoba something with which to carry on her government and, therefore, we will say that she ought to have a debt of $472,000. Then I find that when Prince Edward Island came into the union they also assumed a debt of $4,701,000, but in the case of that province they followed the principle which had been laid down at the time of confederation, and allowed a certain debt according to the population of the island, and agreed to pay the difference between the actual debt and the assumed debt. Now things went along fairly well for a number of years. Finally Manitoba commenced to demand more money, and the result was that in 1882 a change was made by which Manitoba was to receive $50,000 in place of $30,000 on account of government, and then they were to receive 80 cents a head on a population estimated at 150,000, which was probably two or three times in excess of the actual figures. But it was assumed to be 150,000 and that would make a payment on a per capita basis of $120,000. Now in 1882 we find the first reference to the allowance to be paid to the province of Manitoba in lieu of the lands, and in that year it was provided that Manitoba was to receive an annual allowance of $45,000, as it was put in the statute for the want of lands. Because the lands were owned and controlled by the Dominion she received no revenue and had no control over them, and it was thought she ought to receive something for them. Well, Sir, with this last proposition I have no fault to find, I can readily understand that if the four older provinces owned their lands and were able to receive a revenue from them, the new

provinces ought to be put in the same position as the older ones were in, and it was only fair to give them a grant for a certain amount on account of not receiving their lands. That was placed at $45,000 in 1882. In 1885 a change was made and they received from that time down to the present $100,000 annually. I find no fault with that, and I do not think that any person from any of the other provinces could find any fault if that amount had been increased, because we must all understand that if the province did not own its land it was not on a parity with the four older provinces of Canada, and also with British Columbia and Prince Edward Island, which had since come into the union, and, therefore, they were entitled to something. It may be true that the Dominion of Canada received no revenue from these lands, but the Dominion had the administration of them, they were able to hold them out as an inducement for settlers to come into that country, and we know that settlement did come in and not only did Manitoba prosper, but the whole of Canada prospered, by reason of having the lands to offer. Therefore, I say no objection can be found to giving Manitoba an allowance in lieu of her lands, and I do not think that very much fault can be found with that provision of the Bill at the present time. It may be a little exaggerated but that is only a matter of degree. The Federal government is allowing the province of Manitoba now, I figure out, $413,270 annually, in lieu of the right to control her own lands, but it must be remembered that in 1885 the province of Manitoba received something else besides the $100,000 in lieu of her land. She received all the swamp lands from the province, or all lands which hereafter might be declared to be swamp lands. That feature has been pretty thoroughly discussed during this debate, and I will, therefore, only refer to it very shortly when I come to it in a few minutes. But Manitoba also received at that time 150,000 acres of land for the university, and my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Aikins) has tried to show that those lands were not very valuable. But it is more remarkable that my hon. friend has not stated—at least I did not hear him state, nor did I hear anybody state in this debate—how much the province of Manitoba actually received from the 150,000 acres. It will be interesting to know exactly what the provinces did receive. I am satisfied, however, that the Minister of Finance must be away below the actual amount received when he places it at the nominal sum of $2 per acre. If any of these lands are still in existence and owned by the province they must be worth $20 an acre rather than the small sum of $2.

Mr. CARVELL.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). May I say to my hon. friend that the university lands never were owned by the province.

Mr. CARVELL. I appreciate the fact that they went into a fund for the benefit of the university, but that university exists for the advantage of the province, so that really the proceeds come back to the province in that way.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Oh no.

Mr. CARVELL. Then there is a difference of opinion between my hon. friend and myself. In 1884 there seemed to be an attempt made by the Federal parliament to rearrange the financial conditions of the different provinces and they there adhered to a certain matter of principle. They rearranged an increase of the debt allowance to each of the provinces on a proportionate basis according to the population. Now, that was a principle. They increased that debt, so far as the old provinces of Ontario and Quebec were concerned, by $5,397,000, Nova Scotia $793,368, New Brunswick $604,509, Manitoba $110,825, British Columbia $83,107, and Prince Edward Island $182,973. Now, the thing that I complain about particularly in this Bill, so far as the general financial arrangements are concerned, is the debt allowance. I contend, Sir, that it is unfair to the maritime provinces to a greater extent, probably, than anything else, and unfair to some extent to the provinces of Quebec and Ontario. It is not so great an injustice to these provinces as it is to the maritime provinces because they have in the past received large additions to their territory which are very valuable, and under which the province of Ontario is to-day receiving, I think I am safe in saying, millions of dollars in royalties on lands, timber and mines, and upon which the province of Quebec must receive large sums each year in stumpage and royalties on lands and timber.

But now we have a proposition—and I will not discuss it at length because there will be another opportunity during the session—to add to Quebec and Ontario; and you add a second time to the amount which they receive from the Dominion, whereas the maritime provinces received nothing; the maritime provinces cannot receive anything. Then, I want to point out the unfairness of this debt allowance to the province of Manitoba, a debt allowance of $8,000,000, upon which they will forever receive an estimated income of $381,584.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Did I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Carvell) to say that he never could see any reason for this allowance in lieu of debt? Do I understand him to argue that he never was able to see

reason for an allowance made to a province that came in without a debt?

Mr. CARVELL. That is my contention. If you want to give a province sufficient funds to carry on its affairs as a province, you ought to give it in a straight way, not by a circuitous method like this.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that a province that comes in and assumes a share of the debt of the whole Dominion, ought not to receive any compensation?

Mr. CARVELL. I thought the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Meighen's) argument on that point, was the most fallacious I ever heard him advance. I give him credit for being extremely logical as a rule,—I have told him so before, and I tell him so to-night. But I thought he was not only illogical, but absolutely fallacious in his argument on this subject to-day. If he will go back to the terms of confederation, he will find that the debt allowance was not given, because of the debt which these provinces must bear as a part of the whole, but it was based on this principle—I referred to it once before this evening, but I will speak of it again—that the actual debt of the province was assumed by the Dominion. In the case of the old provinces of Canada, nearly the whole debt of Canada, $62,000,000 of a debt of $67,000,000 was assumed, and this, I think, by an arrangement in later years, was increased to some extent. In the case of Nova Scotia, the debt was assumed at $8,000,000, and if it was found to be less than that Nova Scotia was to receive, the interest between the actual and the assumed debt. A similar treatment was accorded to New Brunswick, her debt being assumed at $7,000,000. But the old provinces of Canada and the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick did not receive interest on the debt thus assumed. The province of New Brunswick received interest on only about half a million. It is true, we had a debt of something over $6,000,000 assumed by the federal government. But my hon. friend forgets that at that time we also had assets and that we handed over these assets to the Dominion, amounting to almost that whole debt that was assumed. I cannot tell my hon. friend exactly the amount of these assets. I did not begin to look it up until the dinner recess, and I did not have time to prepare a complete statement. But I can give the hon. gentleman substantial foundation for the statement I have made. In the public accounts of Canada for 1868-9, at page 9, there is a statement of the assets belonging to the Dominion as of that date. I will not go over all these items, but take the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia as examples. We find that in railways alone that province hands over $6,520,900. And from the province of New Brunswick were the assets of the European and North American railway which is now part of the Intercolonial railway. This road was actually constructed and was handed over to the Dominion on the basis of $4,650,903.35. In addition I find the Norton and Apohaqui bridge at $15,595.25, and railway stores $99,888, or in these three items alone nearly $5,000,000 of actual liquid assets handed over to the federal government by the province of New Brunswick, and almost $7,000,000 of actual liquid assets handed over by Nova Scotia. Nor is that all. If the hon. gentleman will turn to the third schedule of the British North America Act he will see what was handed over by the provinces:

Canals with lands of water-power connected therewith.
Public harbours.
Lighthouses and piers, and Sable Island.
Steamboats, dredges and public vessels.
River and lake improvements.
Railways and railway stocks, mortgages and other debts due by the railway company.
Military roads.
Custom houses, post offices and all other public buildings, except such as the government of Canada appropriates for the use of the provincial legislatures and government.
Property transferred by the Imperial government, and known as ordinance property.
Armouries, drill sheds, military clothing and munitions of war, and lands set apart for general public purposes.

If you take the public accounts of Canada and follow the list of property coming under the items I have given, you will find that so far as Nova Scotia is concerned she actually handed over to the Dominion liquid assets to the amount of $7,500,000. And, so far as New Brunswick is concerned, you will find out that it is close to $6,000,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Why was an allowance made in lieu of debt not to the old provinces of Canada but to New Brunswick?

Mr. CARVELL. In order to bring the debt allowance on the basis of population to a parity with that of old Canada.

Mr. MEIGHEN. And the same with Manitoba.

Mr. CARVELL. When Manitoba came in she had not the population. According to the hon. gentleman's argument, the more people you get into a province the more you have to add to the debt allowance. But there is no suggestion that this should apply to New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. You may add a million people to those provinces, but they receive no increase in the debt allowance. New Brunswick, for example, is receiving and has been receiving for many years, al-

most ever since confederation, interest on something like $500,000 at 5 per cent. The federal government assumed a debt which is something over $6,000,000. But then we handed over to the federal government assets to that $6,000,000. Except the amount on which we are receiving 5 per cent, it is true that this debt was paid by the federal government, but we gave them assets with which they paid it. Some of the assets we handed over are among the best assets of the Dominion of Canada to-day. We gave the present Intercolonial railway practically constructed from St. John to Halifax; the only portion of the Intercolonial railway, I venture to say, which has paid its way, a portion which is paying more than twice as much as any other equal mileage on the whole system. Therefore, we paid the federal government for paying our debts, and we owe them nothing.

We would be delighted to take back the property which we gave them and pay our own debts. Then there are the customs and excise; but on the property alone my hon. friend would be delighted to take over the Intercolonial from St. John to Halifax and pay our own debts. Now, what did they do with Manitoba?

Mr. MEIGHEN. The hon. gentleman said that my explanation of the debt allowance was illegal and fallacious. If he will turn to page 1437 of 'Hansard,' of 1905, he will find exactly the same explanation given by the leader of the opposition.

Mr. CARVELL. I wish to follow my argument on my own line, and I am going to show whether my argument is logical or not. Now, the result is that the province of New Brunswick to-day is receiving as a debt allowance probably half a million to three quarters of a million dollars; the province of Nova Scotia is receiving a little more. The province of Manitoba, which has had a population equal to that of New Brunswick only within the last three or four years, and is only about equal to that of Nova Scotia, is receiving interest on $8,100,000 as a debt allowance. If my hon. friends can argue that this is fair and just to the maritime provinces, then I fail to see by what method of argument they can make it appear reasonable. I have already stated that so far as the allowance for land is concerned I think it is fair, the principle is good. I am not saying that the actual amount of figures is fair, but I think the principle is all right.

There is one thing which I cannot understand, and that is why the government of Prince Edward Island has not been making a demand for an increased allowance in lieu of land when Manitoba is being treated so generously, as Prince Edward Island had no public lands any more than Manitoba. When Prince Edward Island came into the union in 1873 they were allowed an annual amount of $45,000 a year, or $800,000 if they wished to borrow that for the purpose of purchasing land from the landed proprietors and selling it to the people again. If they borrowed the money and bought the land they had the property; if they did not borrow the money they got the $45,000 a year. So, therefore, for the purpose of argument, we are safe in saying that the province of Prince Edward Island receives $45,000 in lieu of lands. Prince Edward Island came into the union about the same time that Manitoba did. When Manitoba came into the union she received nothing in lieu of lands. In 1882, she was given $45,000 a year in lieu of lands, and in 1885 she was given the swamp lands, which we have been told here to-night aggregate 8,000,000 acres, and she was given $100,000 annually in lieu of her lands, and she has gone on receiving $100,000 annually ever since. But now the government come down and propose to give the province of Manitoba for all time to come, after making all allowances for interest on what she has received for some of her swamp lands, the magnificent sum of $413,270 annually. Why on earth has not Prince Edward Island been considered, when Manitoba has been treated so magnanimously? It seems remarkable that Prince Edward Island has been entirely forgotten in this arrangement. I merely throw this suggestion out to the hon. members representing Prince Edward Island in this House. I hope hon. gentlemen from Prince Edward Island supporting this government will wake up to the enormity of the situation, to the manner in which they have been treated by the present government in granting this allowance to the province of Manitoba in lieu of her lands.

Now I come to discuss the third branch of the case, and that is the arrearages. While the second branch of the case, or the financial arrangements, are possibly unfair to the rest of Canada, yet they have followed to some extent previous legislation, and in some instances they are justified as a matter of principle. But I cannot for the life of me see where you can justify these arrearages from any standpoint whatever. My hon. friends from Manitoba say, Well, we have had a grievance. My hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Aikins) said that a great many years ago they wanted to extend their boundaries eastward and the Privy Council said they were wrong. Though the highest court in the Empire says they are wrong, yet they insist that they have a grievance. Then they said, We want to go westward to Regina. But the people of Regina said No, and the province of Sas-

katchewan would have nothing to do with them. Then they say, We have another grievance, we want to get northward. And because they could not get northward they have another grievance, and because they have all these grievances the Minister of Finance said the other night:

> I think this matter goes very much deeper than that. The province of Manitoba has been dissatisfied for years, and where you have such a province as Manitoba dissatisfied, and expressing that dissatisfaction irritably, there must be, as my hon. friend once said, something wrong in the political situation

And because Manitoba has had a grievance for all these years the Minister of Finance says: Well, you may have been unreasonable, I think probably you have, but you have a grievance, there is an irritation going on, and it won't do to have the province of Manitoba with a grievance; therefore we will give you something which you are not entitled to, and which we are not giving to any other province in Canada. Will any one say that I am drawing the parallel unfairly? I say the proposition cannot be justified on any logical argument or with any logical reason. The Minister of Finance has not tried to justify it—except, and I will do him this credit, that ten times in the short speech that he made on the resolution, he said: We are going to give her what you gave Alberta and Saskatchewan. That is the Minister of Finance's justification for it—because you did this for Alberta and Saskatchewan we are going to do it for Manitoba. I want my hon. friends to consider the application of this reason to the rest of Canada. Now let us see where it will land us. As I said before, they have a grievance, they are irritated, and it won't do to have Manitoba irritated, therefore we must give them what they want. What do you think will happen next? Manitoba will say: Well, we have a sentimental side to this question. We were called the postage stamp province, and we wanted that remedied. Now we have reason to believe that there is some land round the North Pole, and we want land at the North Pole, and all we have to do is to keep at it long enough, and if the Minister of Finance is in power long enough, he will come back and say, Manitoba has got a grievance, she is dissatisfied, she is irritated, she wants land round the North Pole, it won't do to have Manitoba dissatisfied, and therefore we must either give her land at the North Pole or another donation of a few millions. That is the logical conclusion. I would advise every province in Canada to get busy and work up a grievance. I think you will find that the next thing will be that my friend Sir James Whitney will be coming up here and he will say, I have a grievance, I wanted lands clear to the Nelson river, and you have only given me the right of way. And if he persists long enough, and shouts loud enough, and argues strenuously enough, and the hon. gentlemen opposite remain in power long enough, they will say: It won't do to have Ontario dissatisfied, therefore we have got to give them a couple of million dollars.

That is the only logical position but, there is another way of getting at it. Let us analyse it. My hon. friend says that they should have gotten this land in 1905, but as they did not get it, and as this parliament only passed that resolution saying that they should have it in 1908, therefore, we will date the arrearages back to 1908 and these arrearages are based on two considerations. First, on the debt account. The debt account has been discussed a good deal. I have discussed it myself. I have read every word uttered by the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister on the discussion on the resolutions, I have listened to everything that has been said here to-day and I would like to know, and I hope the Minister of Finance or some other member on the other side of the House, will enlighten us, as to the ground on which the province of Manitoba is being given $202,637 for four years, or a total sum of $810,648. What can be the reason unless it be that Manitoba has a public grievance, and we do not want to have Manitoba irritated, and therefore, we must give her this money. It is not on the ground that if this added territory had been given to her four years ago, she would have more population so that she could have drawn a per capita allowance. It cannot be on that ground as a simple statement of the population would show. The right hon. leader of the government told us this afternoon that there are now 5,571 people in that territory of whom 4,822 are Indians. The federal government looks after the Indians; therefore, you would be reduced down to about 900 people which the Manitoba government would have been compelled to look after during these four years. You are giving them $800,000 because they were not called upon to look after these 900 white people in the last four years. I cannot see any other reason. But if that be illogical and unreasonable, it pales into insignificance when compared with the reasons given for the allowance in lieu of land. I hope that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance will follow me on this point, because he at least, I presume, would like to be able to justify it. It is a well-known principle that we are giving money to the prairie provinces, because they do not have the control of their lands, they have not a chance to sell them, they have not the right to make money out of them, they do not get the minerals, they get nothing out of them whatever, and they are compelled to spend

money in carrying on the ordinary affairs of the government within their territory, let it be large or small. The theory is, that the province of Manitoba must expend money in building roads and bridges, to some extent, providing for school accommodation, looking after the adminstration of justice, and doing all the other things that go to make up the cost of the administration of affairs of government in that portion of the province. We are giving them $413,270 for all time in the future to provide for the administration of the affairs of the government in this added territory. You have only got at the present time 900 people to look after, because the Indians will still be looked after by the federal government. Let us take the last four years. Manitoba has not owned these lands in the last four years, it has not spent a dollar on schools, it has not spent a dollar on roads, it has not spent a dollar on bridges or on any other governmental affairs within that territory for the last four years. It has not incurred either directly or indirectly, one cent of liability in the last four years, and there is no possibility of it being called upon to pay a cent, by reason of the administration of this territory in the last four years. Yet the people of Canada, the people of the maritime provinces, are to pay their proportion of this magnificent sum of $1,368,000 to the province of Manitoba for doing that which they have not done, that which they never will do. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance wants the people of this country to feel that this is a justifiable transaction. I think that he will have to look up some arguments that have not yet been produced in order to justify to his own mind, let alone the people of this country, the grant of this sum to the province of Manitoba. If my hon. friend said: Well, we want to make a present to the province of Manitoba, and then, if he would make a present to the other provinces of Canada in proportion to their population and just demands, there could not be so much objection to it because there you have a principle. But here, without rhyme or reason, without any justification apparent on its face, you are presenting the province of Manitoba with $1,368,000 for doing nothing and for not pretending to do anything. Is there a reason for this? There must be a reason for it. My hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) told the reason why. I am not going into that to any great extent. But, before I take up that branch, I want to take another glance into the unfairness of this arrangement to the people of the rest of Canada. While in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia—I take these two as an illustration—we have our lands, our minerals and whatever we can make out of them, yet we have to look after all the affairs of our country in the way of roads, bridges, public buildings, schools and everything else connected with the affairs of the government. The right hon. leader of the government gave some figures as to what the provinces had received during the last year as territorial revenue from their lands and he gave the province of New Brunswick as receiving $494,000 and Nova Scotia $662,000 in the year 1910. We will say that in New Brunswick we received last year $494,000 from our public domain. I may say here that we have never received that much before. I do not believe that since confederation we have averaged $200,000 from our public domain; we certainly never averaged $250,000. While I am not going to go into local matters, I make this statement that if we continue milking $494,000 a year out of our public domain in New Brunswick, in twenty years we will not have any public domain because, while they are supposed to be cutting lumber in New Brunswick, they are practically cutting pulp-wood. They are getting twice the revenue that they ever got before, but they are doing it at a terrible sacrifice and they are paying the awful penalty in the depreciation of our capital, the only source which we have in New Brunswick from which to raise money except that which we raise from direct taxation. But, that is only by the way. My right hon. friend, however, failed to take into consideration the fact that Manitoba last year received from her proportion of the school lands alone $200,000, as I find by the sessional papers of Manitoba for 1911, or half as much money was paid to Manitoba last year for education alone out of the sale of Dominion lands as was received in New Brunswick altogether from our territorial revenue.

That has not been taken into consideration. The more you compare the financial terms you are giving to Manitoba with the terms given to the other provinces of the Dominion, the more unreasonable do they appear to any fair-minded person. I agree in the opinion of the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) that this is an unfair trade even from the standpoint of Manitoba and, I know I may be charged as being illogical when I say it is unfair to everybody. It is unfair to Manitoba for this reason: You are taking from Manitoba swamp lands which are of very great value, and, there is of course a difference of opinion as to what that value is. But, from the sessional papers of the Manitoba legislature for 1900 I find that in that year the province sold 37,096 acres of land for $115,295, the price ranging from two dollars to five dollars per acre, and the average price be-

ing $3.14. The sessional papers of the Manitoba legislature for 1911 show that last year the provinces sold 142,535 for which was received $737,395, or an average price of $5.17 per acre, so that in these eleven years the average price of these swamp lands has increased by two dollars per acre. Of course, the value of these lands depends on your building roads into them and inducing settlement, and assuming that this is done it is fair to say that the remaining lands are worth more than five dollars per acre. Then, if you take the seven million acres and say they are worth five dollars an acre, the result is that the Dominion is taking from the province of Manitoba an asset worth thirty-five million dollars. These lands are, of course, increasing rapidly in value and the report of the Manitoba government, stated last year that they were selling all the way from three dollars to nineteen dollars per acre, and at the present time they were selling at from six to twelve dollars per acre. It may be said that the province of Manitoba would have to spend a great deal of money in draining these lands in order to make them valuable, but as I understand it the province does not spend out of the ordinary revenue account any money whatsoever to drain these lands. The province is divided into nineteen different drainage districts, and these drainage districts have issued debentures which at present amount to $1,897,853. As I understand it these debentures are a lien upon the land, and the man who buys the swamp lands buys them subject to this lien so that he and his associates in the end not only pay the cost of the drainage, but the interest as well. That is my understanding of it, and the Minister of the Interior can correct me if I am wrong. It is, therefore, the case that these lands were worth last year $5.17 an acre in the province of Manitoba irrespective of drainage, and the money expended for drainage simply appreciates their value because it is paid by the owners of the land and is not practically chargeable to the province. It is argued by gentlemen on the other side that it is only fair when we are taking these lands, to compensate the province for them, but, these hon. gentlemen must remember that the government of Canada does not sell land and will not sell land. The hon. gentleman from Brandon (Mr. Aikins) told us that it was the duty of the Dominion government to drain these lands and make them valuable, but that being done he will no doubt tell us that it is the duty of the Dominion government to give them away to homesteaders. Then, when these lands are developed, settlers will be brought in and every man, woman and child that is brought into Manitoba yields a Dominion subsidy revenue of eighty cents per head to the province, so that from the Dominion standpoint we are receiving nothing and from the standpoint of the province, we are taking that from the province which can be made of very great value to it. It may be asked, why the province of Manitoba accepted such an unreasonable bargain. Well, the only reason I can see is that the province is a little hard up at the present time for ready cash. If the Minister of the Interior would tell us the real facts he would have to admit that the dividends from his telephone scheme are not as great as he anticipated and that in consequence the province of Manitoba is in an unenviable position financially. The fact is, I believe, that Manitoba is so financially hard up that the Conservatives there are willing to sacrifice the immense potential value of these lands in order to get some ready cash in hand to pay their liabilities and to get themselves out of their difficulties. There cannot be any other reason that I can see for it. It is fair to assume that if other and better methods were adopted in selling these lands they would bring in more than $5.17 an acre, and, therefore, from the standpoint of Manitoba the province is getting $2,000,000 cash and is giving away a heritage which will be of enormous value in time to come. The provincial accounts of Manitoba show that last year the province received from lands alone $648,848, thus they are giving to the Dominion lands which will yield them that sum each year in return for a lump sum of $2,178,000. I think my Conservative friends from Manitoba will have to admit that that is not a good business proposition.

For these reasons the Bill is ill-advised and ought not to be passed. I think that the government are not treating the rest of Canada fairly in not giving the rest of the provinces that to which they are entitled. It is true they are putting them off with a promise and saying: When we give back all lands to the three prairie provinces we will take into consideration the rest of the maritime provinces—but it may be a long time before they give the lands back to the prairie provinces. We all know our hon. friends opposite and we can conceive of a condition of affairs in the three provinces when they might be willing to give them back their lands, but we know a condition of affairs when they will not be willing to give them back their lands, and I make the prophecy now that if the political conditions in the prairie provinces remain as they are to-day it will be many years before those provinces get back their lands, and if that be true it will be many years before the maritime provinces get any change in their financial arrangements or receive justice to which they are entitled under this arrangement. Therefore it would be well for the government to consider even at this late

date, the unfair treatment accorded to the rest of Canada, to revise the conditions, to change the Bill or hold it over until an arrangement can be made with all the provinces, thus arriving at something which will be fairly definite, and above all things, based on some principle. When you have arrived at a conclusion based on that principle then you will have that splendid condition which my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Aikins) so desires, when we shall have peace and harmony between all the provinces of Canada.

Hon. T. W. CROTHERS (Minister of Labour). Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen who have criticised this Bill have placed themselves in a position of hopeless confusion. By their addresses, and by an address of the right hon. the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) a few years ago, they have clearly and distinctly answered each other. The criticism was taken by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) that in carrying out the provisions of this Bill the other provinces of Canada would be unfairly dealt with, first by reason of giving to Manitoba a large tract of territory that does not belong to the province of Manitoba, but that belongs to all the provinces of Canada, and therefore the gift or the attachment of this large and valuable territory should not be made to Manitoba without consulting the other provinces and securing their consent thereto. The other ground on which he objects to the Bill is that it proposes to pay out of the treasury of this country a large sum to Manitoba. The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) contends that that treasury belongs to all the provinces of Canada and not to any one province. I think that I shall be able to answer in one moment from a speech delivered by the leader of the opposition a few years ago the first objection, namely, that the other provinces are being unfairly dealt with by attaching to Manitoba this large tract of territory. The right hon. the leader of the opposition, on July 13, 1908, when introducing resolutions dealing with these same lands and proposing to add them to the province of Manitoba, used these words:

My honourable friend from Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) has taken the position that the policy we have adopted is unfair to the maritime provinces, and that they are entitled to some compensation, because the territories which we acquired in 1869 in the Hudson bay district were paid for by the Dominion of Canada, and that if we dispose of them, we should give some compensation to the maritime provinces. Well, the question is not new, it has been raised before, and it has received no sclution such as the honourable gentleman now desires. These territories were acquired in 1869, and in the year following, the parliament of Canada carved out of them a certain domain for the province of Manitoba. But no compensation was asked by the maritime provinces. Later on when we appropriated a certain portion of that domain for the new provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, we made the same disposition,——

—and the lower provinces made no claim thereto.

Mr. FOWLER. Would not the right honourable gentleman see a distinction between the carving out of this territory a new province and adding out of this territory to the provinces forming part of confederation when Nova Scotia and New Brunswick came in?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Does the honourable gentleman believe it makes any difference? The basis of our national life is a federative system. This country is covered by provinces, that is the idea which we have always had before us. That has been the case in the United States. The United States purchased territory from France, Louisiana and from other countries. Since that time her policy has been to turn those territories into states, forming now the American Union. This is the object we aim at. For my part, I regret that the climatic conditions are such in this new territory that it cannot be created into new provinces. I wish we could form a new province on the Hudson bay. I wish we could form a new province out of the Mackenzie river territory. I wish we could form a new province of Ungava. But while it is a wish I devoutly entertain, every man must see that such a thing is impossible. No man, I am sure, from the maritime provinces pretends that we could form new provinces out of that territory. If, then, that territory cannot be turned into new provinces, does it not seem to my honourable friend that the best way to deal with it is to annex it to the existing provinces? We must come to that conclusion. We cannot desire that at one end of this Dominion we should have provinces and at the other end a large unorganized territory. Is not that the goal to which we should aspire, that every inch of Canadian territory should ultimately be under provincial organization? That has been the policy of the United States, until to-day I think all their territory has been turned into states.

My hon. friend from St. John was a member of the government which proposed resolutions giving to Manitoba the very same territory that this Bill proposes to give. He listened to my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) explaining why, as I have just read, the maritime provinces would have no ground of complaint, and I presume he agreed with that statement at that time, and yet to-day, in criticising this Bill, he sets that forth as a reason why the lower provinces are being unfairly dealt with because we are proposing by this Bill to attach to Manitoba a large territory which now belongs to the whole Dominion of Canada. So that the right hon. the leader of the opposition in the remarks he made on the 13th of July, 1908, answers very effectually one argument adduced by the hon.

member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) in criticising this Bill. The other argument that he adduced was that we are proposing to pay Manitoba a large sum of money in which the lower provinces are interested, and that it would be unfair to take this large sum of money out of the public treasury and give it over to Manitoba without consulting the other provinces. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) has been very effectively answered by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), who has proved to a demonstration, to his own satisfaction at least, that that offer made to Manitoba three years ago was $885,000 a year better for Manitoba than the provisions set forth in this Bill.

So that my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) completely answers the other branch of the argument of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley). According to my hon. friend from Edmonton, Manitoba is getting $885,000 less under this Bill than the government of which he was a member offered the province of Manitoba. Now I assume he will admit that the offer of the government of which he was a member was not an excessive offer or an exaggerated offer, that in their opinion at least, it was a reasonable offer, and yet he tells us to-day that by that offer he proposed to give to Manitoba $885,000 a year more than we propose to give under this Bill. And at the same time he tells us that the lower provinces— Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and the other provinces— have great grounds of complaint because he offered Manitoba $885,000 more a year than we offer in this Bill. Well my hon. friend from Edmonton has spent a good deal of time in this House during the present session in advocating what purported to be the interests of the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta. His benevolence has extended down to the provinces of Manitoba and Ontario, and he has bewailed the lack of wisdom manifested by the representatives of these provinces in agreeing to this Bill. Let me tell my hon. friends that the gentlemen who represent Ontario in this House have the utmost confidence in the ability, sagacity and patriotism of Sir James Whitney, and his government of Ontario. We are quite satisfied that Sir James is not permitting any of the best interests of Ontario to be sacrificed in this Bill, and we are quite willing to leave it to him. The gentlemen who represent Manitoba in this House have the same confidence in the government of that province and in the Hon. R. P. Roblin, an old schoolmate of mine, and his colleagues that they will look after the best interests of their province. I would recommend my hon. friend from Edmonton to take the advice of the member from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) who said that he was quite willing to leave the interests of Ontario and Manitoba to the governments of these respective provinces. So where are all the objections to this Bill? They are answered in two or three words, not answered by members on this side, but by members on that side, the one contradicting the other. Let us look at the historical aspect of this matter for one moment because I want to refer to some of the financial arrangements with the different provinces. It is nearly 230 years since King Charles of England conveyed to the governor and company of adventurers of England trading in Hudson bay all that territory draining into the Hudson bay—Rupert Land. Afterwards they by lease acquired from the home government the rest of the territory extending out to the Rocky Mountains, the largest or one of the largest, real estate transactions recorded in history. That company, usually known as the Hudson's Bay Company, in substance owned and governed that one-third of the continent for 190 years almost as an independent nation. In 1867 the fathers of confederation had a vision, they had a foresight, they looked into the future, they prepared not only for the union of the old provinces of Canada, but they looked forward to the day when Canada would compose all of the northerly half of the North American continent extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and they provided in the British North America Act first for the union of the three provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick—and afterwards for the admission into the union of Prince Edward Island, British Columbia, Newfoundland, Rupert Land and the Northwest Territories. In 1870 the Manitoba Act was passed. You all know that at the time Manitoba was formed it contained only a very small area of land some 13,400 square miles from the 93rd meridian of west longitude to the 96th, and somewhere about 132 miles in the other direction. In the year 1877 the boundaries of Manitoba were slightly extended to make them conform to the system of Dominion surveys that had been made in that part of the country. In 1881 this parliament proposed to extend the boundaries of Manitoba to a very great extent, reaching away down eastward to the line drawn northerly from the confluence of the Ohio and Mississippi rivers. But the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council by their judgment, held that they were not entitled to a large portion of that land. This Bill provides that there shall be added to the province of Ontario 40,000 square miles in area which was, by judgment held to be in the province of Manitoba. We have heard a good deal about the debt allowance and

so on. At the time of confederation there were four classes of subsidies recognized and only four, and there has been one added since. There was, in the first class, a sum allotted to each province for government and legislation, secondly, there was provision for allowing 80 cents per head of the population, thirdly, there was provision for paying the several provinces certain sums growing out of the allowance for debt, and in the fourth class, there were special grants. Now I have been unable from the statutes, to ascertain any very definite principle upon which any of these allowances were made. If you look at the Act of 1867, you will find in the first place, that the debt allowed the old province of Canada, which was composed of Ontario and Quebec, was $62,500,000, to the province of Nova Scotia, $8,000,000 and to the province of New Brunswick $7,000,000. There is a special grant allowed in the British North America Act for New Brunswick. That Act provides that the provinces of Ontario and Quebec should be allowed 80 cents per head of their population, based upon the population of 1861. Now that was not made applicable under the British North America Act to the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, for you will find in section 118 of the British North America Act, these words:

The following sums shall be paid yearly by Canada to the several provinces for the support of their governments and legislatures——

The amounts are guaranteed and the section continues:

—and an annual grant in aid of each province shall be made equal to eighty cents per head of the population as ascertained by the census of one thousand eight hundred and sixty-one, and in the case of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick the 80 cents per head was to be based on the decennial census.

They had not adhered to the same principle which was applied to Ontario and Quebec.

—by each subsequent decennial census until the population of each of those two provinces amounts to four hundred thousand souls, at which rate such grant shall thereafter remain.

Now there is a special provision in the Act of 1867 which is applicable to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and not made applicable to Quebec and Ontario. Then you have a special grant made to New Brunswick by this very Act in the very next section:

New Brunswick shall receive by half-yearly payments in advance from Canada for a period of ten years from the Union an additional allowance of sixty-three thousand dollars per annum——

On what principle? There is nothing in the Act to indicate.

Mr. CROTHERS.

—but as long as the public debt of that province remains under seven million dollars, a deduction equal to the interest at five per centum per annum on such deficiency shall be made from that allowance of sixty-three thousand dollars.

Then I find after the union there were some special grants, and I may say that each one of these four classes has been modified from time to time. The sum allowed for government and legislation has been changed many times by statute. The sum allowed per head has been changed at least once, even as to Ontario and Quebec. At the conference in 1906—it was agreed that the annual sum for government and legislation should be $240,000 instead of $80,000, as it had been up to that time in the two provinces, and it was agreed also that their per capita allowance should, instead of being based on the population of 1861, be based upon the decennial census. The special grants have been changed. The debt allowance has been changed time and time again by special legislation.

The first special grant after confederation I find recorded was made to Nova Scotia in 1869, by chap. 2, 32-33 Vic. It was a grant of $82,695 a year. New Brunswick got the amount I mentioned a moment ago, $63,000 for ten years. In the case of Manitoba several changes have been made. Changes were made in 1873, 1874, 1884, and 1907. All these classes of subsidies have been varied from time to time by statute on special grounds. I cannot find any principle upon which they have gone. Now, we come to the present Bill. These three prairie provinces occupy a different position in confederation from that of the other provinces. The British North America Act, section 109, provides:

All lands, mines, minerals and royalties, belonging to the several provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick at the union, and all sums then due or payable for such lands, mines, minerals or royalties, shall belong to the several provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick in which the same are situate or arise subject to any trusts existing in respect thereof, and to any interest other than that of the province in the same.

But these three western provinces, out of the nine provinces of the Dominion, have been deprived of the public lands within their borders. Hence they are to be dealt with on a different basis altogether. Saskatchewan and Alberta, in 1905, were very generously dealt with. Manitoba now is asking, as being in the same class as the other two, to be dealt with on the same basis, and it is proposed by this Bill to do it. Now, I only repeat what I started with, that the hon. gentleman who began this criticism against this Bill has been completely and fully answered by hon. gentlemen who followed him on the other side,

and by the right honourable the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). In the first place, the plea that the other provinces are unfairly dealt with by giving this territory to Manitoba was completely answered by the speech of the present leader of the opposition on the 13th of July, 1908. The statement that too much money is being paid to Manitoba is answered by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), who showed that the government of which he was a member, had offered Manitoba $885,000 more than is provided under this Bill.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton). It is somewhat late, and if it is satisfactory to the leader of the House, I would move the adjournment of the debate.

Some hon. MEMBERS. It is early yet.

Mr. McKENZIE. If I were allowed to speak on another occasion my audience would be fresher than at the present time. But if it is the desire of the leader of the House that I should speak on this occasion, I will do so.

It might have been thought that the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) having been put up to reply to the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), he would be able to dispose of the argument of the hon. member for St. John in a way satisfactory to the government. But it is evident that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) regards the hon. member from St. John as not having been answered. He found the arguments of that hon. gentleman were too keen and cogent, too much to the point, and also that they were not answered by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie, and he undertook to answer them himself. I must say, that if I am capable of following the line of argument presented by the Minister of Labour, it will be necessary to put up somebody else on that other side. If the hon. member for St. John was not answered by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie I can assure you if I am a judge at all, he stands still unanswered, and it is just as necessary now, as it was before to make a proper, a substantial and conclusive reply, if such a thing be possible, to the argument put forward by the hon. member for St. John. The point made by the hon. member for St. John was that somewhere in the neighbourhood of $3,000,000 was being paid to the province of Manitoba without the slightest justification either under the constitution or any form of law that we know of in this Dominion. And that point is still unanswered. As I have suggested, it will be necessary for the Minister of Finance himself, who is answerable to the people of this country for what shall become of the public revenue, to either give a satisfactory answer to the hon. gentleman from St. John or strike this provision out of the Bill. The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Aikins) said that some hon. members on this side were finding fault with the terms because they were too good and some because they were too bad. I submit that it does not make any difference whether the terms are good or bad when we are dealing with the provisions of the statutes under which we live. If we make a bargain which must be governed by the constitution and have no right to break away from it and to make bargains and agreements that have no foundation in the conditions and terms of that constitution, I submit that a bargain in reference to the responsibilities of the citizens of this Dominion must not be governed by the generosity or wishes of any government which for the time being happens to be in power. I submit that the rights of our provinces and of each citizen must be founded upon a better and more stable basis than that. We came into the family of confederation upon a well-defined basis and subject to conditions which were regarded as fair to all, and we have the right to suppose that whether we are in the maritime provinces or in British Columbia, whether the province to which we belong is washed by the surges of the Atlantic, or by the waves of the Pacific, the same laws must apply, and that the conditions under which we entered confederation shall be regarded and respected by the government.

I submit that the moment we depart from that principle, the moment we come, as the Minister of Finance said the other day, to be good-natured, the moment that it is a question of kindliness apart from the consideration of actual facts and conditions and the relations of the provinces to each other and to confederation, that moment we are treading on dangerous ground. The part of the British North America Act which deals with this particular point now under consideration is very simple and very easily understood. It is not necessary to go over the historical events to explain why we are dealing with Manitoba in this way. I was going to say that at the time of confederation it was discovered shortly afterwards that there were some grave doubts as to whether this parliament had the right to create provinces at all, or whether we had any right to make a constitutional compact with any territory, and create it into a province. It was found necessary to go back to the mother country for authority and get a new chapter to add to the British North America Act, and remove all question as to our right to create provinces. Under that Act we got the right to create provinces, to give them a constitution, and all the powers. I submit that we have no right to deal with

any province in the way of giving it better terms, or worse terms, or any terms at all, except under the authority bestowed on us by the British North America Act of 1871. If it is necessary to give better terms to any province, and if we do not find the authority to do so in the British North America Act, it is much better that the province should for the moment put up with the disadvantage, until the constitution is amended and the necessary power is given to this parliament to deal with the conditions. I submit that unless we have the power in the constitution to-day to do what we are doing, it is much better for all concerned that Manitoba should wait until we get the necessary authority than to go at it haphazard as we are doing now. I was saying that when we gave a province its boundaries, its lands and its conditions, we have no authority afterwards, so far as that province is concerned, to add to or take anything away from it. Under section 2 of the British North America Act of 1871 it it said:

> The parliament of Canada may from time to time establish new provinces in any territories forming for the time being part of the Dominion of Canada but not included in any province thereof, and may, at the time of such establishment, make provision for the constitution and administration of any such province, and for the passing of laws for the peace, order and good government of such province and for its representation in the said parliament.

If we had no further power, I submit that would be the end of any legislation of ours with regard to the boundaries of Manitoba. But the next section of the Act mentions something else that we can do:

> The parliament of Canada may from time to time, with the consent of the legislature of any province of the said Dominion, increase, diminish or otherwise alter the limits of such province, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the said legislature, and may, with the like consent, make provisions respecting the effect and operation of any such increase or diminution or alteration of territory in relation to any province affected thereby.

I submit that all the power we have there is to make such further financial arrangements with the province as are made necessary by reason of the territory that we add to it. We have no power there to go to the basis of confederation and reconstruct it. We can make such financial arrangements as are necessary to meet the necessities of the case by reason of the territory being enlarged. But this Bill goes beyond the constitutional powers of this House under the British North America Act, goes to the basis of the arrangement that was made with Manitoba in 1870, and the arrangements that were made in 1885. The arrangements that were made in 1907 disorganize the whole business, and makes a new basis of the financial agreement altogether. For what reason? The reason is that the new arrangements were made at the time Alberta and Saskatchewan were created provinces. These arrangements were made under section 2 of the British North America Act of 1871, which gives us the right to make them. We had the right to make whatever arrangement we pleased with Alberta and Saskatchewan, the best arrangements we could make, for we had authority to do so. But I submit that when you come down to a rearrangement under subsection 3, it only gives the right to rearrange the financial conditions in order to meet the necessities of the province.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The hon. gentleman will admit that on several occasions the parliament of Canada has readjusted the terms of confederation in the case of other provinces.

Mr. McKENZIE. That was done, but I say that the Act of 1895 was in the way of a settlement, as I understand it, with the province of Manitoba, and the other provinces were putting forward certain claims on the Dominion.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The first case was for the benefit of the hon. gentleman's own province in 1869.

Mr. McKENZIE. It does not make the slightest difference. But it was explained here that that was the mere correcting of a mistake in the arrangement of the debt at the time. That was the reason why better terms were given to the province of Nova Scotia. But it is no answer to tell me that a certain thing was done if that thing was not constitutional. I suppose as we grow in population and strength, and as we become wiser in experience, we shall grow in knowledge of the constitution under which we live. I find in our constitution a provision which says that we can add to a province from time to time, and when we do add territory to a province we must make such financial arrangements as will compensate that province for the charges that have been brought about. But certainly we have no authority to go back to the foundation and disorganize that. That is the condition which I find here. I find that in the preamble of the Bill the idea I suggest has been to some extent followed, so far as the draftsman could, until he found it necessary to break away from it; that is, he was going to provide for the necessities of the case where additional territory had been added to a province.

The preamble says:

Whereas, on the thirteenth day of July, one thousand nine hundred and eight, the House of Commons resolved that the limits of the province of Manitoba should be increased by the extension of the boundaries of the province northward to the sixtieth parallel of latitude and north-eastward to the shores of Hudson bay, as in the said resolution is more particularly set out, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the legislature, Manitoba and the parliament of Canada.

And whereas it is desirable that the financial terms——

—should be established. That is the preamble but that is a preamble that is not consistent with the third section of the British North America Act, 1871. They have departed from that and gone into an arrangement which will change the conditions. They have departed from the provisions of the constitution and are acting without authority. I think this parliament is acting without authority inasmuch as the Manitoba legislature did not pass an Act authorizing what we are doing here. This subsection 3 of the constitution of 1871 contemplates that the terms will be accepted by the province, put in the concrete form of an Act and passed by the legislature before we have authority at all. I will have to read it again to show that our power in this legislation is conditioned upon the legislature of Manitoba passing an Act agreeing to the terms upon which we are going to legislate.

3. The parliament of Canada may from time to time, with the consent of the legislature of any province of the said Dominion, increase, diminish or otherwise alter the limits of such province, upon such terms and condition as may be agreed to by said legislature, and may, with the like consent, make provision respecting the effect and operation of any such increase or diminution or alteration of territory in relation to any province affected thereby.

That is the way that the Act was understood by the advisers of the Crown in 1881 as corroborated by an Act of the legislature of Manitoba, passed in 1881, and recited by the drafters of the Act of 1881 passed by this House. The preamble of the Act of 1881 says:

Whereas, by an Act of the legislature of Manitoba passed during the session thereof held in the present year of Her Majesty's reign and intitutled an Act to provide for the extension of the boundaries of the province of Manitoba.

And so on. That shows that on that occasion at least the construction which I want to put upon the Act was the construction which was accepted and acted upon by the officers of the Crown. They reached the conclusion that it was necessary before they could move in this House that the legislature of Manitoba should put in the concrete form of an Act its consent to the provisions proposed and submit that Act to this parliament to be acted upon. That has not been done in this case and I submit to you, Sir, and the members of the government that the conditions precedent have not been complied with. What does the sixth section of the British North America Act say? If there was nothing in the argument that I am putting forward it might well be said that I am wrong and that the construction that I wish to put upon it is not in accordance with the meaning of the spirit of the Act. But, we find an Act passed dealing with section 2 and section 3. Section 6 says:

Except as provided by the third section of this Act, it shall not be competent for the parliament of Canada to alter the provisions of the last mentioned Act of the said parliament, in so far as it relates to the province of Manitoba, or of any other Act hereafter establishing new provinces in the said Dominion subject always to the right of the legislature of the province of Manitoba to alter from time to time the provisions of any law respecting the qualification of electors and members of the legislative assembly, and to make laws respecting elections in the said province.

I am not aware that there is any law of the Dominion of Canada or any law of the federal parliament in any way changing that position. We are told here positively that we have no authority to change the condition in regard to Manitoba or any new province except as we find these conditions laid down in section 3 of this Act. I have not yet heard any answer to this contention, and I have not heard any explanation. I will expect to hear that there is some authority, that there is some way, by which we can get over section 3, section 2 and section 6 of this Act, and that there is some authority by which we can ignore the arrangements entered into at confederation by the different provinces. If there is no authority for ignoring these arrangements then, of course, we are going haphazard and there is no security for property or life under confederation by reason of any of the terms thereof. The question of education is regarded as being very sacred under the terms of this constitution of ours by many of the provinces. Many of the provinces think they have safeguards under the constitution with respect to education that cannot be disturbed or interfered with. They feel that they possess those safeguards as being based upon the terms of the constitution itself. If that can be overridden and overrun by some Act that we may pass in this parliament what is the good of the terms of the constitution? And if they are no good in that case, if they are not to be respected

and accepted in that case or in this, then, of course, all that is necessary is that we pass an Act of this parliament that will override any of the terms of the constitution. Upon that basis and for these reasons I submit that we have no authority at all to change the terms of confederation or the terms upon which Manitoba entered confederation. Manitoba may have entered confederation on terms that were not satisfactory. Manitoba may have entered the confederation on terms that were not as good as they ought to be. Then, of course, there is a constitutional way of remedying the difficulty. That constitutional way, I presume, was followed, particularly in 1907, when at a conference of all the provinces of the Dominion a basis for the payment of subsidies to the provinces was agreed upon which was perfectly satisfactory to the present Premier of Manitoba and to the hon. gentleman who is now Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers), and who was then an important member of the Manitoba government. They, at that time, agreed to the conditions that were accepted by this House and as to which an address was presented to His Majesty for legislation readjusting and reconstructing the terms of confederation. In 1907 the terms of confederation were constitutionally readjusted by an Act of the Imperial parliament which can be found in the Acts of 1908 of this parliament, and, that being the case, I think it is rather strange that now we are making another change, setting aside altogether everything that has been done from 1870 down to the present and taking a new standard for confederation. What is the standard that is taken now? The standard up to now was the proper adjustment of all our difficulties, financial and otherwise, under the terms of that Act.

If this Bill is founded on right and justice the inference from it is that we must start afresh and give new terms to every other province in the Dominion. I submit that there is no justification for acting in this way. I believe the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) was perfectly within constitutional lines when he said that if we were to give better conditions to Manitoba it should only be done after the provinces had all sat down with the Dominion and heard the grievances of Manitoba, if grievances she had, and then make provision to remedy them. But, if each province of the Dominion can come to the government at Ottawa and get better conditions according to the pull it has with the government, and that seems to be the only rule now, where is it all going to end? We heard to-night that the fate of Manitoba could very well be left to the Premier of Manitoba, and acording to the Minister of Labour, Mr. Roblin would see to it that his province received fair treatment at the hands of this government. We were also told that Sir James Whitney and the government of Ontario would see to it that Ontario was well treated, but that is not the spirit in which to deal with a great question of this kind, and that is not the way in which the people of this country would wish to have it dealt with. The people of Canada want to know whether or not we have a constitution in this country; they want to know whether there is going to be an equitable scale of division between the provinces, so that each province will be dealt with according to the understanding on which it entered confederation, and not because Mr. So-and-so and Mr. Somebody-else is more vigilant than another to look after its rights. I submit that there is no constitutional basis for this law and that it is simply a makeshift to get over a certain contingency in order to bolster up the Manitoba government and try and place the province in a better financial condition than it is in to-day. I wish that some one on the other side of the House, who knows something about the subject, would tell me where we find our authority for passing legislation such as this: where do we find a constitutional basis for reconstructing and making over again the financial terms we have accorded to the province of Manitoba? If it is true that we can do so with respect to Manitoba, what argument is there that we cannot do so in the case of Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. If the Premier of New Brunswick, or of any other province, should come here to-morrow with a hard-up story stating that his province was not treated properly at confederation, that his debt allowance and his per capita allowance should be increased, in view of such legislation as this, how can we refuse his demand? I repeat that the reason I spoke on this question is to enter my protest against any manipulation of the standing of the different provinces in confederation without sufficient constitutional authority for it. I say the people of Canada will make a great mistake if they allow this tinkering with the right each province has under the British North America Act. I say that the people of Canada should demand that if changes are necessary with respect to the standing of any province in the confederation, these changes should be brought about in a constitutional way and not in the extraordinary manner in which this Bill proposes.

On motion of Mr. Bradbury, the debate was adjourned.

Mr. ROGERS moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. ROGERS. We will continue the same debate.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 5, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

EXTENSION OF BOUNDARIES—MANITOBA.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Borden for the second reading of Bill No. 115, to provide for the extension of the boundaries of the province of Manitoba.

Mr. GEORGE H. BRADBURY (Selkirk). Mr. Speaker, the question before the House is not a new one. It has been before the country for a number of years; it has been before this House and has been discussed at some length: it is a question in which the province of Manitoba is vitally interested. And it is a question that has been played with by the late government. That government practically penalized the province of Manitoba for years and refused to place the province on an equality with the sister provinces of the west. And now, when the right hon. leader of this government (Mr. Borden) brings in a Bill for the purpose of doing common, everyday justice to the province of Manitoba and to implement the pledge that he gave to the people of that province, we find the right hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) doing all that he can to frustrate this government in thus doing justice to that province. And it is strange to realize that the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House do not even agree in their opinion upon this proposed measure. The leader of the opposition takes the ground that the proposed Bill deals too generously with Manitoba, while the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), the former Minister of the Interior takes the ground that Manitoba is not to be a gainer but is to be a loser under this proposed arrangement. It is very hard to reconcile the opinions of these two hon. gentlemen who sat side by side in the Cabinet for a number of years when justice was denied to the province of Manitoba.

I shall not detain the House at any length, but I wish to refer to a few of the remarks made by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) in dealing with the Bill before the House. That hon. gentleman performed some strange feats of argumentative gymnastics when dealing with the figures relating to the swamp lands in Manitoba. He stated that Manitoba had 8,000,000 acres of these lands that would be transferred back to the Dominion if this Bill went through. And he assumes that these lands had a value of $3 an acre, and said, in view of that fact, that the province of Manitoba was handing back something like $24,000,000 worth of lands. But he was forced to admit that when he claimed that these swamp lands had an area of 8,000,000 acres, it was only an estimate. As against this, we have the estimate of the late Mr. Young, who was well known as the chief geographer of the Department of the Interior. Mr. Young had the facts before him, I presume, when he made this estimate. And this is his statement:—

> The unsurveyed area in the province of Manitoba is estimated at 12,900,000 acres. This is largely unexplored. It is thought that 30 per cent, (4,870,000 acres) may be swamp. This land will be of considerable less value than the swamp lands already referred to.

This is the estimate of a man competent to make an estimate if any man was; and he reached the conclusion that less than 5,000,000 acres of swamp lands are at present held by Manitoba available to go back to the Dominion in case this Bill goes through. Again, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) estimated that, because the swamp lands already disposed of by the province had netted the provincial government something like $3 an acre, the remaining swamp lands were of equal value. But, there is no man in this House who knows better than the hon. gentleman himself that the swamp lands in Manitoba that have already been sold were picked lands, lands lying adjacent to settlements and to railways, and consequently of more value than the swamp lands still remaining in the possession of the province. Ninety per cent of the lands that were sold were prairie lands. I think it safe to say that 95 per cent of the remaining swamp lands of Manitoba are practically bush lands, and any hon. gentleman who knows anything about the bush swamp in Manitoba, can have some idea of the comparative value of the bush swamp area and the prairie swamp area. In my own county there is a large area of that kind of land. Some of it has been drained and cleared, and the men who have done this, estimate that it cost them from $15 to $25 an acre to clear and drain it. So, it is safe to say that when the hon. gentleman estimates that the swamp lands remaining in the possession of Manitoba are worth $3 an acre he very much overestimates the value of these lands.

Another statement that the hon. gentleman made and that was in keeping with a great many statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite dealing with this question, was that these lands were never sold in competition but were sold by private sale; and he gave that as a reason why the lands had not brought higher prices. This statement he made in face of the fact that while he himself was Minister of the Interior large tracts of school lands were sold throughout the province of Manitoba by public auction, or so called public auction, and yet the swamp lands sold by the province of Manitoba realized as large a price as the school lands—which were supposed to be good lands, some of them first-class lands —realized in the sales as carried on under the direction of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver).

Mr. OLIVER: May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bradbury) to give the figures upon which he bases that statement. I think the House would be glad of that information.

Mr. BRADBURY. I have not the figures at hand. But I am satisfied that when the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers) takes the opportunity to reply he will give the figures. He made the statement yesterday—and I have seen similar statements in the Manitoba papers and reported as having been made in the legislature by the Premier of Manitoba and others—that the swamp lands of Manitoba had realized as good a price as the school lands sold by the late government by competition, so called. Under the late Dominion government peculiar methods of conducting the auction were followed. One was this: If in a given district some of their friends wanted a particular piece of land, some person attended the auction who would bid the land away up above its value, and then would fail to deposit his cheque for 10 per cent as was necessary in order to make the sale binding. This land was supposed to be sold, every man present in the office supposed this tract of land was sold to Mr. So-and-So, to Mr. Smith, we will suppose, who was bidding on it, and the consequence was that the auctioneer in settling up would find that the land was not sold at all. We had evidence of this thing in Manitoba on different occasions, and the friends of the government got the land at their own price.

I wish to say in reply to the charge made by the ex-Minister of the Interior that the swamp lands of Manitoba never having been advertised, that there was one large area that I remember something like 200,000 acres, in the year 1905 or 1906, it was advertised in Toronto, Ottawa and Montreal papers and in American papers for thirty days. That land was situated in my own county and the highest bid that the provincial government received at that time was 52 cents an acre. Now, Sir, knowing the land as I do I did not wonder at it because I did not consider it was worth any more. I want to say right here that knowing the bush swamp land of Manitoba as I do there are hundreds of thousands of acres of it that would be dear if the government gave it as a gift to any one who would undertake to drain it, clear it and put it in shape for cultivation. And still my hon. friend tries to make out that the province of Manitoba is losing by this proposed settlement. Who is to be the judge? Is it the right hon. gentleman who leads the opposition, who knows very little about the province of Manitoba, and I am bound to say cares less, or is it the late Minister of the Interior who is a resident of another province and who has been cheated in a princely fashion by the late government of which he was a member, or is it the people themselves who live in the province of Manitoba? I have an editorial here from the Winnipeg 'Tribune,' a paper that supported the right hon. gentleman for many years, that supported his candidates in every constituency at the last campaign and did all that was possible to defeat the Conservative candidates in every riding of this Dominion. Here is what the Winnipeg 'Tribune' says:

Thursday, February 29.—So far as we can see at present Manitoba is to be congratulated upon the terms embodied in the Bill which Premier Borden has introduced to define the boundaries of this province. Especially are our people to be congratulated upon the financial terms to be accorded to this province.

And this, Mr. Speaker, is what my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) tries to convince this House is unfair and inadequate to the province of Manitoba, while the right hon. gentleman who leads the opposition takes the opposite tack and claims that the terms are altogether too generous for Manitoba. The article goes on to say:

Mr. Roblin has maintained a long and strenuous battle for terms of equality with Alberta and Saskatchewan and his final victory entitles him to the thanks of the people of this province. The new financial terms make a splendid addition to the income of this province. The argument against the increase advanced by Sir Wilfrid the other day is scarcely worthy of him. The fact that Manitoba has gone along for forty years on a niggardly subsidy, while her more favoured and recently launched sisters, Saskatchewan and Alberta, were accorded princely terms, should be regarded as an irresistible argument in favour of according to Manitoba justice, even if belated. Sir Wilfrid takes the other view for what reason it is difficult to conceive, except it be due to a prejudice against

the postage stamp province which the ex-premier has long been suspected of harbouring.

Meantime Premier Roblin and his government and the people of Manitoba are to be congratulated upon the settlement that has been secured.

Now, Mr. Speaker, who is in a better position to speak for the people of Manitoba? The Winnipeg 'Tribune,' an organ of the late government, a paper that championed the cause of the hon. member for Edmonton and his leader, which has the honesty and the fairness to come out and congratulate the Premier of this Dominion and the Premier of Manitoba on this magnificent settlement that has been effected. But we have other witnesses? Take the local legislature now sitting in Winnipeg. Every hon. gentleman knows that for years the local legislature has been unanimous in demanding that the province of Manitoba be placed on an equality with her sister provinces. A few days ago a member of that House, Mr. D. A. Ross, the member for Springfield, was asked his opinion of the action of the right hon. leader of the opposition in this parliament regarding the boundary question, and he made this statement:

Mr. Ross said only snatches of Sir Wilfrid's views had been published, but he declared that as far as the ex-Premier's reported stand of Manitoba-getting-too-much was concerned, he was not favourable.

Mr. Ross hesitated. He said only bits of Sir Wilfrid's speech had been published, and he was eager to express an opinion. If it was true, however, that Sir Wilfrid begrudged Manitoba the money, as retroactively speaking, he is reported to have done, well then Mr. Ross said, he is most certainly opposed to that phase of the ex-Premier's stand.

Mr. Ross is a Liberal member of the local legislature, I might say one of the strongest Liberals in Manitoba, and one of the most ardent supporters of the right hon. gentleman who leads the opposition in this House. Another reference was made by another member, Mr. Molloy, M.P.P., a bright young man, who said on the boundary question:

On the boundary question, he said that Manitoba was being sold out by the arrangement made with the Dominion government. He held that they should have been allowed to retain control of the swamp lands, and that the compensation offered was not sufficient to recompense them. The speaker based his argument in regard to the area of the swamp lands on figures given by the late Minister of the Interior, Frank Oliver.

The Premier, intervening, said that Mr. Oliver at that time had simply been playing a game of politics. He (the Premier) had seen Sir Wilfrid Laurier officially immediately afterwards, and the then Premier of the Dominion had told him that the statements of Mr. Oliver were absolutely untrue.

Now I do not wonder that the right hon. gentleman made that statement in face of the facts laid before this House by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, when he read to this House a statement which I have just read by Mr. Young and which shows that the swamp lands even at the biggest estimate, comprise less than 5,000,000 acres. Still my hon. friend raised the estimate up to 8,000,000 acres, to suit his argument, and to make it appear that Manitoba was losing a great deal by this transaction.

There was a piece of swamp land sold in the province of Manitoba, and it was sold by public competition as every acre of swamp land has been sold in Manitoba during the past ten years. Books have been opened, provincial valuators have been put over the land, and an upset price put on each parcel, and any man, the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), for instance, could have walked into the office and bought any of the land that he wanted to buy as hundreds of his Liberal friends did. There was one piece which especially interested Mr. Edward Brown. The hon. gentleman knows to whom I refer, and he knows Mr. Brown is not a Conservative. He is the ex-leader of the Liberal party of Manitoba. There was a large area of land offered for sale, and Mr. Brown put his valuator over that land. The upset price of the government was $2.60 an acre. The valuator came back and advised Mr. Brown that the valuation was too high. The consequence was that Mr. Brown refused to pay $2.60 an acre for the land, but Mr. Brown had the opportunity like any other Liberal in the country. But the truth is, that it would pay the country to give a clear title to much of this swamp lands on condition that they were properly drained. It does seem strange, just on the eve of everyday, common justice being done to the province of Manitoba, that the right hon. leader of the opposition, and his friends, should take the position they are taking at the present time. Instead of assisting the government in settling this question, and allaying the irritation that exists in Manitoba on account of the unfair manner in which they have been treated for years by the late administration, we find these hon. gentlemen arraying one province against another, and trying to incite the jealousy of the lower provinces, and of Ontario as against Manitoba. I hold that this is an unworthy position for hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to take. If this country is to prosper, and be what it ought to be, a great and prosperous nation, it must be by the united efforts of both parties to unite our different provinces, and unite our people from the Atlantic to the Pacific. When

my right hon. friend the leader of the government, is attempting to implement the pledge which he gave to the province of Manitoba, brings in this Bill for the purpose of doing justice, and of placing Manitoba on an equality with the two western provinces, it is hard to understand the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite in opposing that proposition. We, who have lived in that province during the last thirty years, realising that Manitoba is the pioneer province which has blazed the way for the great provinces that have sprung up to the west of us, feel the unfair and harsh treatment that we have received from the Liberal party in this province during the last eight or ten years. Manitoba has been penalized. Why? Because the Conservative party rose equal to the occasion and turned the rottenest government that ever existed in Manitoba out of power, and placed a Conservative government in power. Ever since that day the Liberals in Ottawa led by the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) have penalized that province and have refused to do it simple, everyday justice. In conclusion, I want to congratulate my right hon. friend the leader of the government upon bringing this Bill in to do for the province what he promised, to give to the province an equality in the great family of provinces, and to place Manitoba in the position which she ought to have occupied years ago.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Quebec East). Mr. Speaker, during the last campaign which terminated on the 21st of September, everybody will remember that loud and many were the promises that, if the Conservative party were to be victorious in the contest, the long-pending controversy over the Manitoba boundaries would be settled to the satisfaction of Manitoba, and the whole of the Dominion. Loud and many were the promises that as soon as a Conservative administration had been installed in Ottawa, Manitoba would cease to be a postage stamp on the map. They were victorious, and now the attempt is being made in this Bill to implement the pledge which was made, not only to the people of Manitoba, but to the people of the whole Dominion. This is a sample of the manner, I suppose, in which the different pledges of the present government are to be implemented. Manitoba, forsooth, by the terms of this Bill and of the order in council to which I shall have to refer also, gets an increase of its boundaries, but there is a stigma placed upon the territory which has been added to it. Manitoba is granted financial terms which no one begrudges because they are large, but which we oppose because they are unfair to the rest of the Dominion. Let me remind the House, that when parliament was dissolved at the end of July last, there were upon the journals of the House resolutions adopted as far back as the month of July, 1908 whereby it had been declared expedient by this House that the boundaries of the province should be extended northerly up to the 60th parallel of latitude, and easterly to the 89th degree of longitude. The resolutions also declared that it was expedient that in the added territory which was given to Manitoba, there should be granted to to the province an allowance in money to be a fair equivalent for the land included in that extent of territory. It may not be out of place that I should quote this part of the resolutions:

> That whereas notwithstanding the extension of territory above described, the ungranted lands of the Crown in the territory so to be added to the said province will still continue to be administered by the government of Canada for the purposes of the Dominion; and the said province will not have the public lands as a source of revenue.
>
> It is just and equitable to recognize the increased cost of civil government which such extension of territory will occasion to the province, and in view of the premises, to make to the said province an increased allowance by money payment, the amount of which should be the subject of negotiation between the government of Canada and the government of Manitoba.

When parliament was dissolved everybody in Canada knew that upon these resolutions there had been extensive negotiations between the then government of Canada and the government of Manitoba. We had offered to the province of Manitoba an extension of territory such as is described in these resolutions northerly to the 60th parallel of latitude and easterly to the 89th degree of longitude, but the government of Manitoba demurred to these terms, and claimed a very extensive territory indeed—much more than we thought it would be fair to give them. It was only after thrice repeated negotiations that finally, in the month of March last, the province of Manitoba agreed to accept the boundaries which we had tendered them, and which are now embodied in the Bill before the House.

As to the financial terms, we offered what we thought were fair and reasonable terms to the province of Manitoba in lieu of the lands which were to remain in the Dominion, but the province of Manitoba insisted upon negotiating on an altogether different basis. That is to say, the province of Manitoba was not satisfied with simply having compensation for the lands which were included in the territory which was to be added to its then existing area, but insisted on having an allowance for all the lands comprised in her present and future limits, not only upon the 140,000 square miles or thereabouts which

are to be given her under this Bill, but upon the 70,000 square miles which constitute her present territory. Upon that basis we could not negotiate and that was the line of cleavage between us and the government of Manitoba when parliament was dissolved. When the present government was organized, Mr. Roblin, the Premier of Manitoba, accompanied by Mr. Campbell, his Attorney-General, came to interview the Cabinet. They presented their claims and they stated they would be satisfied, as they had declared in the course of the year 1911, to accept the boundaries which had been defined in the resolution of July, 1908, but they insisted also, as they insisted with us, on having financial terms given to them, not based upon the extended territory alone, but based upon the whole territory of the province. They concluded their claim in the following language:

We, therefore, most humbly pray and request Your Excellency and your advisers to take such action respecting all and singular the terms as shall give every effect to the extension of the boundaries of the province in accordance with the proposal of the House of Commons contained in a resolution adopted on the 13th of July, 1908, and upon terms of equality with either the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta or the provinces of Ontario or Quebec, or upon such other terms or further terms as may be agreed upon between the federal authorities and the legislature of this province.

We understood, from the public press, that Mr. Roblin received audience and was admitted to the Council Chamber to plead his case. And, after that, we are informed by the declaration of Mr. Roblin himself that he carried every point; that he got everything he had asked for; that he was given the boundaries which we had agreed to give him, and that he was given the financial terms which we thought could not be given. At all events, when Mr. Roblin left Ottawa on that occasion, he was quite exultant and jubilant. So jubilant was he that he had to pour out all over the land the echoes of the joy which filled him and which if pent up would have torn his bosom. He proclaimed his joy and his triumph from the housetops and from the street corners. He buttonholed every reporter that came within speaking distance, and told him all he had achieved. But, unfortunately, Mr. Roblin crowed too soon and his crowing was his undoing, for his boasting aroused from his slumbers Sir James Whitney, the Premier of Ontario. Mr. Roblin in the excess of his joy, interviewed, before he left Ottawa, the reporter of the 'Evening Journal,' and on the 21st of November the 'Evening Journal' thus gives the conversation it had had with Mr. Roblin:

Before leaving for the west last night Premier Roblin of Manitoba made the definite statement that as a result of conferences held here during the last few days a basis of settlement of the Manitoba boundary question had been arrived at. The new boundaries of the province as fixed by the Laurier government and as agreed to by the Manitoba government, have been accepted, but the terms of financial assistance to be given to Manitoba have been varied.

The amount of additional subsidy which Manitoba will receive has not been announced, but it is satisfactory to Premier Roblin and Attorney General Campbell, who have carried on the negotiations with Premier Borden and his colleagues.

The Federal government will this session introduce a Bill providing for the settlement, and it will doubtless be concurred in by the Manitoba legislature. The settlement, it is said, will put Manitoba on an equality in regard to financial terms with Saskatchewan and Alberta.

Premier Roblin said that now that Manitoba was to come into its own and be extended to the shores of Hudson bay, the provincial government would take steps to open up the hinterland and secure all data in regard to the country with a view to the future development of its resources.

From Ottawa, Mr. Roblin went to Toronto, and in Toronto it was natural for him to go to the office of the 'Mail and Empire,' and the 'Mail and Empire' gave out, on the 22nd of November, the confidences he had poured into its ears in the following paragraph:

Hon. R. P. Roblin and Hon. Colin Campbell, of Manitoba, go back to Winnipeg to-day having settled the vexed question of the provincial boundaries.

Premier Roblin anounced to-day that the agreement arrived at with the Federal government provided for territorial extension north and east, as laid down in the proposal of the late government.

The financial settlement which the Laurier government refused to make has been conceded by the Borden ministry, Manitoba, in respect to the added territory being placed on exactly the same financial footing as the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta. This involves a subsidy from the Federal treasury in lieu of the public lands, the whole arrangement being in accord with the expressed wish of the Manitoba legislature. Fort Churchill on Hudson bay thus becomes a Manitoba port.

Mr. Roblin stated that a Bill will be probably introduced in parliament giving effect to this settlement this session. He said that on his return to Manitoba he will set to work on a policy of development of the new north country providing transportation facilities, &c.

And from the 'Mail and Empire' office Mr. Roblin went to the 'News' office and the 'News' gave the tenor of the conversation it had with him on the 21st in the following language:

Hon. Mr. Roblin, Premier of Manitoba, who arrived from Ottawa, stated to the 'News'

this afternoon, that through an arrangement with the Federal government the province of Manitoba would have its annual subsidy increased from $200,000 to about $400,000.

'Are you satisfied with the boundary settlement of Manitoba,' he was asked?

'Absolutely,' he replied, it was practically all we asked; Manitoba will henceforth enjoy equality with the other provinces which it has heretofore been denied.'

As I said a moment ago, Mr. Roblin spoke too soon. He awoke Sir James Whitney and when Sir James Whitney saw that Churchill was to become a Manitoba port, Sir James Whitney came down to Ottawa and asked fair or foul that Churchill must belong to Ontario, and then everything was upset. Then the ministerial papers were told that they had to sing another tune, not the tune of the success of Manitoba and of the triumph of Mr. Roblin, but that Manitoba and Ontario had to agree together before any settlement was made. The Ottawa 'Journal' on the 24th of November, contained the following:

The Manitoba boundary question has not yet been settled; it will not be until the claims of Ontario are heard and given that full consideration which their importance demands.

This statement was made to-day by one of the Ontario Cabinet ministers.

'Despite the reports sent out from Ottawa purporting to be official or semi-official, to the effect that this important question had been disposed of, and that in the solution the rights of Ontario were disregarded, you can authoritatively state that such is not the case. He said. 'The government simply discussed the matter with Premier Roblin, but as yet the reported concessions have not been granted.'

Following this tug-of-war between these doughty champions, Sir James Whitney on the one side and Mr. Roblin on the other, there were marches and counter-marches, manœuvring in one direction and another, secret expeditions from Ottawa to Winnipeg and back to Ottawa again, secret expeditions from Ottawa to Toronto and back to Ottawa again. Mr. Roblin insisted that Churchill and Nelson should belong to Manitoba; Sir James Whitney insisted that, fair or foul, Ontario was bound to have both Churchill and Nelson. And so on, for three long months or thereabouts, these negotiations went on, until the whole affair was patched up in the shape of the hybrid conception which we now have in this Bill and the order in council giving to Manitoba the sovereignty without the land, and to Ontario the land without the sovereignty. And this is what they call justice to the province of Manitoba; this is what they call equality with Saskatchewan and Alberta.

Let us go a little further into this mystery. Let me quote now the order in council which is to accompany the present Bill, but for which the present Bill would not be necessary. In that order in council, which was passed on the 20th of February, it is stated:

The Committee of the Privy Council have had before them a report from the right hon. the Prime Minister submitting,—in connection with the proposed extensions of the limits of the respective provinces of Ontario and Manitoba as defined by resolutions of the House of Commons passed on the 13th July, 1908,—that the government of Ontario represents that upon the enlargement of the territory of the province as proposed it would or might be desirable in the interest of the province to extend the provincial railway known as the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario railway at present in operation between North Bay and Cochrane in the said province to a suitable port on Hudson bay; that it may be found necessary or expedient to select for such Hudson bay terminus a point at or near the mouth of the Nelson river, and that as the estuary of the Nelson lies some distance westward of the proposed western or northwestern boundary of the province, the government desires that such arrangements be made as will enable the province, or such commission or public corporation as may be thereunto authorized on behalf of the province, to construct, maintain and operate that portion of the proposed extension of the said provincial railway which may be projected within the extended boundaries of the province of Manitoba for the purpose of reaching the terminus to be selected as aforesaid upon the waters of Hudson bay.

The Prime Minister states that he considers that reasonable provision should be made to give effect to this request on the part of Ontario in so far as it is within the authority of the government and parliament of Canada.

These words are very suggestive, because, whilst this concession to the province of Ontario is made out of the domain of the province of Manitoba, it is evident, from the caveat here included, that the government of the day which passed this order in council has very serious doubts that this is giving anything at all to the province of Ontario. Then the order in council goes on to say that the province of Ontario is to be given out of the domain now to be constituted the province of Manitoba, a strip of land five miles wide until the harbour of Port Nelson is reached.

Well, Sir, is this a settlement? Can the province of Manitoba be satisfied with this? I know the difficulties that my right hon. friend had to contend with in giving an interpretation to the law satisfactory both to Ontario and to Manitoba. I know the difficulties, because we had the same difficulties to face. We had to arbitrate between Ontario and Manitoba, and we gave the best judgment we could on the case presented to us. We selected, as the boundary line between Ontario and Manitoba, the 89th degree of longitude. That was a clear-cut, well-defined line. We may have been right or we may have been

wrong; but whether we were right or wrong, the position of each party was well-known, and the verdict was fair as between them. It may be that it was not satisfactory to one party, but I repeat that it was fair to both. But the present agreement is fair neither to the one party nor to the other: it is not fair to Manitoba, because it takes away a portion of its domain to give it to another province; it is not fair to Ontario, because Ontario, which wants to build a railway through that portion of Manitoba, must forfeit its present charter in order to continue its own railway through that province. The whole settlement may be well described as a black eye to Manitoba, a gold brick to Ontario. My right hon. friend, when he presented to the House the other day the resolution on which this Bill is founded, was emphatic in stating that this Bill was brought in in order to give justice to the province of Manitoba, in order to put it on an equality with the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. Still more emphatic was my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, who recalled the statement made by myself on one occasion, that there was a feeling of irritation which should be alleviated. I agree to all this, but does any one contend that this measure is putting the province of Manitoba on a footing of equality with the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta? It is quite true that the province of Alberta has not its lands; it is true that the province of Saskatchewan has not its lands either; but if neither of them has its lands, their lands have not been given to another province. It is quite true, the boundaries of the province of Manitoba have been extended; it is quite true that Manitoba will no longer be a postage stamp on the map; it is quite true that when a man from Manitoba looks at the map, he will not be humiliated or mortified by the smallness of the province he inhabits; but when he looks at the map he will be shocked at the bar sinister which crosses the province of Manitoba, and which will forever proclaim to the world the inferiority of Manitoba to the neighbouring provinces. This is the condition of what is called a fair settlement. It is impossible that the government of Manitoba may accept such a settlement.

But, Sir, what is the reason which is put forward by the government why this settlement, so called, should be accepted by the province of Manitoba? The very words which were uttered the other day by my right hon. friend in presenting the Bill were that Manitoba cannot complain because the public lands in Manitoba did not belong to that province. Sir, would you have believed that you would ever hear such language in the mouth of my right hon. friend the present Prime Minister? The Prime Minister has said again and again to the people of Manitoba that though they have not the lands at the present time, of right they should have them, and that as soon as he was in office he would see that they were given to them. This statement has been made by my right hon. friend on more than one occasion. It has been made by the Minister of the Interior, by the present Minister of State (Mr. Roche), by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen), by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Aikins), by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury), in fact it has been made by the whole Conservative party. Shall I exhume that document, at one time often spoken of but now hidden beneath the dust of oblivion, the Halifax platform? The Halifax platform says in so many words that the provinces must have their public lands. Mr. Borden, speaking at Halifax, as far back as August 21, 1907, when he laid down the Halifax platform, said:—

> In 1905 the Conservatives took the position that under our constitution the public domain within each province ought to be committed to the management and administration of the people of that province through their provincial governments. That was the basis of arrangement between the four provinces originally constituting the Dominion. At the present time every province in Canada controls and administers its public lands except the three provinces of Manitoba Saskatchewan and Alberta.

And he concludes as follows:—

> We have not receded from the policy which we announced two years ago, and therefore we are prepared to restore their public lands to the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan upon fair terms.

Manitoba is not mentioned here, but as the policy is to place Manitoba on a footing of equality with Saskatchewan and Alberta, it goes without saying that Manitoba also should have her public lands restored to her. But if there was any doubt about it that doubt was removed this summer. What I have just read is somewhat ancient history, but we have also comparatively recent history. We have first of all one of the numerous amended platforms of my right hon. friend during the last election, and in that he stated in so many wards that one of the planks of the Conservative party if they are restored to power will be:

> The granting of their natural resources to the prairie provinces.

There is still more. My right hon. friend last summer toured Manitoba. I shall not refer to what he said in other provinces, but I shall call the attention of the House to what he said in Manitoba, speaking in Winnipeg. Listen to his words:

Before discussing a subject of great public interest now under the consideration of parliament, I desire to touch upon certain questions of paramount importance to the people of the west. To-day in Canada six provinces enjoy the right to control and administer the public lands, mines, minerals and other natural resources within their boundaries. That right is not enjoyed by the three prairie provinces. The Liberal-Conservative party since 1902 has firmly asserted and maintained the rights of these three provinces to their public domain. We stand for that right to-day and we will maintain it. The public lands, and natural resources are vested in the Crown, to be administered for the benefit of the people. In six provinces the Crown, in dealing with the public domain acts upon the advice of the provincial ministers and under laws enacted by the provincial legislatures. In the three prairie provinces the Crown in dealing with such lands acts upon the advice of the federal ministers and under laws enacted by the federal parliament. Why should there be any such discrimination against the people of these three provinces? The day is not far distant when Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta will receive from a Liberal-Conservative government at Ottawa the just recognition of their undoubted right to their public lands and natural resources.

There is a Conservative administration in Ottawa to-day and it is dealing with that province, not however, by giving the lands to that province.

Then at Brandon my right hon. friend spoke in these words:

> In 1902, in 1905, in 1907, and again in 1910, we have stood for the right of the western provinces to own and control their public domain. It is the right of the people of those provinces to have their public lands and natural resources administered by their own governments under the control of their own legislatures. They say that they are free men and being free men in a free country have as good a right to control through their own local legislatures, and by their own provincial executives, the administration of their public lands and natural resources as have the people of any of the eastern provinces who enjoy and have enjoyed that right. The Liberal-Conservative party supports that claim and will enforce it at the first opportunity.

Will enforce it at the first opportunity! Is there not the opportunity here to do so? What prevents my right hon. friend from carrying out the promises which he made to the people of Brandon and the people of Winnipeg and the people of the whole province of Manitoba, in Manitoba?. My right hon. friend had the opportunity to do so, but has deferred doing so. What reasons he has for this course I do not know, but I know one thing, and the statement was cheered a moment ago that the opportunity would come for him to do so, I know one thing that whenever my right hon. friend attempts to carry out the promises he made to the people of those provinces and to give back to Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, their public lands, he will find in his path the same lions which he finds to-day and which make him recoil from his position and force him to go back upon his promise.

That is very significant, but there is something which is perhaps more significant than what has been said by the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister is not the only one who has spoken in grandiloquent terms upon this question. My hon. friend the Secretary of State (Mr. Roche) in a speech delivered in 1906 on this question, on a motion made by Mr. Lake, then member for Qu'Appelle, on the question of the coal strike, said:—

> The hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) has spoken about the humiliating position in which our country has been placed. In the first place I claim it was a humiliating position in which to place those new provinces to withhold from their hands the control of their own public lands. Had the rights of the people of those provinces been fought for as they should have been fought for by hon. gentlemen supporting the government, the provinces would have control over their lands to-day, and the provinces would have been able to grapple with their own coal strike without calling on the federal government for relief.

It was a humiliation to the people of Saskatchewan and Alberta that their own public lands were not given to them. If it was a humiliation for Saskatchewan and Alberta, how are we to characterize the deeper humiliation of Manitoba whose lands are given, not to Manitoba, but to another province, the province of Ontario? I have only to say that, in my humble judgment, the position taken in this respect, by Manitoba and by the government of Canada in relation to Manitoba is poor business, politics, and still poorer statesmanship.

Wtih regard to the financial terms given to the province of Manitoba, I have not much to say beyond what has been said by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) and my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver). I do not begrudge at all the money which under the terms is given to the province of Manitoba. My hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) stated that I had been the enemy of Manitoba. Why should I be the enemy of Manitoba? I am a Canadian, and look upon this question as a Canadian. And, as a Canadian, and a representative of the people, I am bound to regard it not merely from the standpoint of the extension of Manitoba's boundaries, but from the standpoint of the stewardship which I, like the hon. gentleman and every other member of this House, owe to the people of Canada. So far as I am concerned, Manitoba is welcome to the money. But I have serious objection to the principle upon which this money is to be given to Manitoba. It is

not to the giving of the money, nor to the sum, high as it is, that we take exception; but I say without hesitation, that the principle involved in this Bill cannot be defended before any audience outside of the province of Manitoba. Nay, it cannot be defended, even in Manitoba. Manitoba is following the example so often given of trying to secure special terms from the Dominion, and it is a rather ungracious task to fight against the province of Manitoba getting more money than she is now receiving from the Federal Treasury. But I have this to say to my hon. friend from Selkirk, that the question is higher than the mere question of money. We stated in 1908, when we introduced the resolution now partly implemented by the present government, for the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba, that, so far as this territory was concerned, as the addition to the province would involve a greater expenditure on the part of the provincial government, it would be fair, as Manitoba was not getting the lands, that she should get the equivalent of those lands. But that is not what is done to-day. It is not an equivalent for the land of this territory that the present government has agreed to, but this government undertakes to review the whole financial terms of Manitoba, a province which has existed for more than thirty years, and to give new terms, new facilities, new subsidies to that province over that which she has enjoyed for many years past. Is there any justification to this? What justification can there be for such an attitude? This provision to give more money to the province of Manitoba over the subsidy which she now receives from the Federal Treasury is in no way a corollary of the extension of the boundaries in Manitoba. Whether the boundaries are extended or not does not affect this question. Manitoba can always come here, if she chooses, to ask for better terms. But there is a limit to this thing. There is a parity amongst the provinces, and there is no reason in the world why one province should be better treated than another. But since the principle is admitted by the present government of treating with Manitoba on a basis which was not the basis of the resolution of 1908, since the principle is admitted that better terms should be given to the province of Manitoba, because of what she is now receiving for the cost of the administration in the province, I should have supposed that the most natural way would have been for the present government to give Manitoba lands and not money. I believe Manitoba preferred to have the lands, and no one knows it better than my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers). Again and again the province of Manitoba through its legislature, expressed its preference, in the arrangement of the matter which we are now considering, to have lands and not money. Why were not the lands given? Why were not the promises made by the Prime Minister to the people of Manitoba not twelve months ago—hardly eight months ago—why were they not implemented? It was his policy, a policy for which he has fought for years. He proclaimed that policy from one end of the Dominion to the other. He has the majority; every one behind him was ready to vote to give the lands to Manitoba. And yet, it is not lands but money that he is giving to Manitoba. What the reason can be I do not know. But one thing I do know, and that is that the question is not so simple for the right hon. gentleman now that he bears the responsibilities of government, as it was when he sat on this side without responsibility. It was easy to say: We will give the lands. And, for my part, so far as concerns those lands which are not prairie lands, I see no difficulty at all in giving them to the province. My objection to handing over the prairie lands is that these lands are the basis of our policy of immigration, and it has always seemed to be right that we should retain that basis of our policy in our own hands. I do not know but that my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden), may have come to the conclusion, now that he has the responsibilities of office, now that he must be responsible for what he does, now that the difficulties which we saw when in office, but which he ignored, loom up so large and so dark before him, that he must recall his oft-proclaimed policy and declare that he will not give the lands, but will give the money instead of the lands. With regard to the compensation in money, whether the province of Manitoba receives less or receives more, for my part I am not very much concerned. If she receives more, she is welcome to it; if she receives less, that is her business. The question is not there, the question is in the constitutional difficulty. What reason can be given for changing the allowance for debt which was given in 1885, to the province of Manitoba? What reason can be urged in behalf of Manitoba that cannot be urged also on behalf of every other province in the Dominion? I listened yesterday with great attention to the argument on this point presented by my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen). As usual, he put his case clearly and in felicitous language. I have no objection to offer to his case or to the premises he laid down, so far as they went. But he did not go far enough in the premises he laid down. I followed him and agreed with him as to the basis of his debt allowance. When the four original provinces of confederation were joined, the Dominion

assumed the debts of those provinces, Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. The terms were not very clear at first. But, in the course of time they were all elucidated. The debt, I think, was calculated to be some $90,000,000. At all events, it was stated officially, and has been accepted ever since, that the debt which was then accepted by the Dominion government, and of which the provinces were relieved represented an average of $13.43 per head of the population of that day.

And whenever a new province was brought into the Dominion, it was thought reasonable, seeing that the newcomers were to undertake a share of the burden in the government of the province, that an allowance should be given to them at the rate of $32.43 per head of the population. That has been the accepted policy ever since, that was the policy accepted for Manitoba, that was the policy accepted for British Columbia, for Prince Edward Island, and for all the other provinces as they came into the Dominion. But after the province had come into the Dominion, if she was entitled to compensation on her population at the time she entered the Dominion, what reason can be alleged why she should be given better terms than any of the other provinces, on an increased population? The only reason advanced by my hon. friend was that the thing had been done for Saskatchewan and Alberta. I take issue with him. Alberta and Saskatchewan were not treated differently from Manitoba, or Prince Edward Island or British Columbia. Remember that the population of Alberta and Saskatchewan, when they entered confederation, was larger than the population of Manitoba when she entered confederation, or that of Prince Edward Island, and of British Columbia. But the moment British Columbia, Prince Edward Island and Manitoba entered confederation, from that moment they assumed their share of the advantages and of the burdens of confederation. After that they are on a parity with the other provinces. I repeat that there is no difference whatever between the position of Manitoba and the position of Saskatchewan and Alberta, with the only exception that the population was larger in the one case than in the other case. If there is any difference at all, it is that Manitoba was treated more generously than any other province of the Dominion was ever treated. No one knows it better than my hon. friend. He knows that time and again the terms which were originally allowed to Manitoba were improved, as he said so himself yesterday four or five times. It is so, they were increased from time to time, but they were increased not on any principle but out of generosity, they were increased, and more favourable terms were given every time, not because Manitoba was entitled to more favourable terms, but simply because she was in some condition of dire distress. My hon. friend states, and that was the only argument which he gave in support of his views, that there were precedents for what we are now doing. There is no precedent at all. Again I repeat that the terms which were given to Manitoba from time to time were not advanced on any principle at all, but simply in order to assist the province in somewhat difficult circumstances.

The hon. gentleman stated in answer to a statement made yesterday by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley), that the thing had been done without a conference. True, the terms were increased without a conference; but this shows only the necessity of having a conference. If we had had a conference we would not be where we are to-day, we would not have Manitoba coming and knocking at our doors for better terms, and another province likely to come for better terms. We would not have British Columbia knocking at our door for better terms if we had had a conference at that time, or at any time, to settle once for all what should be the relations between the provinces one towards another, and it seems to me that the basis of confederation would be more secure, secure though it is. What answer can be given to the argument of my hon. friend from St. John when he says that if you do it for one province you have to do it for another province? Why is it that Manitoba is to-day receiving a debt allowance on some $8,000,000? Simply because the population of Saskatchewan and Alberta, when they entered confederation, being estimated only at 250,000 each, their debt allowance amounted to $8,000,000. If the population of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta had been 100,000 they would have been entitled to less, and so would Manitoba; if their population had been only 50,000, they would have been entitled to still less. That would be acting according to principle. There is no answer at all, I submit, to the statement which was made yesterday by my hon. friend from St. John that you are opening the door to claims which you cannot resist when they are presented. If the province of British Columbia asks to have her terms improved under the same pretence as Manitoba is asking, because the population of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, estimated at 250,000, gets $8,000,000, what answer can you give British Columbia? Will it be any answer to say, you are a mountain province and Manitoba is a

prairie province? because after all, that is what it amounts to. You have to treat the three provinces similarly, and so far as the money terms are concerned, the amounts should be exactly as they are. I see no serious objection to that. But so far as the debt allowance is concerned this is an abuse of the power of the majority; and moreover, I do not hesitate to say and to repeat that you are opening the door to consequences which you will reap at no distant time.

There is another feature of this Bill for which there is also no possible justification, and that is the arrearages to be given to the province of Manitoba. Again I repeat what I said a moment ago to my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury), it is not a pleasant task, it is rather an invidious task, to have to insist on this principle, because the effect would be to deprive the province of Manitoba of what she is getting under this resolution. But what is the basis of this resolution? My right hon. friend stated, in opening this debate, that Manitoba had asked her arrearages to date back to 1905. Why? Because it was in 1905 that Alberta and Saskatchewan were brought into the Dominion. He thought, however, that would be giving Manitoba too much, even for his extravagance, and he said, we will give her these arrearages dating back to the month of July, 1908. Why from the month of July, 1908? Because at that time this parliament passed a resolution to which I will refer, providing for the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba. Well, I could conceive that there would be some justification for the allowance which is now made if the province of Manitoba were in a position to tell us in 1908, we would have accepted the boundaries which were then offered, but we could not come to any settlement, because the late administration denied us the terms you are now giving to us. Under such circumstances there might be a basis of justification. But if Manitoba did not get her enlarged boundaries before this year, it is because the late administration differed with Manitoba upon the financial terms. The reason why Manitoba was not given enlarged boundaries at that time was because she did not accept the offer that was made her. Shall I give you the proof? Here it is, in the petition presented to this government by Manitoba herself. This is what is said in the memorial of the province:

> While we maintain that the province has been unfairly dealt with in this respect, and, as a matter of right, is entitled to have included within its area all the northern territory proposed to be divided between Manitoba and Ontario, we desire to apprise Your Excellency of our decision, and the conclusion arrived at by the legislature of the province in the year 1911.

In the year 1911. It was only in the year 1911 that Manitoba acepted these boundaries and, under such circumstances, I put it to the common sense of every hon. gentleman in this House, what reason can there be why Manitoba should be given the extra time which is granted before she accepted these boundaries. It is too palpable not to be interpreted at once. But the government has decided otherwise, for what motive I do not know, for what motive I cannot comprehend, and, therefore, for these reasons it seems to me that this Bill and these terms are altogether extravagant, uncalled for and unjustified. As to the allocation for public buildings, I think the terms are generous but I do not discuss them. There is, Sir, in the province from which I come an agitation going on upon this question and in a paper which supports the government, 'L'Evenement' of Quebec, we read two or three days ago, that there should be no agitation, that the minister would speak and that they would give us an explanation. They are not in a great hurry to speak. We have been expecting that they would give us their policy. They have not done so and as they have not discussed this particular part of the subject I will not discuss it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir. WILFRID LAURIER. I understand very well the spirit of those cheers. These gentlemen have a policy that they dare not explain, but they want us to discuss it even before they have presented it to the House. That is the spirit in which the subject is approached. Why do not these gentlemen speak if they want us to reply to them? Let them speak and for my part I shall be very happy to give them my views.

Mr. PELLETIER. Why not give them now?

Sir. WILFRID LAURIER. Because my hon. friend (Mr. Pelletier) has not said anything. I understand that my hon. friend has a speech covering a ream of paper to prove his point. I shall be happy to hear him. But, in the meantime I stand within the lines of Torres Vedras. I shall speak when the time has come and then I shall not be backward at all.

But, with reference to the case, as we have it now before us, I beg to say that in my humble opinion, the government have approached this question, not from the point of view of principle, but from the point of view of expediency, and as is usual when expediency is substituted for principle, they have created new trouble for themselves and for the country. They

have brought into existence new difficulties which it will be more difficult to settle than the difficulties that they are now pretending to settle. They have failed to give to Manitoba that fair measure of justice to which Manitoba is entitled, they have failed to give to Ontario, the right to which Ontario thought she was entitled, they have opened the door to claims which are just and fair, and just as equitable as anything that is now to be found in this Bill, and, in my humble judgment, they have done more, they have violated some of the soundest principles of constitutional government as applied in this country. Therefore, for these reasons, I beg to move in amendment:

That this Bill be not now read a second time, but that it be resolved, that while this House is favourable to the extension of the boundaries of the province of Manitoba, it is of opinion that the terms under which it is proposed to make the said extension, as set forth in this Bill and in the order in council of the 20th February, 1912, are unfair and unjust both to the people of Manitoba as well as to the people of the other provinces of the Dominion.

Hon. ROBERT ROGERS (Minister of the Interior). Mr. Speaker, before venturing to make answer to some of the arguments as advanced by my right hon. friend who has just resumed his seat (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and before undertaking to deal with some of the provisions as contained in the Bill now before us, for our consideration, I desire to say but one word in respect to my own position as a supporter of this Bill, and it is this, that I do not wish to be understood by the members of this House, as supporting this Bill simply and only because I happen, for the time being, to occupy a seat upon the floor of this parliament as a representative from a constituency within the borders of the province to which this measure directly relates. But, Mr. Speaker, I desire to be understood by the hon. members of this House, and by the people of this country, as supporting this Bill, because I find in its provisions evidence that it adopts the principle of equity and of justice. I desire to be understood as supporting this Bill, because I find in the clear and straightforward statement, as made by the right hon. gentleman who leads this government (Mr. Borden), when he moved the second reading of this Bill yesterday afternoon, representing, as he does, the great party to which he belongs, and which he leads, I recognize that he stands to maintain and to uphold that grand old traditional policy of the party, that has ever stood in the past and that I trust, ever may stand in the future, to uphold equal rights and equal justice to all and all parts of our country. That, to my mind, is exactly what this Bill undertakes to represent. It promises nothing more and it promises nothing less. This Bill is made necessary in order that we might rectify a condition of affairs through which and by which a serious injustice has been done to the province of Manitoba.

The right hon. gentleman, dealing with this question this afternoon, has gone over somewhat of the history of the conditions which prevail in Manitoba, but he did not undertake to tell the whole story to the House. He has not told the House that Manitoba occupied a position of inequality with every province in this Dominion; he has not told the House that during the past eight or ten years that province pleaded with him, as the leader of the Dominion government, to rectify the injustice and to remedy the adverse conditions of which she complained. We have, as was well said by the right hon. the Prime Minister two classes of conditions in respect to provinces in this confederation. We have provinces that own their own lands, their mines, and their natural resources, and we have the three prairie provinces that have been treated upon an entirely different basis. Now, when in 1901 the people of Manitoba presented their views as represented by a unanimous legislature to the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, then Prime Minister, we were told that we would have to wait for the terms and conditions which we were pleading for, until such time as the new provinces would be formed out of the Northwest Territories. We regarded that answer as reasonable and we so accepted it in Manitoba. We in Manitoba waited in patience for the day and for the hour when it might suit the convenience of the right hon. gentleman to introduce the necessary legislation for the formation of these provinces, and, when that day and that hour came Manitoba was represented here pressing her claims. But, we very soon found that we came here under circumstances well described by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) this afternoon; we found that our claims were to be treated by the then Prime Minister and by his government as a whole, as a political question. We came here representing a unanimous province and our first words to the right hon. gentlemen were in effect that a fair and just settlement of Manitoba's claims would in no way effect either one party or the other. But, that did not seem to satisfy my right hon. friend; he did not think that such was the opinion of his own political friends in Manitoba. Presenting that case as strongly as was possible for the representatives of Manitoba to present it, it was necessary for my right hon. friend to make some answer and while he did not do the representatives of the province the honour of giving them a

direct answer upon that occasion, he made a statement from his place in parliament which was in effect: that Manitoba could not be treated with, that Manitoba's position could not be considered at the time, simply because he had sitting behind him in this House a gentleman who represented that territory and who had entered an objection. And, when we made inquiry, as to why the hon. gentleman representing a small portion of that territory was objecting, we were told that the hon. member for the constituency of Mackenzie objected by reason of the fact that he was fortunate enough to secure a Liberal majority in that particular district, and, therefore, he did not want it to go to the province of Manitoba or to anywhere else. That is a sample of the treatment which we were receiving from the Prime Minister, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, at that time. It is true that the public press took some note of that statement and the right hon. gentleman found it necessary to meet that objection, and he prepared a Minute of Council about a month later and transmitted it to the province of Manitoba. In this minute of Council he undertakes to find another excuse. It is dated March 21, 1905, and the concluding paragraphs set forth:

The committee are likewise of the opinion that the desire of the province of Manitoba for an extension of its boundaries to the shores of Hudson bay is not an unreasonable one, and they suggest that when the measures now before parliament for the formation of the two provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan are disposed of, the subject of such extension of the boundaries of Manitoba might profitably be considered. This committee think it possible that in this connection questions would arise which concern other provinces inasmuch as the territory lying to the north of the other provinces may be made the subject of requests of a character similar to that of the province of Manitoba in the present case. The committee, therefore, recommend that at a convenient date after the formation of the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan the request of Manitoba for an extension northward be taken up with the object of coming to a speedy conclusion, and trust that this suggestion may be acceptable to the government of the province of Manitoba whose welfare and development the present ministry desire to promote in every way compatible with their obligations towards the other provinces of the Dominion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you find here two excuses by the right hon. gentleman as to why the extension of the Manitoba boundaries should not take effect at once. The first excuse was that it might be necessary to consult other provinces in this matter. It is true that my right hon. friend undertook upon that occasion exactly the same course that he is taking to-day so far as the province of Ontario and the province of Manitoba are concerned. He is disappointed to-day, in that it was impossible for him to make trouble between the province of Ontario and the province of Manitoba. I know that it is disappointing to the right hon. gentleman to see that the province of Manitoba and the province of Ontario have been able to effect a settlement which has been acceptable to both provinces and entirely satisfactory on every ground. My right hon. friend in this Minute of Council next told us—and I would remind you that this Minute of Council was dated in 1905—that he would endeavour to bring about a speedy settlement of Manitoba's claims. Well, what about that speedy settlement? Here we are in this parliament seven years later proposing a settlement, and I am sure if the right hon. gentleman had been allowed politically to live, and finish his work, that the province of Manitoba would have waited seventy-seven times seven years before justice was rendered to her by him. The right hon. gentleman did not like the idea of that little province of Manitoba sending down to Ottawa eight or nine supporters of the right hon. Mr. Borden when in opposition as well as when in power. That is the only reason I can see why we did not get fair terms from Sir Wilfrid Laurier on that occasion. Now, the leader of the opposition takes objection to the fact that Manitoba is getting certain arrears in respect of the claim which she had from that date in 1905 down to the present time. In 1905, by virtue of that Minute of Council, Manitoba was obliged by the then government to meet in conference the other provinces and that no doubt, with the object of delaying the settlement of Manitoba's claims. That conference took place in 1906, and in 1907 we were promised in the Speech from the Throne that a Bill would be presented to parliament by which this vexed question would be settled, but, the pledge of the right hon. gentleman as usual was not kept and no Bill was introduced.

It is true, a resolution was introduced in 1908, and in 1909, a copy of that resolution and of a Bill, as prepared by the right hon. gentleman, was transmitted to the government of the province of Manitoba for their consideration. The moment the government of Manitoba received that Bill, they sent representatives to Ottawa to discuss terms and conditions with the right hon. gentleman. When we arrived we complained that the boundaries provided for were not those to which the province of Manitoba was entitled. I am not going into the details of that matter, which were fully covered by my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Aikins), last night. But when the representatives of Manitoba found in 1909, as was stated to the delegation by the right hon. gentleman himself, that the Liberal members assembled

around him, as representing the province of Manitoba, had decided on those boundaries, and therefore, they were fixed, and finally fixed, as far as he was concerned, we felt that there was no other course open to us, under the circumstances, than to accept the boundaries as laid down, and they were accepted by us. Manitoba heard nothing more during the year 1910. During the year, 1911, we received an invitation to come and meet the right hon. gentleman, and his colleagues. That conference took place, lasting for two afternoons, and no settlement of any kind or description was reached, because the right hon. gentleman did not appear to be willing to treat Manitoba in the fair manner in which we believed she was entitled to be treated. But, worse than the conditions proposed, and the delay which was practised by the right hon. gentleman during his régime, was the policy by which he penalized and punished the province of Manitoba to such an extent that I want to say, from my place in this House, that no amount of money which this parliament could vote could compensate the province of Manitoba for the injury which was done her by the actions and the words of the right hon. gentleman.

Now, a good deal has been said during the course of this discussion in regard to the swamp lands of the province of Manitoba. If there was no other reason, this very question of the swamp lands furnishes a good and sufficient reason why the province of Manitoba has been at the door of the Dominion of Canada asking for a rearrangement of the terms which were made in 1885. If the terms which were then made, had been faithfully and loyally kept by the Dominion of Canada, there would perhaps have been less reason why the province of Manitoba should be here to-day asking for the changed conditions which she is asking for; and if there is one man in public life to-day who is more responsible than another for the violation of that contract of 1885, in respect of the swamp lands, it is the right hon. gentleman who was the leader of the late Liberal government. Under the contract of 1885, between the government of Manitoba and the Dominion government, Manitoba was to receive certain swamp lands; and let me give you a sample of how these lands were dealt out to the province. Under that contract an arrangement was arrived at by which certain inspectors were to be appointed to go out and decide what sections or quarter sections were swamp lands and what were not. It was provided that the government of Manitoba would have the right to appoint one or more representatives on a commission for that purpose, and the Dominion a like number; and as soon as the government of the right hon. gentleman opposite took office, one of the first things they did was to dismiss Manitoba's representative on that commission, in order that Manitoba might be penalized and punished. Following that, when a Liberal government was in power in Manitoba, an effort was made by the government of the right hon. gentleman opposite, during 1898, the first full year after they came into power, to convey certain swamp lands to the province of Manitoba. As will be in the knowledge of hon. members of this House, the Liberal government was defeated in Manitoba in the year 1899, and how do you suppose the province was then treated by the Liberal government at Ottawa in respect to its swamp lands? In the year following, in the first half of 1899, the province got 160 acres of swamp lands from the government of the right hon. gentleman; a short time afterwards they got about 30,000 acres more; in 1901, they did not get an acre; in 1902, in the first half of the year they got 20,000 acres more; in the last half of the same year they got 160 acres more. I will give you another sample, from a Minute of Council as prepared by the government of Canada, of how they deprived the province of Manitoba of a great portion of the territory that rightly belonged to her. That Minute of Council, which was passed on the 28th of September, 1904, after reciting that the inspectors had examined an area of 284,000 acres, goes on to say:

> The minister states that of the area thus examined the commissioners find an area of 146,274 acres falling to the province as swamp lands.
>
> That by a comparison of the schedules furnished by the commissioners with the books of the Department of the Interior and its agencies in Manitoba, it has been found that of the total area of 146,274 acres selected as such swamp lands, an area of 43,192·27 acres is available.
>
> The minister submits a revised schedule of such of the lands included in the schedule of the commissioners as are found available, comprising an area of 43,192·27 acres, and, being satisfied of the accuracy of the same, recommends that the lands enumerated therein be vested in His Majesty King Edward VII, for the purposes of the province of Manitoba, under the provisions of the fourth section of chapter 47 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

By that one act alone the government of the right hon. gentleman were able to take away that which their own inspectors claimed belonged to the province of Manitoba. In that one inspection of 284,000 acres, they were willing to give to the province of Manitoba only 43,000 acres, and keep over 140,000 acres, which, as they themselves admitted, belonged to the province of Manitoba. I may say that the same condition was applied throughout, with the

result that nearly a million acres of the swamp lands belonging to the province of Manitoba were used by the government of the right hon. gentleman opposite for their own purposes.

I say it was no wonder Manitoba complained of her conditions and complained bitterly in respect to the matter of swamp lands. The same conditions continued all the way through. We had an interest in certain lands upon which a mortgage had been given by the province of Manitoba in connection with the Hudson Bay railway and Manitoba pleaded with the government of the right hon. gentleman opposite again and again to have those lands surveyed but without success, with the result that Manitoba had to accept the cash value of the obligation or even less than the cash value of the obligation out against them; and a few days after the Canadian Northern Railway got control of those lands they were able to come down here to the government at Ottawa and secure from them the right to go to Saskatchewan and select the very best lands found there. This prevented the province of Manitoba from getting justice and the resources of the Dominion of Canada were exploited entirely for the benefit of a railway corporation. I might continue with the discussion of the manner in which the district of Keewatin was taken from Manitoba and various other matters but I shall not take up the time of the House in dealing with these details. I shall at once take up the question that has been so fully discussed by the right hon. gentleman (Sir. Wilfrid Laurier) and by every other hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who has taken part in this debate. The right hon. gentleman complains that the terms and conditions as provided by this bill should not date back to the year 1908. I would remind my right hon. friend that this is no new course for this House to take. My right hon. friend undertakes to tell the House that it is a violation of the constitution that such a course should be taken. This House did the very same thing in 1869 and again in 1885 for the provinces of Ontario, Nova Scotia, Quebec and New Brunswick and the same principle; the same course that is being adopted by this government to-day was adopted by the governments of those days. My hon. friend from St. John undertook to tell us yesterday that Manitoba had made a final settlement of her claims in 1885 and told us something more, in which he was supported by the hon. member from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) that before this House approves of the bill now before us for consideration, we should invite a conference of the different provinces of the Dominion to consider whether or not the terms and conditions being granted to the province would be acceptable and satisfactory to the other provinces of Canada.

Mr. OLIVER. It is hardly that way. My idea was that there should be a conference of the provinces to enable the other provinces to have their claims dealt with, at the same time as the claims of the province of Manitoba.

Mr. ROGERS. My hon. friend from Edmonton may have had that idea, and I can quite understand, perhaps, that he does not know as much about that question, or at least should not know as much about it as the hon. member for St. John. I think I shall surprise you and shall surprise this House, when I say that the very claim embodied in the Bill now before us was presented by the premier of the province of Manitoba to an inter-provincial conference held in the city of Ottawa in the year 1906, and further, that the province of Manitoba on that occasion, was able to get a unanimous endorsation from the conference, and that it had no better friend upon that occasion, no man who better helped and assisted to bring about the unanimous decision in favour of Manitoba, than the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley). Yet, six years after, for reasons best known to himself, he comes down to this parliament and undertakes to tell us that we should again go before an interprovincial conference with respect to our claims, as now presented. When this conference was called a letter was addressed to the premiers of the different provinces of Canada, as follows:

Ottawa, Sept. 10, 1906.

Sir,—In accordance with the request of the provincial governments for a conference with the Dominion government to discuss the financial subsidies to the provinces, I beg to inform you that such a conference will take place at the city of Ottawa on Monday, 8th October next, at 11 a.m., which you are invited to attend.

Your obedient servant,

WILFRID LAURIER.

When the province of Manitoba received that invitation, that province took precautions to avoid conditions such as we are meeting from the other side of the House to-day. A Minute of Council was passed and transmitted to the right hon. gentleman and to the Secretary of State of which I shall read the last portion:

On the recommendation of the hon. the President of the Council, Committee advise,—

(1) That the hon. the President of the Council of the executive of the government of the province of Manitoba be authorized and empowered to represent the province at the said conference for the purposes aforesaid, and, on behalf of the province, to agree to such solution of the said several matters in issue, having regard especially to the rights of the province of Manitoba, as shall, in his opinion,

be fair, reasonable and just, and in the best interests and welfare of the province.

(2) That at the said conference it be distinctly understood and agreed that any allowances that may be made to the province of Manitoba, with respect to the said several matters in issue, shall in no wise abrogate or dispose of certain other claims of the province respecting the swamp lands, the adequate compensation to the province for public lands taken and used for the purpose of the Dominion, the readjustment of the capital account of the province, the handing over to the province for administration of the school lands and the school lands fund, and the extension of the boundaries of the province, and any and all other matters or things not embraced within the special matters set forth in said interprovincial conference resolutions, to all of which such other matters or things the province claims to be entitled to substantial relief from the Federal authorities.

(3) That a copy of this report be forwarded to the Secretary of State for Canada.

Certified,

20th September, 1906.

C. GREYBURN,
Clerk, Executive Committee.

It was on these terms and conditions that Manitoba attended that interprovincial conference. When her representatives came here, they came prepared with an order in council which was presented by the premier to the Interprovincial Conference. In order that the House may understand the position taken by that province at that time, I shall read you the parts of that order in council that referred particularly to the amounts that are now being asked for in the Bill before us. Part of the second order in council presented to that conference was as follows:

It is contended, and strongly so, that the province of Manitoba is equally entitled to be paid as large an annual sum by way of compensation for public lands as the two recently created provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta.

These provinces, it is provided, are to be each paid annually, until the population reaches 400,000, in the sum of $375,000, and thereafter on an increasing scale as the population multiplies up to the extent of $1,125,000 annually. Manitoba but receives $100,000 annually and the amount is fixed for all time to come and subject to no increase, no matter what the population of the province in the future may be. Surely, it cannot be reasonably maintained that this dissimilarity and discrimination between Manitoba and the other new provinces is fair to the people of Manitoba. In all phases of the subject the injustice to Manitoba is most apparent. At the present time the two new provinces each started with $375,000 in lieu of public lands. Manitoba but receives $100,000, notwithstanding its population is greatly in excess of either Saskatchewan or Alberta. As previously stated, the present annual payment to the new provinces, in lieu of lands, is subject to increases, on the basis of population, until the population reaches 750,000, when thereafter the payment to each is to be $1,125,000 annually. The effect of this arrangement is, that at the present time each of the new provinces are given $275,000 more than Manitoba, with provision for increase as the population grows, and that, when their population is 750,000, they will each receive for public lands, anually, $1,025,000 more than Manitoba, notwithstanding that Manitoba, in a great measure, as the parent Prairie province of the west, has stood the vicissitudes and hardships of pioneering for many years, and is largely responsible for the present stature and significance of those provinces, and may have at that period as great, if not greater, population than either of those provinces. It may be that the new provinces have not been given too much, but, if so, it must naturally follow that Manitoba receives too little—a mere pittance in comparison.

Manitoba went further in this memorandum and dealt with the question of the capital account. Referring to the amount of allowance at $32 per head, on a population of 125,000, making a total of $4,054,759.35, and they concluded in this way:

It is contended that the fixing, in 1884, of 125,000 as the population upon which the province should be paid a per capita allowance of $32.43 per head was an arbitrary proceeding, it being impossible at that time to estimate, with any degree of accuracy, what the population or requirements of the province would reasonably be at future periods, and it is the more evident that placing the population of Manitoba at 125,000, for the purposes aforesaid, was entirely too small, viewed in the light of the parliament of Canada having, a little over a year ago, based the capital account of Saskatchewan and Alberta on a population of 250,000, when, as a matter of fact, the population of those provinces, in both cases, was far inferior to that of Manitoba, as it is to-day.

The province claims, in any event, that it should be accorded in this respect the same or equivalent treatment as the two new provinces named, who each draw annually, on this account, $405,375, or just twice as much as Manitoba.

That was the case made by the province of Manitoba at the time that conference assembled at which were present the gentlemen whom I have just named. In order that the House may have a clear understanding of the facts of the case, I desire to read the reports of the public press in respect of the work and the action of the conference on the matters to which I have just referred. The conference assembled on the 8th of October, and Mr. Roblin at once presented Manitoba's case. This is the report of the matter in the Toronto 'Globe' of October 9th:

After some discussion, therefore, it was recognized that the resolutions could hardly be presented to the Dominion Cabinet in their original form, and a committee consisting of Messrs. Gouin, Weir, Murray, McBride, Pugsley, Foy and Campbell was appointed to

suggest amendments which would overcome the obstacles to a general endorsation of the resolutions. Then the conference adjourned and left the committee to their work. The latter remained in session until shortly after six o'clock and reached conclusions which they will report to a general committee which will meet to-morrow morning at ten o'clock. An hour later the provincial delegates, it is expected, will be able to lay before the representatives of the Federal government the demands for an increase of subsidy in an amended form.

In case some hon. gentlemen might doubt the accuracy of the report of the Toronto 'Globe,' let me give the report of the Toronto 'Mail and Empire' of the same date:

Resuming in the afternoon Mr. Charles Lanctot, Deputy Attorney General of Quebec, was appointed secretary to the provincial gathering. The Quebec resolutions of four years ago were considered and it was decided to appoint a sub-committee to frame a resolution regarding them. This sub-committee consists of Messrs. Gouin, Foy, Pugsley, Weir, McBride and Campbell. They sat until six o'clock, and it is understood agreed upon the text of a resolution to be submitted to the general conference to-morrow. It reaffirms the resolutions of 1902, leaving it open, however, to each province to make independent representations.

The province of Manitoba was represented at the conference upon these terms, and insisted that the question should be left open to independent representations.

While the provincial delegates were in conference the representatives of Alberta and Saskatchewan asked permission to retire so that they might confer on the subject of the resolutions of 1902. This was granted and when they re-entered the conference Premier Scott announced that they concurred with the other delegates on this subject.

Then on October 10th:

From other sources, however, it is learned that the provincialists were making anything but progress. The resolution submitted by the sub-committee reaffirmed the subsidy resolution of 1902 with a clause reserving to each province the right to make special representations to the Dominion authorities. This proviso particularly affects Ontario, Manitoba and British Columbia. Manitoba does not want her claim for a readjustment of the provincial boundaries to be sidetracked. . . .

In the afternoon the situation improved. The conference sat for three hours and after it had risen Premier Gouin once more told the waiting newspaper men that there was nothing to announce. It seems, however, that after a stubborn fight the original resolution was finally agreed to unanimously with a special proviso in it reserving the rights of those provinces which have claims for additional recognition to have them considered. The resolution will be presented to the federal ministers tomorrow morning by Premiers Gouin and Whitney and an opportunity will be afforded to Premier McBride to present British Columbia's case for special consideration.

The Toronto 'Globe' goes on to deal with the report of this same committee. I may explain that the reasons were presented the following day, as stated by the press to the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who now leads the opposition. Let me quote to him the reasons as they appear in the public records of this House:

Therefore, it is unanimously.

Resolved—1. That the subject matter of the resolutions adopted by the conference of the representatives of the several provinces, held at Quebec in December, 1902, and which were shortly thereafter presented to the government of the Dominion and which were ratified by the legislatures of the then existing provinces, except that of British Columbia, be now pressed upon the government of the Dominion for immediate and favourable action, under reserve of the right of any province to now submit to such government memoranda in writing concerning any claims it may have to larger sums than those set out in the said resolutions, or to additional consideration or recognition.

That reason was unanimously accepted and carried by that committee and presented by the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who leads the opposition to-day. I would like to quote what the 'Globe' had to say in dealing with these reasons at that time.

Premier Roblin continued to press his claim, and I find in the Toronto 'Globe' the following report of the official minutes of the conference:

Moved by Mr. Roblin, seconded by Mr. Peters, that the report of the committee charged with the preparation of the resolutions embodying the views of the conference on the resolutions of 1902 be adopted, and it was unanimously adopted as follows:

Whereas the members of this conference are of the opinion that it is desirable in the interests of the people of Canada and essential to the development of the provinces that an immediate provision be made for an increase of the subsidies granted by the Dominion to the several provinces and for the award to the provincial governments by Canada of an amount sufficient to meet the costs of the administration of criminal justice not exceeding twenty cents per head of the population; therefore it is unanimously resolved (1) that the subject matter of the resolutions adopted by the conference of the representatives of the several provinces held at Quebec in December, 1902, and which were shortly thereafter presented to the government of the Dominion and which were ratified by the legislature of the then existing provinces, except that of British Columbia, be now pressed upon the government of the Dominion for immediate and favourable action, under reserve of the right of any province to now submit to such government

memoranda in writing concerning any claims it may have to larger sums than those set out in the said resolutions, or to additional consideration for recognition.

(2) That in the case of the government of Canada concurring in the views of the conference as expressed in the above resolution a measure should be submitted to the parliament of Canada at the next session providing for payment of such increased subsidies and allowances as may be determined upon, pending an amendment of the British North America Act if such amendment should be deemed necessary.

Now, Mr. Speaker, those resolutions were presented in the amended form as suggested, to the right hon. leader of the then government and his colleagues, who joined that inter-provincial conference, and you will be surprised to learn that he accepted those resolutions as representing the claims of Manitoba:

The Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier announced that the Dominion government had come to the conclusion to agree to the resolutions embodying the views of the interprovincial conference submitted by the hon. Mr. Gouin on the 10th October, with the exception of that portion of the first resolution proposing an increased subsidy towards the cost of the administration of criminal justice.

This was not anything that affected the province of Manitoba more than any other province. Then later on I find in the report of the minutes signed by Mr. Lanctot and Mr. Joseph Pope:

Sir Wilfrid Laurier further observed that his government had considered this question up to this moment in the hope that the present interprovincial conference would be unanimous. He said that while there is unanimity with respect to the principle of increased subsidies and also in regard to that portion of the resolution of the interprovincial conference submitted by Mr. Gouin on October 10, to which the government has agreed there was a special claim from British Columbia touching which some difference as regards the amount exists. Sir Wilfrid Laurier added that he wished to report to his colleagues on that point before giving a final assent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you will see that Manitoba had presented her case, and in doing so had obtained the support of the representatives of all the provincial governments. Mr. Roblin presented his case to the right hon. gentleman, and he accepted it. Now let me ask if Manitoba was not justified in asking for arrearages back to 1905 and 1906? When she could not get arrearages back to 1905, she wanted to get them at least to 1906, when the right hon. gentleman accepted the resolution in confirmation of her claim as presented by all the provinces. I ask you what more could Manitoba have done to establish her case in the clearest possible manner than the course she has adopted in pressing her claims now for fair treatment, and for equality of treatment with the other provinces of this Dominion? I mentioned a moment ago that she was promised a speedy settlement in 1905 by an official Minute of Council. She was again promised a settlement by the official statement of the right hon. leader of the government in 1906, when he accepted the basis recommended by the Interprovincial conference. Again in 1907 Manitoba was promised a settlement in the Bill by which her boundaries were to be extended, and a settlement was to be effected of the terms and conditions. Then again we had the resolution of 1908 which was brought before the government in its amended form, and which was accepted by the province of Manitoba. And yet after all these things, we have the right hon. gentleman the leader of the opposition and his followers coming here and discussing this question from various points of view, some undertaking to place one province against another, and others undertaking to set the east against the west. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) was very solicitous with respect to the maritime provinces.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. ROGERS. I do not blame my hon. friend for standing up for his province. But when in 1908 the right hon. gentleman who sits beside him was passing a resolution for the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba, my hon. friend from Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) raised the same question on behalf of the maritime provinces, and what answer did he get from the then leader of the government? The answer was read yesterday by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers), and I will not trouble the House by reading it again. But the right hon. gentleman made it clear that he would not consider the proposals then made by the representatives of the maritime provinces. Now let me tell you that the conditions are different to-day. We have at the head of affairs as Premier of Canada a gentleman who represents a constituency in the maritime provinces, and what did he tell this House yesterday in discussing this matter? He assured this House that when the time arrived for making a final settlement of the natural resources of the three great provinces of western Canada, at that time the government would take into consideration every interest relative to the affairs and welfare of the maritime provinces. Now I ask you, and I ask every hon. member of this House, if there is a citizen in the maritime provinces who is not prepared to accept in its

entirety the word of the right hon. gentleman who leads the government of Canada to-day. Some hon. gentleman opposite have undertaken to say that our natural resources are being withheld from us. The leader of the opposition who addressed the House this afternoon dwelt somewhat warmly on the position taken by the leader of the government in respect to the natural resources of the three prairie provinces. He said that the leader of the government had promised certain terms previous to the last general election. Well, I want to tell him that we are under a different régime in this country now than we were in 1905, and that when the present leader of the government makes a promise to his fellow countrymen they can depend upon it that that promise will be fulfilled. The reason why the three prairie provinces are not getting their natural resources to-day is simply because this is a matter so important that it involves a great deal of consideration, it involves considerable time. I know that the leader of the opposition would have been glad to use this lever to justify him in continuing his policy of penalizing the province of Manitoba, to which he has taken such a particular dislike during the past ten years. But this is not a matter that can be settled hastily, because we have evidently a work of education to perform in some of the western provinces in this respect; we find that even some gentlemen in the province of Saskatchewan, for example, are willing to follow in the footsteps of the leader of the opposition.

He is willing to take the ground that the natural resources of the province should not be handed over. That is the position taken by the Hon. Walter Scott, Premier of the province of Saskatchewan. Surely you would not expect this government to force a provincial government to take over the natural resources if they did not want them. Mr. Walter Scott, following in the footsteps of my right hon. friend opposite, has been ready and has shown by his statements, that he wishes to treat this matter from a political point of view. That is the manner in which he has treated it ever since he came into power . I hold in my hand some statements made by Mr. Walter Scott with respect to this particular matter, and I would like to quote them to the House. Dealing with this question, Mr. Scott said in 1906, that:

He could prove that before he went to Ottawa for the Autonomy session he had come to the conclusion, with a great many other people, that it would be better that the public lands should not be handed over to the possession and management of the people of the province, and if they could induce the Dominion to give them a fair subsidy it would be better for the lands to remain in the care of the Department of the Interior. Then it came down to the very simple question as to the adequacy of the terms. His friends contended, and would contend, he had no doubt, to the end of the chapter, that the terms were inadequate. (Mr. Wylie—'Hear, hear.')

The member for Maple Creek said 'hear, hear,' but let him look among his political friends outside the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan and he would fail to find one who would agree with him.

Mr. Wylie. But we are the judges.

Mr. Scott remarked that they had the judgment of the people of Alberta and Saskatchewan. Before the provinces as a whole stated their opinion at the elections last fall there was a by-election at Edmonton, and since the provincial elections they had had three other contests, all of which endorsed the terms. West Assiniboia and Saskatchewan went unanimously in support of the Act, and Strathcona gave a large majority.—Scott Budget speech, 'Leader,' May 21, 1906.

Therefore, Mr. Walter Scott was willing then, as I presume he is to-day, to measure terms and conditions for the province with respect to the natural resources and to treat the question as a matter of politics. If it is necessary, I am satisfied that we are prepared to go to the province of Saskatchewan and educate the people there, and I am also satisfied that it is in their best interests, notwithstanding Mr. Walter Scott or Mr. Anybody-else, to have their own natural resources and to administer them for the benefit of their own province. Then again, speaking in 1908, I find Mr. Scott saying:

In addition to the parliament of Canada having settled the question, the province has settled it in the campaign of 1905. It was plainly put and fully discussed. He was satisfied that the cash grant which the province obtained in lieu of their public domain was more advantageous to them than the lands would be. (Hear, hear.)

Then again:

There was not a public man except a bitter partisan, who had opened his mouth on the subject who did not admit that Saskatchewan and Alberta had been made much better off by the federal administration of the lands than they would be, had the lands been under their control.—Regina 'Leader,' Aug. 8, 1908.

Again on August 15, 1908:

We have heard a good deal about the land issue. As I pointed out in this hall on Wednesday evening, in view of the verdict the people gave three years ago on the land, as well as other autonomy questions, what was there for the government to do but what we have done? The people did not want the land arrangement disturbed. They said the same again yesterday. How long is it going to take the people of Saskatchewan to convince Mr. Haultain that they are satisfied with the terms granted them by the Autonomy Act?—'Leader,' Aug. 17, 1908.

Then we have Mr. Scott speaking as follows on October 6, 1911:

If Saskatchewan had the lands, what would we be doing with them? Mr. Haultain tells

you we should be using them for revenue. This is the burden of his contention—that the province is losing revenue by not having the lands.

This land bargain issue in Saskatchewan is a false issue. For practical purposes we might as well discuss stopping the sun in its course.

The autonomy land bargain is not a legitimate issue in the provincial field, and would not be used as an issue if the opposition thought there was good ground on which to attack us in the sphere where we are really responsible.

I am willing, not only willing, but glad, to defend the vote which I gave in parliament in 1905 in favour of the land terms.

The straits of the opposition as regards finding any reasonable grounds of attack against the government's record or policy is confessed by them, in their desire to keep the autonomy land bargain before the province as an issue. They thereby confess that they lack any real ground of criticism.

Lastly, suppose that Mr. Haultain is in office on the strength of this collection of suppositions. it is his policy to acquire the lands. He has been elected to get the lands. How will he go about it? In 1905 and to-day I believed and believe it better that we should have money in lieu of lands, but I can conceive of changed conditions which might lead me in 1920 or 1930 to want the public domain for the province, and against such a day I should really like to know what machinery assists to turn the trick. My curiosity is perfectly sincere.

Mr. Walter Scott undertakes to say that in twenty or thirty years he would be willing to consider the proposition of accepting the natural resources for the province of Saskatchewan, and he asks what machinery there would be to turn the trick. I answer Mr. Walter Scott that the Conservative government of this Dominion, are the machinery through which, and by which that trick will be turned to the advantage of the great province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Scott goes on to say:

I have questioned lawyers and I have yet to learn how it could be done. They tell me that the thing is impossible.

It therefore follows that Mr. Haultain would be utterly helpless to obtain the lands. The province has no more power to take possession of the lands than it has to obtain the moon. Parliament's power to enact the Saskatchewan Act was as complete as its authority to elect the Customs Act, and the land bargain has no more place as an issue in our provincial affairs than any tariff schedule.

If time permitted, I could bring, to quote an illustrious Canadian, 'mountains of evidence' to sustain the Liberal position on this land question. I assure you that it is not on account of lack of defence that I complain against the dragging in of the issue, because our position is sound and strong, while the opposition ground is easily upset.

Am I going too far when I suggest a doubt as to the sanity of any Saskatchewan man who complains against our land terms?

When urging the principle of local ownership of the lands, I know that all I hoped to obtain was recognition of our right of proprietary interest in them. I certainly never expected the actual transfer to the new provinces.

That is what Mr. Walter Scott has to say upon this matter, and let me repeat what I said a moment ago, that when this government have had the opportunity and time to investigate this matter, the promise, as made by my right hon. friend who leads the government, will be faithfully and loyally carried out.

I may say, in reference to the question of financial terms, as cited in the Bill, that my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in discussing this question to-day, in reference to the capital allowance, makes a very different argument when he is arguing against the province of Manitoba from the argument which he made, when he was arguing for the same condition of affairs by the creation of the two new provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta. I hold in my hand a copy of 'Hansard' which contains the argument as advanced by the right hon. gentleman at that time. I am not going to quote at length from what the right hon. gentleman has said, but I desire to place the following before the House:

What can have been the reasoning which induced the fathers of confederation in 1867 to depart from so obvious a principle of finance and government?

The reasons are simply these. Confederation was the result of several compromises. It would have been impossible to establish it if there had not been a policy of give and take adopted among all the constituent bodies. And I am quite sure, I am speaking absolute historical truth when I say that neither Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario nor Quebec would ever have consented to part with their revenues, to give up their powers of taxation in customs and excise, if they had not been promised that out of the federal revenues they would be allowed a certain sum every year to defray the expenses of their own local governments and administrations. This is the reason why this provision is to be found in the British North America Act. It is there. I do not think it is sound, but though in my judgment unsound, it is the duty of everybody in this House and in this country to take confederation as we find it, with its good points and its blemishes, and carry it to the end on the principle upon which it was established. Therefore, upon this point I believe it is the duty of the Canadian parliament to continue that policy in this instance and make a liberal provision for these two new provinces which we are about to admit into the Canadian family.

That was the argument advanced by the right hon. the leader of the opposition upon that occasion, when discussing the question as to whether the position of the provinces then to be created would be the same as the other provinces in respect to customs and excise taxes. I submit that the same

conditions exactly apply to the province of Manitoba. For example, in this past year of 1911, the province of Manitoba contributed to the public treasury of this Dominion in customs and excise something like nine and a half million dollars, and as against that the subsidy given to the province of Manitoba by virtue of the policy adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite was something about $800,000. I therefore say it is not to be wondered that Manitoba makes the claim she is making to-day in order that she may find relief from the condition in which she finds herself of being placed in a position of inequality to every other province in this Dominion. It is upon that ground and upon that ground alone that Manitoba has appealed to this parliament time and time again for justice. Manitoba appeals to the parliament of Canada asking that the restrictive conditions that were applied to her as a province shall be removed, so that she may be enabled to take her place of the full sisterhood with the other provinces that form confederation. Let it be remembered that the people of Manitoba have for the forty years past been the pioneers of that western country. Let it not be forgotten that through their energy and determination and perseverance as pathfinders in that great western land, its possibilities have been opened up to eastern Canada and there has been demonstrated to the world the happy future in store for the hundreds of thousands of settlers who made their homes upon the fertile prairie. Is it fair and reasonable that that province which undertook the hardships of the early pioneer life should be compelled to accept an inferior position to other provinces either in the west or in the east? This Bill undertakes to place Manitoba in a position of equality with the other provinces of the Dominion, and that is all it undertakes to do. Manitoba complains that she has been too long regarded as the kitchen province of the Dominion; she thinks it time that she should be invited to the dining room and given her full status amongst the provinces of this confederation. That is the position which this Bill undertakes to place her in, and I submit to this parliament and to the people of this country that it is only just and fair that such fair treatment should be accorded her.

House divided on amendment (Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Béland,
Bellemare,
Boivin,
Bourassa,
Boyer,
Brown,
Buchanan,
Cardin,
Carvell,
Cash,
Champagne,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Chisholm (Inverness),
Clark (Red Deer),
Cruise,
Delisle,
Demers,
Devlin,
Douglas,
Gauthier (St. Hyacinthe),
Gauvreau,
German,
Guilbault,
Guthrie,
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),
Kay,
Knowles,
Kyte,
Lachance,
Lamarche,
Lanctot,
Lapointe (Kamouraska),
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Law,
Lemieux,
Lovell,
Macdonald,
Maclean (Halifax),
McCraney,
McCoig,
McCrea,
McKenzie,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Marcile (Bagot),
Martin (Montreal, Ste. Mary's),
Michaud,
Molloy,
Nesbitt,
Neely,
Oliver,
Pacaud,
Papineau,
Paquet,
Pardee,
Proulx,
Reid (Restigouche),
Ross,
Sevigny,
Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Tobin,
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Verville,
Warnock and
White (Victoria, Alta.)—65.

$140\frac{1}{2}$

NAYS:

Messieurs

Aikins,
Alguire,
Ames,
Armstrong (York, O.),
Arthurs,
Baker,
Ball,
Barnard,
Bennett (Calgary),
Bennett (Simcoe),
Best,
Blain,
Blondin,
Borden,
Boulay,
Bowman,
Brabazon,
Bradbury,
Broder,
Burnham,
Chabot,
Clare,
Clark (Bruce),
Clarke (Wellington),
Clements,
Cochrane,
Cockshutt,
Crocket,
Crothers,
Currie,
Davidson,
Doherty,
Donnelly,
Edwards,
Elliot,
Elson,
Fisher,
Foster (Kings, N.S.),
Foster (Toronto, N.),
Fripp,
Gauthier (Gaspé),
Girard,
Lavallée,
Lennox,
Lesperance,
Macdonell,
Maclean (York, O.),
McCurdy,
McKay,
Marshall,
Meighen,
Merner,
Middlebro,
Monk,
Morphy,
Munson,
Nantel,
Nicholson,
Nickle,
Paul,
Pelletier,
Perley,
Porter,
Rainville,
Reid (Grenville),
Rhodes,
Robidoux,
Roche,
Rogers,
Schaffner,
Sexsmith,
Sharpe (Lisgar),
Sharpe (Ontario),
Shepherd,
Smith,
Stanfield,
Staples,
Steele,
Stevens,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Stewart (Lunenburg),
Sutherland,
Taylor,
Thompson (Yukon),

Goodeve,	Thornton,
Hartt,	Walker,
Hazen,	Wallace,
Henderson,	Webster,
Hughes (Victoria, O.),	Weichel,
Jameson,	White (Renfrew),
Kemp,	Wilcox,
Kidd,	Wilson
Lalor,	(Wentworth) and
Lancaster,	Wright.—103.

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Messieurs	
White (Leeds),	Emmerson,
Burrell,	McNutt,
Haggart,	Gordon,
Osler (Sir Edmund),	Lafortune,
Forget (Sir Rodolphe),	Brouillard,
Northrup,	Bureau,
Hepburn,	McMillan,
Carrick,	Lapointe (Montreal),
Fowler,	Pugsley,
Bristol,	Charlton,
Thoburn,	Robb,
Smyth,	Clarke (Essex),
Barker,	Martin (Regina),
Beattie,	Sinclair,
Boyce,	Richards,
Cromwell,	Wilson (Laval),
Barrette,	Seguin,
Achim,	Fortier,
Lewis,	Murphy,
Armstrong (Lambton),	Bickerdike,
Tremain,	Carroll,
McLean (P.E.I.),	Power,
Coderre.	Ethier.

Mr. CARVELL. I beg to call attention to the fact that the hon. member for Yamaska has not voted.

Mr. MONDOU. The reason I have not voted is that when the Bill goes before the committee I intend to explain my position fully.

Mr. LAMARCHE. Before the vote is taken on the second reading of the Bill I wish to speak and explain the position I have taken.

Amendment negatived.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONTINENTAL CAN COMPANY.

On the order being called for the second reading of Bill (No. 119), respecting certain patents of the Continental Can Company.—Mr. Fripp.

Mr. CARVELL. In my opinion this Bill should not receive a second reading. This is really the same question that was discussed in this House last week in reference to the patents of a man named Rambaut, and while the House did not decide as a matter of principle that they would not pass the Bill, still the hon. member who had charge of the Bill was satisfied that it should not be passed and dropped that particular portion of it. The whole object of this particular Bill is to place some five or six patents with reference to a certain mechanism for making tin cans under the provisions of section 44 of the Patent Act. That is the section which allows the commissioner of patents to grant to the patentee the right not to manufacture in Canada as was purely the intention of the patent law but to license some other persons to manufacture and to pay him a royalty. As I before said, the only class of patents to which this clause should apply are those dealing with articles such as heavy machinery for which there would be very little sale. If we adopt this Bill then this patentee will be in a position to license some one else to manufacture, and perhaps it may be five or ten years before the industry would be established in Canada, whereas in the ordinary course he would have to manufacture within two years of the issue of this patent.

Mr. BORDEN. The Minister of Agriculture is not in the city to-day, but he will be here to-morrow. I suppose there would be no objection to allowing the Bill to go to the committee where the considerations which the hon. gentleman has mentioned, and which are very important, may be taken into account.

Mr. MACDONALD. The point raised by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) is one which goes to the very principle of the measure and can hardly be considered a matter for the committee. In the last parliament this question formed a subject of discussion and the sense of the House then was against giving to foreigners the right by special legislation of this parliament to continue for a longer period than there was any necessity for under the original patent the rights of the patentee.

Mr. BORDEN. I have never understood that the second reading of a private Bill affirmed any principle.

Mr. MACDONALD. That is true to a great degree where you are dealing with a private Bill which simply confers corporate powers, but here the proposition involved is really an amendment to a substantive law in so far as this particular person is concerned. It is not a matter to be settled by a committee.

Mr. BORDEN. I have no objection to allowing the Bill to stand, but I think that considerations of that kind should be entertained by the special committee to

which a Bill of this special character is to be sent. The Bill comes back to the House in the ordinary course upon the report of that committee either for or against the Bill. In fact, as the hon. gentleman knows, it comes back to this House, it goes into Committee of the Whole, and the report of the committee upon it is usually adopted by the House.

Mr. MACDONALD. I have no objection to the Bill going to the committee with the distinct understanding that I do not approve of the principle of the Bill, and I do not want to have it afterwards said that we are bound to accept the report of the committee to which I do not belong.

Mr. CARVELL. With that understanding I am willing to withdraw my opposition to the second reading, but I would not like to be told that a committee has decided this question and we have to abide by the decision of the committee. I would like to reserve the right to oppose it when it comes back from the committee.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 120) for the relief of Ethel May Stewart—Mr. Clark (Red Deer).

EXTENSION OF BOUNDARIES—MANITOBA.

House resumed the debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Borden for the second reading of Bill (No. 115) to provide for the extension of the boundaries of the province of Manitoba.

Mr. CARVELL. Before my friend proceeds with the debate, I want to raise a question which I raised before six o'clock, and which was not decided by the Chair. I raised the question that the hon. member for Yamaska was sitting in the House and had not voted, and I claim that I am entitled to a decision, because under the authority of Bourinot at page 504, it is distinctly stated:

> If a member of the Commons who has heard the question put does not vote, and the attention of the Speaker is directed to the fact, the latter will call upon him to declare on which side he votes; and his name will be recorded accordingly.

Now, Sir, I raised the point that you, Mr. Speaker, should call upon the hon. member to state on which side he voted. That is supported by a number of references, one of which says:

> In the English House of Commons, 3rd February 1881, Mr. Speaker informed the House that several members who had given their voices with the noes when the question was put, had refused to quit their places, and consequently he had submitted their conduct to the consideration of the House. A number of members were then suspended for refusing to withdraw during the division after having been warned of the consequences by the Speaker.

And not withdrawing during the division would be the same as not voting in this House. I think the hon. member for Yamaska (Mr. Mondou) should be requested by the Chair, to state his reason why he did not vote and on which side he would have voted.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have only to say that I did not notice the hon. member (Mr. Carvell) raising the question, or I would have attended to it then. But, as other business has intervened in the meantime, it is too late now to raise the question.

Mr. P. E. LAMARCHE (Nicolet). Before the House rose, my right hon. friend, the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) had proposed an amendment which had been voted down. It was as follows:

> That whilst the House is favourable to the extension of the boundaries of the province of Manitoba, it is of opinion that the terms under which it is proposed to make the said extension as set forth in this Bill and in the order in council of the 20th of February, 1912, are unfair and unjust both to the people of Manitoba as well as to the people of the other provinces of the Dominion .

I voted for that amendment; but not for the same reason as my right hon. friend. I voted for it because that amendment declares that the terms under which the extension of Manitoba's boundaries are proposed in the Bill are unfair and unjust. But, in my opinion, they are unfair and unjust, not because the conditions set forth in the Bill are so, but because of the absence of other clauses, which I judge, are absolutely necessary. And it is my intention, Mr. Speaker, to develop as briefly as possible the reason why I take that position. The liberty for the people of this country to express their free will through the voice of their representatives is one of the most precious privileges that has ever been granted by the British Crown, and it is the underlying principle of our parliamentary institutions.

The will of the people of my constituency, clearly manifested, on the 21st of September last, by their cheerful and generous acceptation of the promises I had made to them during the campaign, shall to-day dictate my conduct and force me to break away upon this important question from many political friends, for whom I have personally, the most profound respect, notwithstanding our divergence of views and opinions.

The Bill, which is to-day submitted to the approval of this House, provides for

a concession in land and money on the part of the federal government in favour of one of the provinces of this confederation.

There is not one Canadian, I believe, who will not admit the opportunity of effecting under just and reasonable conditions, the annexation to Manitoba of that important portion of our common territory. Our sister province is, at present, geographically too small to satisfy her ever growing energy, to justify her legitimate ambitions and to assure the perfect equilibrium in our political system. Every one will admit also that such transfer of property, if made with due respect to law, justice and equity, is compatible and in harmony with the principles laid down by the fathers of confederation.

The Bill, as far as I can see, contains nothing objectionable. I perfectly agree to every one of its clauses, but, in my opinion, it is incomplete, and I cannot support it for the reason that I fail to see in it a saving clause for the rights of the minorities.

The portion of the territory contemplated for annexation is free from financial liabilities. Is it free from moral obligations? If not, is it in our power, and is it our duty, to point it out in the present legislation? There is a question which has, in the past few weeks, caused many commentaries and occupied many legal minds.

The problem of education, commonly called the school question, has, at different intervals, demanded a solution. The different administrations which have succeeded each other in the government of this country, have dealt with that problem, and some of them have made it worse and more difficult for a satisfactory solution.

In the province of Quebec my right hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, has been defeated in many counties during the last election, partly on account of a serious movement inaugurated against him way back in 1905, as a result of his attitude on the school question in Alberta and Saskatchewan.

The school question in Keewatin, although the same old school question, arises in this case under a new form as regards its legal aspects. What is the law in force to-day in the Northwest Territories? And is the portion of land contemplated for annexation comprised to-day, for the purposes of the law, within the limits of the Northwest Territories? These are two questions that I will try to elucidate before going any further.

The Northwest Territories, as well as Rupert's Land, entered into confederation in the year 1870, on the 15th of July. On the 8th of April, 1875, the federal government of the day, which had at its head the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie, passed a law for the regulation of that newly acquired region, and that law provided for a system of separate schools, by which the Catholic or Protestant minority was protected for the future against the payment of a double school tax. That principle which is laid down in article XI of chapter 49, 38 Victoria, reads as follows:

XI. When, and as soon as any system of taxation shall be adopted in any district or portion of the Northwest Territories, the lieutenant-governor, by and with the consent of the council or assembly, as the case may be, shall pass all necessary ordinances in respect to education; but it shall therein be always provided, that a majority of the ratepayers of any district or portion of the Northwest Territories, or any lesser portion or subdivision thereof, by whatever name the same may be known, may establish such schools therein as they may think fit, and make the necessary assessment and collection of rates therefor; and, further, that the minority of the ratepayers therein, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish separate schools therein, and that, in such latter case, the ratepayers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic separate schools shall be liable only to assessment of such rates as they may impose upon themselves in respect thereof.

In article I of the same Act, the Northwest Territories are defined as follows:

I. The territories formerly known as 'Rupert's Land' and the Northwest Territories (with the exception of such portion thereof as forms the province of Manitoba), shall continue to be styled and known as the Northwest Territories.

This certainly included Keewatin. That law of 1875, did not, however, come into force immediately. In its article 78, it was enacted as follows:

78. This Act shall come into force and effect upon, from and after such day as shall be named in a proclamation to be issued by the Governor in Council for that purpose.

The order in council putting the law ininto force was published in the official 'Gazette,' on the 7th of October, 1876, and the law was put into effect the same day. On the same occasion, viz., on the 7th of October, 1876, the Keewatin Act, which had been assented to on the 12th of April, 1876, was put into effect by a proclamation which appears in the same issue of the Canada 'Gazette.' The Act is intituled as follows, 'An Act respecting the Northwest Territories, and to create a separate territory out of part thereof.' Its reference is 39 Victoria, chapter 21. The new district formed out of and separate from the northwest territories is described as follows in article I of the Act:

I. All that portion of the Northwest Territories, bounded as follows, that is to say:—

Beginning at the westerly boundary of the province of Ontario on the international boundary line dividing Canada from the United States of America; then westerly following upon the said international boundary line to the easterly boundary of the province of Manitoba; thence due north along the said easterly boundary of Manitoba to the north-east angle of the said province; thence due west on the north boundary of the said province to the intersection by the said boundary of the westerly shore of Lake Manitoba; thence northerly following the said westerly shore of the said lake to the easterly terminus thereon of the portage connecting the southerly end of Lake Winnipegosis with the said Lake Manitoba known as 'the Meadow Portage'; thence westerly following upon the trail of the said portage to the westerly terminus of the same, being on the easterly shore of the said Lake Winnegosis; thence northerly following the line of the said easterly shore of the said lake to the southerly end of the portage, leading from the head of the said lake into 'Cedar lake' known as the 'Cedar,' or 'Mossy Portage'; thence northerly following the trail of the said portage to the north end of the same on the shore of Cedar lake; thence due north to the northerly limits of Canada; thence easterly following upon the said northerly limits of Canada to the northerly extremity of Hudson bay; thence southerly following upon the westerly shore of the said Hudson bay to the point where it would be intersected by a line drawn due north from the place of beginning, and thence due south on the said line last mentioned to the said place of beginning—

Shall be and is hereby set apart as a separate district of the said Northwest Territories by the name of the district of Keewatin.

In the Keewatin Act many clauses of the Northwest Territories Act are made applicable to the new district, but no reference is made to Article XI., which contains provisions for separate schools, and legally speaking there can be no doubt that from the 7th of October, 1876, and for some time as we will see later, the separate school clause was ineffective in the new district, as long as the Keewatin Act stood in force.

It is important, however, to point out that the District of Keewatin, as described in the Keewatin Act, is only a part of the territory to be annexed to Manitoba, and which is described in the present Bill; the other part consists in a piece of land of about fifty miles wide and extending from the northern boundary of the actual province of Manitoba towards the northern limits of Canada.

This strip of land has always remained since 1870 and is still a part of the undisturbed portion of the Northwest Territories, and in that part, at least, the law introduced in 1875 relating to separate schools, has always been in force. It is in that section of Keewatin that we find that place called Le Pas, where there is, at present, if my information is correct, a voluntary school in operation. The law introduced by Mackenzie, in 1875, and the Keewatin Act, introduced in 1876, as I said before, came into force the same day, 7th of October, 1876. It may be well to know that the law introduced by Mackenzie was a legislation of a permanent character, while the Keewatin Act was only a law of exception and passed temporarily for the purpose of awaiting the settlement of a local difficulty.

In order to assure ourselves that the law of 1875 had a permanent character, it may be well to read the speeches made in the Canadian parliament, during the session of 1875, in the month of March, by the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie, the Hon. Mr. Blake and others, and if you consult the fourteenth volume of the debates of the House of Commons, 1875, page 658, you will see that the Hon. Mr. Blake is quoted as having said that:

He believed that it was essential to our obtaining a large immigration to the north west that we should tell the people beforehand what those rights were to be in the country in which we invited them to settle.

And further:

I do not agree with the policy of asking people to settle in that western country and tell them that a paternal government would look after them, and would give them such institutions as the government thought suitable. We had better let the people know their fate, politically and otherwise before they settled there.

That was, Mr. Speaker, the spirit of the law and it was in that spirit that the Canadian government of 1875 has put its seal to that legislation of equity, which was to be accepted by the settlers of that country. The Keewatin Act was only a temporary and accidental legislation, and its preamble bears out my assertion. It reads as follows:—

Whereas it is expedient, pending the settlement of the western boundary of Ontario to create a separate territory of the eastern part of the Northwest Territories.

In the same law we find a proviso giving authority to re-annex any part of the new district to the Northwest Territories. In 1905, an order in council was passed to reunite Keewatin to the Northwest Territories. It is contended, and I think with reason, that such order in council was 'ultra vires,' because it provided for the re-annexation of the whole of Keewatin, while, according to the provisions of the Keewatin Act, the Governor in Council, without the parliament, had only the right to re-annex parts of that territory, but not the whole.

Although that order in council seems to be unconstitutional, it shows, at least, the intention of the government of the day,

and we shall see immediately how their intention has been carried out.

When the statutes of Canada were revised in 1906 the Northwest Territories Act, as modified by several amendments, was inserted as chapter 62, but the Keewatin Act was left out, and moreover, if we consult in Vol. IV, of the Revised Statutes, 1906, page 7, under the title of History and Disposal of Acts, we find 'District of Keewatin, Chapter 53, effete and recommended for repeal.' Furthermore, Art. 4 of 6-7 Ed. VII intituled 'An Act respecting the Revised Statues, 1906,' reads as follows: 'The several Acts enumerated in Schedule 'A' to the said Revised Statutes are hereby declared to be and to have been on, from and after the last mentioned date (31st January, 1907) repealed to the extent mentioned in the said Schedule.'

And in Schedule 'A', Vol. III, R.S.C., p. 3063, I read the following: '53. An Act respecting the District of Keewatin the whole repealed.'

I think every lawyer in this House will bear me out when I say that, at least, since the revision of 1906, which came into force on the 31st January, 1907, the Keewatin Act is no longer a law of this country, and, as a result, the District of Keewatin, is no longer excepted from the Northwest Territories as they are defined in Article 2 of chapter 62 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, and which reads as follows:

Article 2 in this Act, unless the context otherwise requires:

(a) Territories means the Northwest Territories which comprise the Territories formerly known as Rupert's Land and the Northwestern Territory, except such portions thereof as form the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta and the Yukon Territory, together with all British territories and possessions in North America and all islands adjacent thereto not included within any province, except the colony of Newfoundland and its dependencies.

The Northwest Territories Act applies, therefore, not only to that strip of land, which has never been excluded from the Northwest Territories, but it applies also to the other part to be annexed and which has automatically returned to the Northwest Territories by the disappearance of the Keewatin Act. The Northwest Territories Act, however, as we find it in the Revised Statutes of Canada, chapter 62, is somewhat different from the original legislation of 1875 and this as a result of several amendments.

The original Article XI of the law of 1875 relating to separate schools has now become Article X of chapter 62 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, and it reads as follows:

X.—The Commissioner in Council, if authorized to make ordinances respecting education, shall pass all necessary ordinances in respect thereto, but in the laws or ordinances relating to education it shall always be provided that a majority of the ratepayers of any district or portion of the Territories or of any less portion or subdivision thereof, by whatever name the same is known, may establish such schools therein as they think fit and make the necessary assessment and collection of rates therefor; and also that the minority of ratepayers therein, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish separate schools therein, and in such case the ratepayers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic separate schools shall be liable only to assessments of such rates as they impose upon themselves in respect thereof.

Do we find in that Article X the existence of a right in favour of the minorities to separate schools and a protection against the payment of a double school tax? It is my opinion. The Commissioner in Council cannot pass an ordinance establishing a school system without providing for the rights of the minority. The Commissioner in Council, however, cannot pass such ordinance without, first, being authorized to that effect by the Governor General in Council. Therefore, the government is at liberty to give or to abstain itself from giving the proper authority to the commissioner, but if it is given, it is to the establishment of separate schools and nothing else.

Now, is it possible to establish a school system in the Northwest Territories in any other way than by the means of an ordinance emanating from the Commissioner in Council?

I think so, but the only way would be by a law of this parliament passed in open session, in the regular way, but I hold that, even that law would have to provide for the rights of the minority, unless Article X of the Northwest Territories Act is repealed, modified or made non-applicable, which would be the breaking away from the just and equitable policy of Mr. Mackenzie, consecrated thirty-six years ago by the Conservative as well as the Liberal party.

If you peruse the disposition of Article X, you will find that it is divided into two distinct sections, although they are not numbered, but simply separated by a semicolon, after the word 'thereto,' in the third line.

The first part simply states that the Commissioner-in-Council shall pass all necessary ordinances respecting education, if he receives the proper authority. No mention is made in that first part, of laws, for the good reason that the Commissioner-in-Council has no right to make laws. His legislative powers are exercised by way of ordinances. This is clearly stated in Ar-

ticle VII of the Northwest Territories Act, which is entitled 'Legislative Powers of Commissioner-in-Council,' and there can be no doubt about it.

In the second part of Article X it is clearly stated that not only the ordinances shall provide for the protection of the rights of the minority, but the laws as well. In other words, not only the Commissioner of the Northwest Territories is ordered to respect the rights of the minority, but even the parliament of Canada.

The government of Canada, through its executive, has the right to give or to refuse to the Commissioner-in-Council, the proper authority to enable him to pass an ordinance establishing schools recognized by law.

Has the government made any use of that power? If my information is correct, the government of Canada, under the past administration, as well as under the present one, has either refused or neglected, not only to give the proper authority to the commissioner, but even to name the persons to form his council, although it had been duly and repeatedly requested by a certain number of British subjects inhabiting the territory which is now contemplated for annexation to the province of Manitoba; and a certain newspaper, 'The Manitoba Free Press,' if I am not mistaken, qualified the lack of action in that matter as a sharp piece of work and good tactics in contemplation of the prospective extension of boundaries. Now, I think the non-existence of regular school system in Keewatin would be a very poor reason to allege, especially by those who have been instrumental in refusing to act. But, is it necessary, Mr. Speaker, in order to find the true spirit of the law which is now in force, to go through all those tortuous legal technicalities? The article which now regulates education in that part of the country should be considered as forming part of a constant policy in existence for thirty-six years in the minds of those who have worked for the best interests of Canada, and in order to know the true meaning of that law, those who are to be consulted are not the politicians who have modified and tortured the texts, during the past few years, but those rather who have given life to that legislation of justice, expecting that it would last untrammelled longer than their own mortal existence.

Last week, curious coincidence, the Canadian statesman who has been the instigator of that charter of rights for the people of the northwest, passed away practically at the same moment as an effort was being made to leave in oblivion the work of his life. Why not live up to the former engagements entered into by the government of our country? Is it because the other party to the Act is weak and feeble? I do not think such an idea could make its way in the spirit of a broad-minded people, and I do not think it could be invoked with success in a British country like ours.

Is it because the respect of minorities is a principle which has been productive of bad results in our country? We have been told several times by the best accredited representatives of the English minority of the province of Quebec that it was a good principle and that the majority of that province was very particular in taking the means to safeguard and respect it. Why should not the same principle work as well in other portions of Canada? We are told very often that in this free country of ours all religions are on the same footing. We know also that the full exercise of the Catholic religion has been guaranteed from the time of capitulation. It is the duty of Catholic parents to send their children to a school of their faith and, Mr. Speaker, I say that we are limiting their liberty in that respect in making them pay a double tax for the exercise of that privilege, when we can avoid it. In the province of Manitoba there has been a school question which has been incompletely settled. A judgment of the highest tribunal of the empire has recognized that the Catholic minority of Manitoba was suffering serious grievances. To-day we are asked to vote in favour of a Bill which provided for a concession to Manitoba. That Bill is only the first part of a contract because the Legislature of Manitoba has to accept the terms of the arrangement as they are laid down in the present measure. It would not be in my mind, a policy of coercion but rather a policy of conciliation to insert in the Bill a saving clause for the rights of the minorities in the new district to be annexed, similar to the clause which I have seen in the Bill which protects the rights of the Hudson's Bay Company.

I have respect, Mr. Speaker, for those who differ with me in their opinions. The question is difficult and intricate if we look only into its legal aspects. I will even admit that I have considered the spirit of justice and equity stronger than the doubtful solutions arising from the text books. The principles I have set forth, which I think are just and equitable, I have preached politically for ten years, and, in the last campaign, I made, in connection with this Keewatin question, some declarations that were not ambiguous, and I made them to the knowledge and in the presence of those to whom my candidature was agreeable and useful. I am here to-day to keep my word and I shall do my duty.

These are the reasons why I have voted for the amendment moved by my right hon. friend and these are the reasons why I shall vote against the Bill that is proposed to the House.

Hon. F. D. MONK (Minister of Public Works). Mr. Speaker, I personally am obliged to my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Lamarche) for affording me an opportunity of giving some explanation to the House with regard to the point which he has raised. My hon. friend has explained his position in moderate and clear language. I do not think anybody, even those who do not entirely agree with him, can find fault with the manner in which he has placed the case before this House. But Mr. Speaker, before taking up the consideration of this phase of the question which my hon. friend has touched upon, I would like to say, after all I have heard this afternoon that, upon the whole, my hon. friends on the other side of the House have taken what I would call a somewhat gloomy view of the measure brought down by the government. It is, to my mind, necessary to point out that there is a brighter view and that in bringing down this measure my right hon. friend the leader of the government (Mr. Borden) has placed, so to speak, the keystone in the arch of confederation, completing the great work begun by Macdonald, Cartier and the other fathers of confederation.

It is the rounding up of that great work at which we are assisting this evening, and it seems to me that such an important event for our country should afford cause for more gratification, and more self-congratulation than we have heard from the other side of the House during this debate. Three provinces, Quebec, Manitoba and Ontario, are profiting by the work which, to-day, the traditional descendants of the founders of confederation are bringing to completion. For my part, having more intimate connection with the province of Quebec, I congratulate the government upon bringing into the provincial organization of this Dominion the territory which is being added to my native province, because I believe that the very best results will come from it. The territory which is being assigned to the province of Quebec is of immense value. There is within its confines great lumber, wealth, vast water-powers, which when developed, will enrich our whole country, extensive mineral areas, and most productive fisheries along the coast which comes under the jurisdiction of the province of Quebec. To the province of Ontario an equally valuable area is assigned for development, an area which comprises probably more agricultural resources than is to be found in the territory given to Quebec, a territory where there is lumber wealth and mineral resources and which brings the province of Ontario into contact with the great fisheries of the Hudson bay. And, to the province of Manitoba, this is a particularly welcome thing, because it brings to an end the discontent, the justifiable discontent, which had prevailed in that province. I have never been able to understand why, when we carved out the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, we did not, at the same time, in view of the temper of the people of the west, and the long-standing aspirations of Manitoba, the first born of the provinces of confederation —I have never been able to understand why we did not satisfy the claims of Manitoba at that time. No man can look at the map of the Dominion to-day without seeing with the naked eye the comparatively insignificant position which that province occupies territorially, and none can fail to appreciate why there is dissatisfaction in that eldest of the prairie provinces. We are now at long last rendering justice to Manitoba; we are handing over to her territory which ought to belong to her as a province, and we are finishing up the work of confederation in this way. When I heard my right hon. friend, the Prime Minister, presenting this measure to the House, I recalled that nearly forty years ago when I was not more than a boy, I myself heard Cartier, one of the great workers in the initiatory process of the foundation of this Dominion with prophetic version foretelling the hour when the whole of British North America would be organized into provinces and when the dream of himself and his associates would be polarized. Well, Sir, to-day we are giving effect to that prophecy of the great Sir George Cartier. One would suppose, hearing the remarks of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley), that the first organizers of confederation had entered into the scheme as a land speculation. When we heard the hon. member speak of the necessity, in the disposal of these great territories, of consulting provinces far removed from the regions which we are discussing, and talking of compensation being given to these provinces, one would suppose we were assisting in a land deal. Well, that is not the spirit in which the founders of confederation proceeded; that is not the spirit which presided over the negotiations when they acquired Rupert's Land and the territories of the northwest. There was no payment there for real estate; it was under an order in council of the Imperial government that most of these lands were handed over to us, and, while it is true, that in 1868, compensation was paid to extinguish the rights—other than trading and commercial rights of the Hudson's Bay Company, the idea at the bottom of it was that these territories would afterwards be distributed among the provinces in order to complete a symmetrical plan under which this territory would become provincially organized for the fuller and more completed development of the confederacy then in an embryo state. It is not a matter of adjusting accounts among the

provinces; it is not a matter to be taken up in a book-keeping spirit; but it is a matter which should be regarded in the light alone of the fruition of the scheme of confederation. It seems to me, therefore, that the criticism we have heard to-day about the financial terms granted and about consulting the other provinces, and about an accord between Manitoba and Ontario, as to a right of way for a purely provincial railway into the hinterland and towards Hudson bay; it seems to me that the constitutional points raised in these questions did not evince on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite that large and liberal-minded view which we should take of an event of this kind, and which should lead us to a more generous, more comprehensive, and larger view of the whole situation. The port on the Hudson bay is a port which belongs to the Dominion and which will be developed by the Dominion, and what more natural than since an arrangement of this kind cannot be come to without the mutual consent of all interested, that there should be a consent to this right-of-way giving Ontario the privilege of pushing its provincial railway up to the very shores of the Dominion harbour on Hudson bay.

This is a matter which, it seems to me, ought to be the subject of general congratulation and exultation, at least in its general features. But in all human events a bitter drop usually surges out of the fountain of our joys, and my hon. friend from Nicolet (Mr. Lamarche) has brought to the surface that bitter drop in this instance. For my part, I am very glad to be able to explain to this House and to the country, my position on this question. A great many very unfair criticisms of the government have come from certain quarters in regard to the educational aspect of this question. I have read of these criticisms with very great regret, because I do not think they are in the least degree founded. But from their tone, one would suppose that it is in a certain way the resuscitation or resurrection of the Manitoba school question. It is, I think, proper, to point out, in order to clear away what doubtful points may exist, in regard to this matter, that, as I have always understood, the Manitoba school question was finally, and for all time, settled in 1897, by the settlement arrived at between the Dominion government and the government of Manitoba, in regard to that question, and it cannot in any sense come up again. I have always held to that opinion, and have expressed it on many occasions, though I have absolutely condemned the terms of that agreement. There are several ways in which, under our constitution, the Federal government can intervene, and interfere in matters of education. They are provided for in section 93 of the British North America Act, and, in the case of Manitoba, in section 22 of the Manitoba Act, the charter of that province under Imperial authority. It was under the latter section that what I cannot help calling the regrettable question at that time arose. But it does not in any sense, arise in the present instance. Where disagreements arise, we can interfere by conference, under section 22 of the Manitoba Act we can interfere by remedial order, we can interfere by legislation, and we can interfere by settlement; but surely, to anybody who reads with attention and care the dispositions of section 22 of the Manitoba Act, and of section 93 of our Constitutional Act, when those means have been exhausted and a settlement has been arrived at, there is the end of the matter. I remember having given public utterance to that sentiment in 1896, after the general elections of that year, in which the electorate had declared against the mode adopted at that time, by the leader of the government, Sir Charles Tupper.

After that election, I expressed the view, and I think with reason, that the country had decided that there should be no remedial legislation, and that, as far as remedial legislation was concerned, the Manitoba question was settled. I gave public utterance to that view, which was commented on at the time by the papers in my own province, and I believe outside of it. What happened in 1896? My right hon. friend, the leader of the opposition at that time and the leader of the opposition to-day, declared as his policy before the country that there should be no remedial legislation—that it was not the proper system to adopt in order to remedy the grievance which had been established by the highest court of the empire as a real grievance of the minority in Manitoba. He was in favour of conciliation and he held out to the electors of Canada that as soon as he was placed in power he would name a commission, the chairman of which would be Sir Oliver Mowat, a man commendable to everybody, and that under the management of that commission this question of the Manitoba schools would be settled, not by remedial legislation, but by conferences and agreement. Well, Sir, in my own province that programme was absolutely ratified and adopted, we who were in favour of remedying the grievance by remedial legislation returned from the province of Quebec a small baker's dozen, if I remember correctly. Therefore, the attitude of my right hon. friend in that regard was endorsed in my province and all over the country. What happened afterwards? A settlement was arrived at in 1897 though not exactly in the manner announced by my right hon. friend. As brought down to the House in 1897, that settlement is to be found in the Sessional

Papers of that year, volume 30, Sessional Paper No. 35, and if this is consulted, it will be found that the agreement, in the estimation of the minority themselves of the province concerned, was absolutely inadequate to remedy the grievance. I condemned it as such, but it was approved by parliament. The ministerial party of that day without any exception approved of the terms of that agreement, by voting confidence in the government after it had been adopted. It was approved by the country in the elections of 1900, more particularly in my own province.

I think I am justified in saying that as far as interference from the Dominion parliament or the Dominion government is concerned in any way we are to-day absolutely functi-officio. There is no power in the Dominion parliament or in the Dominion government to touch in any way the disabilities, the inconveniences, the great injustices to my mind from which at the present moment the religious minority in Manitoba are suffering. Therefore, it seems to me that it is our duty to examine what rights there are in the district of Keewatin which, according to my hon. friend from Nicolet, are to be safeguarded or attended to. From the animadversion and vituperation with which certain attacks have been made upon those of us in the Cabinet who are supposed to be more particularly concerned with the protection of the rights of the minority, that we should inquire if there are any vested rights in the Roman Catholic population of the district of Keewatin. In the petitions which I have received, in the requests which have appeared in the public press, reference is continually made to the Statute of 1875 to which the hon. member for Nicolet (Mr. Lamarche) has referred. The statute of 1875 contained the disposition which he has read to the House and which I would like briefly to quote. It is to be found in chapter 49 of the Statutes of 1875, section 11, regarding the Northwest Territories. It says:

> When and so soon as any system of taxation shall be adopted in any district or portion of the Northwest Territories, the Lieutenant-Governor, by and with the consent of the council or assembly, as the case may be, shall pass all necessary ordinances in respect to education, but it shall therein be always provided, that a majority of the ratepayers of any district or portion of the Northwest Territories, or any lesser portion or subdivision thereof, by whatever name the same may be known, may establish such schools therein as they may think fit, and make the necessary assessment and collection of rates therefor; and further, that the minority of the ratepayers therein, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish separate schools therein, and that in such latter case, the ratepayers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic separate schools shall be liable only to assessments of such rates as they may impose upon themselves in respect thereof.

This disposition is reproduced in the statutes of 1896, but it never was in any way enforced in the district of Keewatin. This Act of 1875 never applied to the district of Keewatin in any way. In the year after the Act was passed the district of Keewatin was organized separately under the Keewatin Act and this separation of the district of Keewatin from the rest of the Northwest Territories was for the purpose of temporarily providing for the administration of that district. Even as far back as 1875 this intention was expressed by parliament, as we find in the debates; the disposition of that territory was purely temporary, it was intended to incorporate it with the province of Manitoba or part of it with the province of Ontario. It was separated from the territories of the Northwest as being immediately about to be incorporated with existing provinces, and the disposition of section 11 to which I have referred was especially for that purpose and then there is the Keewatin Act. Mr. Alexander Mackenzie, as will be found on referring to the debates of 1876, stated that this leaving out and this failure to provide any school law protection, any educational guarantee, was because the measure was temporary and it was intended before long, even at that time, 30 years ago, to place that territory under the school administration of the province of Manitoba or the province of Ontario or even perhaps to return it to the Northwest Territories. Therefore, I say that from the 7th of October, 1876, the date at which the Northwest Territories Act of 1875 came into force and the district of Keewatin Act of 1876 was also proclaimed, there never was any educational guarantee or law of any kind in the territory with which we are now dealing up to the time of the erection of the two provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, 30 years during which this district was kept in that state of suspense, and it is, I think, fair to assume that during that time there never was any law in existence in that territory under which any vested rights of any kind or description might be acquired.

I come now to the moment when the two provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta were organized. Up to that moment, during 30 years, in the district of Keewatin, there were no schools, there was no school legislation, there was no law of any kind under which any living man could claim any guarantee of any kind whatever in respect of education. In 1905 we created the two new provinces of Saskatchewan

'and Alberta by the two Acts of that year 'and in the same year was passed this 'statute which, I think, is important to 'quote to the House, because we are com-'ing to a crucial and important moment 'in connection with the examination of 'this question. In the year 1905 at the 'time the Dominion parliament was creat-'ing these two large provinces alongside 'of Manitoba, we passed a statute amend-'ing the Northwest Territories Act, chapter '27, 4 and 5 Edward VII, section 3. We were then left with the Northwest Terri-'tories and with the district of Keewatin. 'What were we going to do? We had not 'carried out the expectation and the very 'natural request of the province of Mani-'toba to simultaneously receive its own 'extension of boundaries. This is what I 'find in section 3 of that statute:

The Northwest Territories shall hereafter comprise the territories formerly known as Rupert's Land and the Northwestern Territories, except such portions thereof as form the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, the district of Keewatin, and the Yukon Territory, together with all British territories and possessions in North America and all islands adjacent to any such territories or possessions except the colony of Newfoundland and its dependencies.

Therefore, the Dominion parliament, after having created and organized these two new provinces, as I read this sentence —and I submit to the House that it is not subject to any other interpretation—declares what shall be the new Northwest Territory, and keeps out of the Northwest Territory the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, the district of Keewatin and the district of the Yukon. That was, at that moment, the will of parliament. Keewatin was not thrown into the Northwest Territory, but by the express declaration of the will of parliament, and for the same reasons that had prompted the creation of the district of Keewatin in 1875, it was kept aside to be placed in the province immediately adjacent. I say that was the will of parliament at that moment. The will of parliament was that the district of Keewatin should not once more be thrown into the Northwest Territory. At that very moment this annexation to the province to which we are annexing it to-day was already an urgent, a burning question. And parliament, with perfect reason, decreed that Keewatin should remain under the same régime as that under which it had been before.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Was Keewatin not reannexed to the territories in 1905, by a proclamation which was provided for in the Keewatin Act of 1875?

Mr. MONK. I have just stated to the House what was the legislation immediately following or contemporaneous with the creation of the two new provinces. But four days afterwards, on the 24th July, 1905, under the section of the old Keewatin Act, the Dominion government passed an order in council—the order in council to which my hon. friend from Nicolet (Mr. Lamarche), referred. This did not detach from Keewatin, in conformity with the terms of the Act, some proportion or portions of the district, but assigned the whole of the district to the Northwest Territories. And it is claimed—and I think with reason —that the order in council was absolutely ultra vires of the powers of the government under the section of the Keewatin Act to which I have just referred. But the strangest part of all came about when the revised statutes of 1906 came into force. The revised statutes of 1906, chapter 62, section 2, provides as follows:

In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires, 'territories' means the Northwest Territories, which comprise the territories formerly known as Rupert's Land and the Northwest Territories, except such portions thereof as form the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta and Yukon Territory.

Leaving out entirely the district of Keewatin in spite of the statute to which I have referred, passed in the previous year. So that, as I understand, the Act of the previous year was not repealed.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Will the hon. minister please read that section again?

Mr. MONK. I say that under section 2 of chapter 62, the Act respecting the Northwest Territories, the description of the Northwest Territories is not taken from the Act of 1905. It is not made to comprise the Northwest Territory except the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, the district of Keewatin and the Yukon territory. The district of Keewatin is left out in the revision of the section. Although the will of parliament declares in 1905, that the statutes to which I have referred was that the district of Keewatin should remain outside of the Northwest Territories, and although that statute of 1905 is not repealed by the revised statutes —it is mentioned among the statutes revised—still in this section the Keewatin district is left out of the list of exceptions and so is thrown into the Northwest Territories.

Mr. ETHIER. May I ask the hon. gentleman to read the last part of the section 2? He does not read it all. The last part concludes the definition of the word "territories". The hon. gentleman reads only the exceptions.

Mr. MONK. I will read it all to my hon. friend:

'Territories' means the Northwest Territories which comprise the territories formerly known as Rupert's Land and the northwestern territory, except such portions thereof as form the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta and the Yukon Territory, together with all British territories and possessions in North America and all islands adjacent thereto, not included within any province, except the colony of Newfoundland and its dependencies.

What I wish to point out is that the statute of 1905, though it is not purported to be repealed by the revised statutes, but consolidated, clearly takes out of the Northwest Territories the district of Keewatin, whereas under this section 2 of chapter 62 of the revised statutes as it is proclaimed in the following year, the district of Keewatin is left out. Therefore under this section 2 of chapter 62 it was actually thrown into the Northwest Territories, contrary, as I submit, to the clearly manifested will of parliament expressed by the statute passed in the previous year.

Mr. GUTHRIE. But the revised statutes, I presume, would supersede the statutes of the previous year. We passed the revised statutes as well as the others.

Mr. MONK. I suppose so. But the statute of the previous year was not repealed.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I would take it to be repealed by implication.

Mr. MONK. I do not think so.

Mr. PROULX. Is it not repealed by the statute of 6-7 Edward VII—the next year?

Mr. MONK. Now, Sir, let us take the section to be found in the revised statutes of 1906. Up to 1906, we have not a shadow of reason for contending that there is in the district of Keewatin during the thirty years during which it had existed any legislation of any kind whatever concerning education or educational privileges. But let us take what happened in 1905 and 1906 and let me read to the House these sections concerning education to be found in the revised statute. I quote from the revised statutes of 1906 chapter 62, section 10:

The Commissioner in Council, if authorized to make ordinances respecting education, shall pass all necessary ordinances in respect thereto; but in the laws or ordinances relating to education it shall always be provided that a majority of the ratepayers of any district or portion of the territories, or of any less portion or subdivision thereof, by whatever name the same is known, may establish such schools therein as they think fit, and make the necessary assessment and collection of rates therefor; and also that the minority of the ratepayers therein, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish separate schools therein and in such cases, the ratepayers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic separate schools shall be liable only to assessment of such rates as they impose upon themselves in respect thereof.

Taking it that this enactment of section 10, to be found for the first time in 1906 as applicable to the district of Keewatin, taking it that it came legitimately into our legislation, were there any vested rights of any kind or description whatever created under that section? The House will note that in order to create any of these rights it was necessary that the commissioner of the northwest should be provided with a council. Without that council he could not pass any laws or regulations whatever in respect of education. But that was not the only condition. Not only must he be furnished with a council without which he had no authority whatever to legislate, but he must be specially authorized by the Dominion government to pass ordinances in respect to education. Neither of these conditions were ever fulfilled. It is not surprising that they were not fulfilled, because everything at that moment in that territory was in a state of transition; there was no necessity for providing it with a council. It was not necessary for him to pass any ordinances in respect to education, because the régime over which he had control particularly in that direction was in a transitory state. Whatever may have been the reason, he was never authorized to pass any ordinances, he never received any council to advise him in his legislative capacity, and no law or regulation of any kind was adopted in that régime in respect to education. And can it be pretended that there were vested rights in respect to education?

Mr. GUILBAULT. Will the hon. member permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. MONK. Certainly.

Mr. GUILBAULT. When was the nomination of that council asked for the first time? Was it under the present government or under the ex-government?

Mr. MONK. I believe that the first request addressed to the federal government of appointment of a council was made in 1909. In a few moments I will refer to the matter mentioned by my hon. friend.

I say, therefore, that when you speak of vested rights in respect of education, you speak of rights that have been obtained in a substantial form, and under legislation which has been adopted. This section 10 which came into force under the circumstances I have indicated, in these peculiar, strange, mysterious circumstances, in respect of which I think some explanation ought to be offered by those who at that time were responsible for the legislation, was potential legislation, permissive or restrictive legislation. But, surely no vested

rights of any kind could arise under a clause of that kind until it became effective by the creation of a council under the authority conferred upon the commissioner to legislate, and furthermore, by legislation putting in force ordinances and regulations by the commissioner thus surrounded by his council and vested with authority. There never was at any time anything of that kind. So that what we have to-day in the district of Keewatin is merely a restriction which never became operative or effective because the clause itself never came into operation through the failure to name a council and to authorize that council to legislate.

I have spoken in regard to the district of Keewatin. My hon. friend from Nicolet (Mr. Lamarche) has referred to the narrow strip on the eastern part of the district of Keewatin, probably one-ninth at most of the territory with which we are dealing to-night, and which, when the two new provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta were created, were left out of those provinces for the sake of symmetry and remained in the Northwest Territories. But in that narrow strip, although the former section of the Act of 1875 applied without any interruption, it never became effective, no schools were organized, the ordinances of the Northwest Territories were never applied in that district, and no vested rights of any kind, to my mind, were created. Now under these circumstances I do not think it is possible to say that there are, in any portion of that district, acquired rights with which we can deal. Let me here mention to the House, in answer to the question put by my hon. friend from the county of Joliette (Mr. Guilbault), a petition was presented to the government—I have a copy of it here—on the 9th of July, 1905, for the establishment of a school at Le Pas. That petition does not indicate the character of the school to be established. There is a correspondence upon the subject. I will not take up the time of the House in quoting lengthily from the correspondence upon that subject, but I will merely state the facts. In 1909 application was made to the government for the establishment of a school in that strip. The government does not seem to have thought at the time that it was possible to organize that school under any law. The report of Mr. White, commisisoner, was that there were no laws under which effect could be given to that application. I believe that application was from the Catholic minority. So far as I can see from the document, it was for the establishment of a school at that place. There was afterwards an application from a Roman Catholic bishop. That application was made since the present government came into power. The matter was referred to the commissioner of the northwest, and the report was in the same sense, that there were no ordinances applicable or susceptible of any application in that territory under which any possible effect could be given to that expressed desire for a local organization.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I thought the question of my hon. friend from Joliette (Mr. Guilbault) was whether there had been an application for the appointment of a council, and when it was made for the first time.

Mr. MONK. I am not aware that there was at any time an application for a Council; it may be so, but I am not aware of it. There were several applications—I think two or three, at any rate—for school organization under the laws, but I am not aware that there was any demand—although there might have been a demand—for the nomination of a council. When this government came into power, one of the very first questions brought to our consideration with which we had to deal—I think the very first question—was precisely the demand of Manitoba for an extension of its boundaries. There has been a pretension that at that moment it was the duty of the government to complete the council and to authorize the commissioner, assisted by the council, to pass educational legislation. It seems to me a most preposterous proposal that we, at that moment, when seized with the immediate question of the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba, which had been before the country for years, and obliged to deal with that question, should, by the nomination of a council and the authorization of the commissioner to pass ordinances in respect to education, still further complicate the question which was already before us to be decided. It would have been not only highly improper, but absolutely preposterous at that moment. We would have been called upon to deal immediately with the territory, to name a council, and to complete the organization of that territory as if it were to remain permanently outside of the province. I always considered that that was a most improvident demand and a most indefensible proposal. I think this is a proper view to take of it. Then, there were no vested rights of any kind in Keewatin territory, and there are at present no vested rights, nothing substantial in the way of legal or acquired rights in the territory with which we are dealing. There is a legislative restriction in case the commissioner in charge of the territory should be provided with a council, and in case he should be authorized to legislate on education. But, there is no council, we found no council, we have to deal with the question and the commissioner has never been provided with a

council or authorized to legislate. There are no obligations of any kind existing under any legal disposition in that territory. Let me read to the House the law which governs our dealings with this question at the present moment. I shall quote from the Imperial Act, 1871, 34-35 Vic. We are doing something absolutely different from what we were doing in 1905, because then we were organizing two new provinces. These are the sections of the Imperial Act, under which we are authorized to create new provinces or to extend the boundaries of a province:

The parliament of Canada may from time to time establish new provinces in any territories forming for the time being part of the Dominion of Canada, but not included in any province thereof, and may, at the time of such establishment, make provision for the constitution and admission of any such province and for the passing of laws for the peace, order and good government of such province, and for its representation in the said parliament.

3. The parliament of Canada may from time to time, with the consent of the legislature of any province of the said Dominion, increase, diminish or otherwise alter the limits of such province upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the said legislature, and may, with the like consent, make provision respecting the effect and operation of any such increase or diminution or alteration of territory in relation to any province affected thereby.

In 1905 we were giving a constitution to the two new provinces. Under the third section, under which we are acting at the present time, we have no constitution to give to the province of Manitoba. It has its constitution under Imperial legislation. In 1905 we were called upon to establish the constitutions of the two new provinces. We found there a territory under which there had been legislation in respect to schools in force for a long time, in which there was a population, in which there was a Catholic minority, a number of schools organized under these ordinances and what we were required to do, was to provide protection for the actual, substantial vested rights of that minority under the new constitutions of these two provinces. We were making constitutional limitations. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) at that time, took that view of it, and he will remember that he invited us to mount with him upon the rock of constitution and the very section of the Northwest Territories Act was to be incorporated in the constitutions of these new provinces, which we were dealing with, with such limitations as we think were fit and proper at the time of the foundation of these new provinces under section 2 of the Imperial Act.

But, in this case, we have no constitution to confer upon any of the provinces between which we are dividing that territory. We have no power to place constitutional limitations upon those provinces under section 3, under which we are acting. We cannot change the constitution of any of these provinces. It might be argued that, under the very general permission of section 3, which I have just read, we could impose conditions upon the province of Manitoba. To what extent can we impose those conditions? I have said to the House that in my estimation there are, in this territory, no vested rights, no substantial rights acquired under any legislation. But, if you admit that, and if you say that we can, because this is a matter of mutual consent between ourselves and this province, impose any condition we like, it becomes a question of policy. What should be the policy? Is it the opinion of the House, is it the opinion of my hon. friend from Nicolet, that since it is a matter of mutual consent, we should say to the province of Manitoba: You shall not have this territory to which you are clearly entitled under the scheme of the division of the territory unless you accept as a condition that you will have a dual system of schools in your province; you have the system which exists in the old province of Manitoba; and which has been declared to be constitutional by the decision of the Privy Council in the Barrett case, as a matter of constitutional law; you will not have that territory unless you consent to a dual system of schools in the enlarged and extended province. To my mind, Mr. Speaker, it would be impossible to conceive of a proposition more calculated to do injustice to the very large minority of Catholics who are to-day in the old province of Manitoba, and for whom there is reason to hope that the government and the people of Manitoba will do something in the future to relieve them from the disabilities and injustice under which they suffer at present.

Mr. MACDONALD. Has the hon. member (Mr Monk) any assurance or understanding that any such thing will be done?

Mr. MONK. None whatever. But, leaving aside now the legal question of vested rights and of what should be the policy in dealing with that great province, I submit that at the present moment, without the existence of any properly or so-called vested right, to say to the province: you will not have this territory unless you consent to establish within your limits a dual system of education, would be, in my mind, an extremely unwise and unfair condition to place upon Manitoba. There are, in my opinion, no legal rights whatever to safeguard, and as a matter of pure policy to say we will place that condition upon any transfer of territory would be absolutely

contrary to the best interests of the country, and even to the best interests of the minority in that province. It is a well known fact that in spite of the extremely unenviable conditions of the agreement arrived at in 1897, the minority in the province of Manitoba has been treated with the extremest indulgence possible by the government of Mr. Roblin. There is no doubt whatever that everything that could be done for that minority under the laws as they exist, has been done. At the present moment, it seems to me that for us to take up that extremely hard and unjustifiable position with respect to this territory, would be impolitic and improper. That is the opinion I hold of the situation, viewed from the standpoint of policy. Then, Mr. Speaker, if it is to be considered entirely as a question of policy, it seems to me that would bring up the whole question of public schools, so to speak. For my own part, I am not a believer in the system of education which perhaps meets with the approval and favour of the majority of the members of this House, and which to-day meets with great favour in the United States. I believe in a system of education which preserves absolutely for the parent the right to educate his child according to his consicence; I believe in a system of education with moral and religious training for the child, and that principle is the principle which, notwithstanding the fiercest educational controversies, has always been maintained in the legislation of England. In the United States a different opinion prevails. Some fifty years ago in that country the people came to the conclusion that the primary system of education which had produced the greatest men of the republic from Washington to Jefferson was not a proper system, and the prevailing educational system was then commenced to be introduced, and in my opinion, after years of trial it has been found absolutely insufficient and defective. To-day, throughout the republic of the United States, the most eminent men and the greatest thinkers of every religious persuasion have come to the conclusion that the prevailing educational system has not in any way produced the result which its promoters expected from it. Now, I do not believe in that system, but it undoubtedly has obtained great favour in many parts of our own country, and there is hardly a doubt that it meets with the approval of the majority of the members of this House. Now, what would be thought of a policy by which this parliament would say to all three provinces concerned in this transaction—Quebec, Ontario and Manitoba—we will not transfer to you any part of this territory unless you establish denominational schools in every part of this annexed territory. I know, Sir, that in the province of Quebec, such a proposal as that would be deemed an affront and no doubt the province of Ontario would take the same view. If you divest this question from the idea of vested legal right; if there are no legal rights whatever and it becomes a question of policy, I say that the proper policy for us is to transfer the territory to the province of Manitoba without any condition whatever in that respect. And, there is no provision which we could insert in the deed of transfer which would afford any protection to the people of the annexed territories better than the protection which is afforded by the constitution of Manitoba in section 22 of the Manitoba Act. We neither could nor should afford any other protection than is to be found in that legislation, and under it, if there are any rights of any kind existing in that territory, those rights will continue to exist after the extension of the boundaries. What laws may be in force will continue to be in force until altered by competent authority, and that competent authority, if it is the provincial authority, will be absolutely limited by the constitutional provisions which exist under section 22 of the Manitoba Act, to which I have referred. There is therefore, to my mind, nothing which we can place in this Act as a question of policy, which would give greater protection to the people of the new territories than is provided under the constitution of Manitoba itself, and in our dealing with that province, as in our dealing with the other provinces concerned, I think we cannot do a wiser thing under the circumstances than to pass the territory over without any conditions of any kind whatever.

Mr. ETHIER. The hon. member states that if there are vested rights there is no necessity for putting in a proviso to protect these vested rights.

On the same principle, if the Hudson's Bay Company has vested rights, why is it necessary to make a proviso for them? What is the difference between the vested rights of the minority and the vested rights of the Hudson's Bay Company?

Mr. MONK. The difference is this, that the rights of the Hudson's Bay Company are purely proprietary rights, as to which there is no doubt whatever, and in transferring this territory, we are obliged to provide for those proprietary rights. I do not think there are any vested educational rights, but if there were any, the only way in which they could be protected, if the transfer is to take place, is under the educational clause 22 of the Manitoba Act, which we cannot change or vary in any way.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What is clause 22? The right of appeals only?

Mr. MONK. It is the charter of Manitoba, which says this:

In and for the province the said legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject and according to the following provisions:

Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law or practice in the province at the union.

Then there are two subsections with regard to an appeal and remedy in case that provision of the law should be violated.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What application has this to the present case?

Mr. MONK. Under this section, if there are any rights existing in this territory, and if after its incorporation into Manitoba those rights are interfered with, this section will operate to protect those rights, whatever they may be.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. But I understood my hon. friend to say there are no rights there.

Mr. MONK. I am certainly of opinion, and have endeavoured to show, that there are no rights of any kind existing. I say the commissioner was never authorized to legislate, and no rights of any kind were created under that permissive section. There were no schools organized under the law and no rights to be protected; and under the imperial constitution of Manitoba there can be no other guarantee than the guarantee provided in section 22.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Section 22 has no application at all to this territory. It refers to any right which existed in the province at the union, that is, in 1870.

Mr. MONK. The words seem to me to have the same application as those of section 93 of the British North America Act. Subsection 2 provides for an appeal in case vested rights are interfered with.

Mr. PROULX. I beg to remind the hon. minister that section 22 deals with a province; but this territory does not come in as a province; it is only added to a province.

Mr. MONK. For every part of a province I believe there is a remedy under section 22. I thought it necessary to show to the House and the country that this matter has been most carefully considered by ourselves, in view particularly of an agitation which it has been attempted to start, and which I consider most unfounded and unwise. Speaking as a member of the Catholic minority, I am not at all disposed to say that there should be the slightest disposition to give way when we have clear and established rights. I believe that the foundation of the prosperity of this confederation, in which we all have faith and hope, reposes on absolute respect for the rights of all minorities, and the strict maintenance of those rights on every occasion possible. But I believe at the same time that we must confine our exactions as a minority to the clear cases in which those rights exist under the law. There should be a strict adherence to the constitution. Where there is no evidence of any existing right, it would be, I think, unwise and wrong to make claims that have no foundation in law. I and my colleagues have endeavoured to give to this matter the most careful consideration. As a matter of policy, after the irritation that has existed in regard to the Manitoba school question, the idea no doubt prevalent in the minds of many people is that the settlement of the Manitoba boundaries has possibly been retarded by the acrimony that prevailed in regard to that question. It would be wrong at the present moment to make excessive claims. I have absolute confidence myself that the Manitoba government will in due course give favourable consideration to the disabilities under which the minority suffer within the limits of the old territories, and with whom, under my interpretation of the law and of the agreement of 1897, they have no power whatever to interfere. I believe that at the present moment to impose conditions with regard to this transfer which are not clearly founded in law, would indispose the government and the people of Manitoba. These western communities are generous and broad-minded, but they do not like control or domination. In this case there is to my mind no ground for any such domination or any such imposition of conditions, and I have confidence that, from the measure in the shape in which it is submitted by the government the very best results will follow.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will bear me for two or three moments while I refer to this question. I have listened to what the hon. member for Nicolet (Mr. Lamarche) has said, and if I can interpret his argument, it is this, that there would have to be coercion of Manitoba in connection with education if his suggestion were entertained.

If anything ever was settled by this House once and forever it was settled in 1896, that there was to be no coercion of Manitoba in respect of education. I was a member of the House at that time, and I disagreed with my party then in regard to this question. I was one of seven, and there are only two of us in the House now, who took this stand that there was to be no coercion of a province, and we were supported in that contention by the

then opposition, led by the right hon. gentleman who leads the opposition at the present moment (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and it was settled once and forever that there was to be no coercion of the province of Manitoba in regard to education. If the hon. member for Nicolet (Mr. Lamarche), means anything to-night he proposes that there shall be inserted in this Bill something coercive of Manitoba. Not for one moment will the people of this country stand for the coercing in any shape or form of a sovereign province like Manitoba whose rights in this matter were settled long ago.

In 1896 the then government of the day felt that they were constrained by the constitution to give remedial legislation on behalf of Manitoba. That was argued and upheld by the government, that they were coerced to do that thing. I contended against that then, the province of Ontario from which I come also took that view, and now when another Conservative government are in office they do not feel that they are constrained by the constitution to in any way attempt to coerce the province of Manitoba. Thus you can see that there is some kind of progress in a constitutional way, and to my mind it is a sign of progress that neither the government nor the parliament to-day are disposed to coerce a sovereign province like Manitoba in the matter of education.

Passing along we come down to the legislation which established the new provinces in the northwest. To my mind there was coercion then. It carried after a very long and severe fight, but even then there were members in the Liberal party who left their party on that occasion because of what was considered coercion of the provinces. In the first instance coercion was attempted by the government and failed, and later on when a modified form of coercion was attempted it succeeded in a way, but still the circumstances were different in that we were creating new provinces in the second case, and interfering with an established province in the first case.

Now we come to this case. There is a proposal that there shall be some kind of coercion of Manitoba in this case. I am voting for this measure to-day and I am glad to vote for it because there is no attempt at coercion in it, and in that respect it is altogether different from the two former measures. I grant that on the line of the argument of the previous speaker the minority may have a grievance, but, if they have a grievance the remedy is still in an appeal to the province of Manitoba to do them justice, and I believe if their grievance is a good one and they persist in it, they will get some kind of modification that will meet their views and that would be better than that we should attempt the coercion of a province and should interfere with what might be called the rights of the majority, because a majority may have rights, and these rights may be greater than what the grievances of a minority may be. If the proposal of the hon. member for Nicolet (Mr. Lamarche) means anything it must mean that there shall be coercion of the whole province or coercion in regard to education in the newer portion that is now to be added to it, and in that case we would have a province with two different kinds of laws in regard to different sections of it. That anomaly surely could not exist. If it meant that the law was to be widespread and the minority's rights were to be incorporated in the statutes of Manitoba now, I say we would be going altogether too far in interfering with that province. So I have simply risen to say that I am voting for this measure because I have seen this parliament grow, both as regards the government and as regards the House, in at last adopting the policy that there must not be coercion in this country in matters educational, and that it is best in every way to leave these questions to the people of the respective provinces.

I believe the people of all our provinces will respect the rights of minorities and will do justice to all, and that the only natural and the proper thing for this House to do either in the past or on this occasion, is to absolutely keep clear of these questions and to leave them to the provinces for settlement and for the doing of any right that a minority can fairly claim. This Act shows an advancement, a progress in our country in this respect, that at last we have decided not to interfere in any way with a sovereign province in the matter of education.

Hon. L. P. PELLETIER (Postmaster General). Mr. Speaker, the Bill we have before us now is one of great importance in itself, but its importance is greatly enhanced by the fact that it will be considered by parliament together with two other Bills, one extending the boundaries of the province of Ontario, and the other extending the province of Quebec.

This country is growing rapidly, and its population is keeping pace with its progress.

It is now proposed by two of these Bills, that Ontario will take over and administer all that portion of territory extending from its present limits as far as Hudson bay, and to extend to the boundaries of the province of Quebec, so as to include the whole of Ungava.

By the present Bill it is also proposed to extend the boundaries of the province of Manitoba, but it is to be noted that special conditions are made as to public lands and school lands which this government keeps.

The features of this Bill which have not met with the approval of hon. gentlemen opposite are mostly what I might call the financial terms or conditions. It has been argued by some gentlemen that this government was giving too much to Manitoba. Other gentlemen on the same side of the House have argued that the government was doing the reverse of that. It has been attempted to convince the maritime provinces that they were unfairly treated. I do not think I am going too far in saying that no very great or serious objection has been raised in that regard.

One argument which has been put forward by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) may at first sight have been considered as having some force. He said that the resolutions provided for the extensions of the boundaries of these two provinces had all been passed in the same year,—as a matter of fact, they are contained in the same resolution. Why, then, he said, should we give to the province of Manitoba arrears which we are not giving to the provinces of Ontario and Quebec? Speaking with all due deference to all the hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this question, this was the only argument that struck me as being, at first sight, very serious. But if we consider the state of affairs existing then as it exists now, I think that even the hon. member for St. John, who has put forward this argument for his own province and the two sister provinces by the sea, will admit that his argument cannot live in the light of the facts. I may not have understood it, and I speak subject to correction; but it seems to me there is a vast difference between the positions of Ontario and Quebec in this respect, and that of Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan in 1905. We must not lose sight of the fact that to Ontario and Quebec we are giving the lands within their boundaries, but we give here to the province of Manitoba only the extension of boundaries, but we keep under this government the school lands and the public lands. What the government did in 1905 for Alberta and Saskatchewan is what this government is doing to-day for Manitoba in that respect. Even if that resolution of 1908 had been put on the statute-book and agreed to by all the provinces, Ontario and Quebec would not have had much revenue from these territories. As a matter of fact, they would have had none. But Alberta and Saskatchewan had been receiving, in lieu of public lands, a money grant. And if Manitoba had been treated like the sister provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, she would have received a similar grant from 1905. But Manitoba has been deprived of this revenue. Now I ask the question—and it is a fair one—why should we be reproached for giving to Manitoba what she ought to have received from 1905? Are we to be told that this in an unfair arrangement. Surely not. Speaking for myself, I should have been disposed to consider a claim by Manitoba going back to the time when the money was given to the other provinces, because Manitoba was entitled to that amount as much as Alberta and Saskatchewan were. This argument of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) which I have been considering as the only serious argument, and is the only one to which I think it necessary to refer.

Manitoba has been kept in the background because, in the eyes of the late government, she was guilty of being a Conservative province, and now that the Conservative government is in power at Ottawa, we intend, at once, to give the province of Manitoba the territorial limits to which she is legitimately entitled and of which she has been unjustly deprived.

The financial conditions are, as I understand, reasonable and acceptable, and there seems to be no great obstacle in the way, except, that as far as the Catholic members of the Cabinet are concerned, they are told that they are not doing their duty on the vexed question of separate schools.

My right hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Sir. Wilfrid Laurier) has told us that on this question he is within the lines of Torres Vedras. My right hon. friend knows that ground well; he has been there very often. I have never been there: I am not going to be there to-night.

Now, this is an important question. The papers in our province, as the right hon. gentleman himself put it this afternoon, speak of nothing else just now but this question. The right hon. gentleman referred to it but said he was not going to speak of it. I am not here to judge the course my right hon. friend has chosen to follow in this matter, but I have the right to look on and see what is going on. And I see here a great party the leader of which says in this House that we have before us an important matter, but he is not going to touch it, that he has no policy with regard to it. And he says, very aptly: Give us your policy on this question. Mr. Speaker, we have put the Bill before the House: that is our policy. The right hon. gentleman was fifteen years in power, and when he brought measures before parliament, if somebody had told him he had no policy with regard to the matters involved he would have been very much surprised. And I was surprised this afternoon to be told that this government has no policy. The right hon, gentleman's own papers in the province of Quebec are calling us arch-traitors because this Bill is before the

House in the form in which it appears. The right hon. gentleman (Sir. Wilfrid Laurier) has nothing to say. I take it that if there are clauses in the Bill which the government brings before the House which are bad in the eyes of certain members, those members should stand up like men and tell us so. And if a Bill which the government brings down shows important omissions, it is the duty of the loyal opposition in this House to tell us: You have forgotten to put something in this Bill which ought to be there.

Since we are confronted with it and since we must look back to that past, so as to know where we stand for the present and for the future, if the House will give its attention for a short time, we will consider the facts.

But even after my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works had spoken, again these gentlemen have nothing to say, they are playing a waiting game. They were waiting for me, and they are not going to be disappointed. For my part I do not approve of the game they are now attempting to play. When a government has a policy to lay before parliament and the country, it is the duty of that government to state clearly the reasons which actuate it. For my part, Mr. Speaker, I am quite ready and intend to utter my opinions on this subject freely and boldly, whatever the consequences may be to my future and to myself. I am going to take a stand on this question, because I believe that the time has come when every man must take a stand upon it. It is not my purpose to play with this question politically; it has been made a football long enough. Fifteen years ago this question was approached by one of the political parties with the sole object of making political capital out of it. I may be pardoned if I look at this question briefly. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Work' has referred to the statute giving existence to the province of Manitoba. He has read a part of the statute, and as it is one of the important bases of my argument, I will recall briefly the facts of the case. The statute giving Manitoba its existence as a province, contained the following clauses:—

Section 22. In and for the said province, the said legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject and according to the following provisions:

1. Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have, by law or practice, in the province at the union.

2. An appeal shall lie to the Governor General in Council from any act or decision of the legislature of the province, or of any provincial authority, affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education.

3. In case any such provincial law, as from time to time seems to the Governor General in Council requisite for the due execution of the provisions of this section, is not made, or in case any decision of the Governor General in Council on any appeal under this section is not duly executed by the proper provincial authority in that behalf, then, and in every such case, and as far only as the circumstances of each case require, the parliament of Canada may make remedial laws for the due execution of the provisions of this section, and of any decision of the Governor General in Council under this section.

It is useless to dwell at any length on the interpretation to be given to the clauses which I have just read. Their sense and meaning have been interpreted by the highest judicial tribunal of the British Empire, the Privy Council in England, and I shall refer to that in a moment. Let me say in passing, that they leave no doubt whatever as to the rights which, under that statute, the minority, either Protestant or Catholic, had to their own schools.

In defiance to that Act, the Greenway government, in 1890, submitted to the Manitoba legislature a Bill which ignored the vested rights which the minority had. This was done for a political purpose, to obtain undue political advantage; however, it became the law of the province, and it has remained the law of the province, with slight amendments, ever since. This law might have been disavowed by the federal government. If it had been disavowed, it would probably have been enacted and re-enacted year after year. and it would have kept the province at war wtih the federal government, and a most unsatisfactory state of affairs would have ensued. As the law creating Manitoba contained stipulations providing for a better, more complete and final settlement of the question, in a judicial or 'quasi' judicial way, it was thought better that the interested parties should have recourse to them.

When the working out of the Manitoba School Act was attempted or rather begun, a number of interested parties questioned the validity of the law and its constitutionality; this is the case known as the Barrett case. It went from court to court, to the Privy Council in England, and here is the holding of the Privy Council:

AN APPEAL FROM THE SUPREME COURT OF CANADA.

City of Winnipeg, Appellant,
and
Barrett, Respondent.

Held, that the Act of 1890, which abolished the denominational system of public education established by law since the union, but which did not compel the attendance of any child at a public school, or confer any advantage in respect of attendance other than that of free education, and at the same time left each denomination free to establish,

maintain and conduct its own schools, did not contravene the above proviso; and that, accordingly, certain by-laws of a municipal corporation which authorized assessments under the Act were valid.

I am not here to criticise that judgment. I have to take it as it stands; it declares that whilst the statute, erecting Manitoba into a province, provided that the minority's schools should not be interfered with, the Manitoba School Act which apparently did take them away was rigorously constitutional. The point of view taken was that the Manitoba School Act did not compel the Catholic minority to attend any schools except their own, that they were still at liberty to have their own schools and to send their children to them. However, the matter did not rest there; the Catholic minority had another remedy which was given them by the constitution, by means of an appeal to the Governor General in Council. This appeal was made, but at the time, there was a great agitation over the question in this country; some people were clamouring that this appeal could not and should not be entertained that the judgment of the Privy Council in the Barrett case had settled the question, and so forth. The government of that day acted very prudently in the matter; in view of the fact that their power to hear this appeal was questioned; they decided that the question should be referred to the courts, so that, like the Ne Temere question, it would be decided by the highest court of the empire. They fully expected, and had reason to expect, that when the Privy Council had spoken, everyone in the country would submit to the decision given at the foot of the Throne.

The case was referred to the Supreme Court of Canada, and was there decided in one way. That judgment was afterwards carried to the Privy Council, which reversed the decision of the Supreme Court, holding as follows:

> Where the Roman Catholic minority in Manitoba appealed to the Governor General in Council against the Manitoba Education Act of 1890, on the grounds that their rights and privileges in relation to education had been affected thereby:
>
> Held, reversing the judgment of the Supreme Court on a case submitted to it:
>
> (a) That such appeal lay under section 22, subsection 2, of the Manitoba Act, 1870, which applies to rights and privileges acquired by legislation in the province after the date thereof.
>
> (b) That Roman Catholics having acquired by such legislation the right to control and manage their denominational schools, to have them maintained out of the general taxation of the province, to select books for their use, and to determine the character of the religious teaching therein, were affected as regards that right by the Acts of 1890, under which state aid was withdrawn from the schools, while they themselves remained liable to local assessment in support of non-sectarian schools to which they conscientiously objected.
>
> (c) That the Governor General in Council has the power to make remedial orders in the premises, within the scope of subsection 3 of section 22, e.g., by supplemental rather than by repealing legislation.

I shall not dwell upon this judgment. The Catholics of this country had bowed to the first decision in the Barrett case, and Catholics and Protestants had to bow to the last judgment in this Brophy case. This, the men who governed Canada at that time fully understood, and they decided to stand on the constitutional rights, as interpreted by the Queen of England in the Privy Council.

Unfortunately, the statesmen who took this view had to fight those who, for political reasons, thought it advisable and proper to make of it a political question, and to use it for all it was worth. I find no words in the vocabulary to qualify their action, and I shall not attempt to do so. However, let me say that it was a Grit government in Manitoba which was responsible for this legislation, by allowing vested rights to be set aside, and a Grit opposition in federal politics, which countenanced and encouraged resistance to the Privy Council judgment.

The Grits in this country are not the Father of Confederation, they fought it and do not seem to care whether the pact of confederation is undermined or not. They had, at that very critical moment, a noble and important duty to perform; they decided to put that to one side and make use of the situation in order to further party ends, a fact which no man in this country can deny.

Let me now state the course of action followed: The Privy Council had declared that the Catholic minority had the right to appeal to the Governor General in Council. The appeal was heard, the case was argued, and the Governor General in Council decided that the appeal was well founded, and that it should be allowed; consequently, a remedial order, such as is provided by the law, was passed; this Remedial Order was communicated to the Manitoba government, and the Manitoba government threw into the waste paper basket that order, traceable to the Queen of England, and decided to persist in their unfortunate legislation.

It became the duty of the federal parliament to pass remedial legislation, and the famous Remedial Bill was introduced in the House of Commons. Every one knows that this Remedial Bill was accepted by the interested parties as the measure of justice they expected.

It was then that the most extraordinary, to use a very mild term, page was written in the history of this Canada of ours. The men, the great men then in power, understanding their responsibility, offered the measure of justice for adoption by parliament. Most of them did not believe in separate schools, but they decided to stand by the constitution of this country and by the decision of the Privy Council.

What were they then confronted with? The political party then in opposition in Ottawa, the friends of the same party in Manitoba who had, in violation of the constitution, taken away their schools from the minority, decided to obstruct the passage of the Remedial Bill; unfortunately, the time limit for the expiration of that parliament was not very long, they talked against time, and prevented, by their obstructive tactics, the passage of the Bill.

The leader of that party, by the way, was himself a Catholic, that is, one of those from whom it might have been reasonably expected that he would concur in the adoption of that legislation. However, he did not do so. I might perhaps express my opinion in regard to that, but as I might have to employ unparliamentary language, I shall refrain from doing so. I am bound to say, however, in all fairness, that, at that moment, the right hon. gentleman declared that he did not think much of the Remedial Bill; he thought that the Catholic minority in Manitoba who were satisfied with it were wrong, and substituted his own judgment for that of the people most interested; he took the stand that something better could, should, and would be done. He and his political friends from the province of Quebec repeated that one after the other and his political friends from the other provinces started this other cry—that there should be no coercion of Manitoba, and every one remembers the slogan 'Hands off Manitoba.' It took them four months to repeat that, until the ears of the people were full of it, and parliament had to be prorogued before the Remedial Bill was passed. By that time, the Grit newspapers of the country had very skilfully succeeded in making a great number of people believe that the Conservative government was the persecutor of Manitoba, and so forth.

The Conservative statesmen of that day, undaunted, had to face the storm. They did so like men, they took their political lives in their hands, because they were the successors of Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir George Etienne Cartier, and, with their back to the wall, they performed a noble duty. What did we see then? Let me quote here from two speeches made by the same man, to demonstrate how the people were appealed to on this Manitoba school question, which was the great issue in the elections of 1896. I will first quote the speech made in Quebec by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, leader of the opposition then and leader of the opposition to-day, and then I will quote another speech by the same gentleman in Massey Hall, Toronto. At the Jacques Cartier Hall, Quebec, on May 7, 1896. Mr. Laurier (now Sir Wilfrid) said:

JACQUES CARTIER HALL, QUEBEC.

Do not misunderstand my intentions, I repeat here that I wish the minority in Manitoba to obtain justice. It is a principle written in letters of gold in the programme of my party, that the rights of the minority must be respected. . . .

If the people of Canada bring me to power, as I am convinced they will, I will settle this question to the satisfaction of all interested parties. I shall have with me in my government Sir Oliver Mowat, who has always been in Ontario, at the peril of his own popularity, the champion of the Catholic minority and of separate schools. I will put him at the head of a commission, where all the interests at stake shall be represented, and I affirm to you that I will succeed in satisfying those who are suffering at this moment. Is not Sir Oliver Mowat's name alone a guarantee of the success of this plan?

And finally, if conciliation does not succeed, I shall have to exercise that constitutional recourse which the law furnishes, 'a recourse which I shall exercise completely and entirely.'

Briefly put, it reads thus: To you Catholics of Quebec, I, your future Prime Minister, promise and undertake that I shall give your people of Manitoba a more complete measure of justice. I will have the great Sir Oliver Mowat with me, he is a friend of the Catholics, always has been.

This speech inflamed Catholic enthusiasm in Quebec, and the small fry, the ward-heelers, went with that speech throughout the province, adding on to it special comments, such as the following which I had heard at almost every meeting during that election, and which ran thus: Now gentlemen, you see what this great man Laurier will do for his Catholic people in Quebec. Do you not think that Catholic Laurier will do better than Protestant Tupper?

Mr. LEMIEUX. That's what Sir Charles Tupper said in Winnipeg, reversed.

Mr. PELLETIER. My hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) instead of attempting to deny this admits it and tries to bring in Sir Charles Tupper, which is entirely beside the question.

Mr. MACDONALD. What did you say?

Mr. PELLETIER. What I said then I am saying now. I would suggest to hon. gentlemen opposite that they take their medicine like men. We are told, and it is

true, that a great many of our own people went back on Sir Charles Tupper, and did not extend to him the 'glad hand' of gratitude.

I am not here to approve of what they did. To say the least, I think they made a great mistake, but it is, to a certain extent, explained by the fact that when appeals are made to religious enthusiasm, either Catholic or Protestant, we always find people who allow themselves to be carried away by them.

Mr. McKENZIE. Like the navy question in Quebec last election.

Mr. PELLETIER. We will let the navy rest for the moment with the remark that a gentleman who has been a judge ought to know that we should try each question judicially. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. McKenzie) were addressing a jury no doubt he would speak about the state of the weather outside the courthouse. But let him come with me to Massey Hall, Toronto, and hear what Sir Wilfrid Laurier said there, and I quote from the Toronto 'Globe' so that there be no mistake about it.

Mr. Laurier said: He was there (in Toronto) to say, not that he would give either a small or a large amount of relief to the minority, but that assisted by his friend, Sir Oliver Mowat, he would settle the question, not by appeal to any class, but by appeal to the sense of justice which was emplanted in every one by the Creator . . . He was a Roman Catholic and a French-Canadian, and, therefore, might have strong sympathy for the minority, but as he himself would not be coerced by anybody, so he would not consent to force coercion upon any one.

This is the same man who said in Quebec, that he would give a big measure of relief. In Massey hall he would not say whether it would be big or a small measure. At first sight there are many words in the Toronto speech which resemble the Quebec one, but mark the ending. The cry in Ontario had been 'do not coerce Manitoba,' and we find on the lips of the Laurier of that time, the very same words, put there, no doubt, for a purpose. There was enough in that speech to allow the Grit press and the Grit speakers to go about and say all over the province: 'Look at the great man we have as our future Prime Minister, he will not coerce Manitoba.' The Grit candidates went upon the hustings with the Remedial Bill in their hands and said: 'If we are returned to power, we will take that Remedial Bill and tear it to pieces, shouting: 'Hands off Manitoba.'

Mr. TURRIFF. Nothing the matter with that.

Mr. PELLETIER. I am not surprised at that. This is the same double-faced policy we have had for fifteen years. What, Sir, was the result of all this? Quebec sent a majority to put in power the man who promised to give a better measure of justice to the Catholic minority of Manitoba, and the English-speaking Protestants sent a majority to bring to power the man who would not coerce Manitoba. Meanwhile, the Manitoba minority lay by the way-side knowing full well what they could expect from the government which the leader of the opposition did not wish to coerce.

A commission had been promised which would look into the question and solve it; instead of that, there was a conference between the Manitoba Grits and the Ottawa Grits, where sunny smiles and sunny ways, we were told, would produce important results.

What those results were, I need not mention, except to say, in a word, that, during fifteen long years, a great number of Roman Catholics in Manitoba have been obliged to pay for the maintenance of schools which their children did not attend, and have had to put their hands in their pockets a second time, to have other schools where, according to their belief, they could send their children for their education. Then we heard, falling from the lips of His Majesty's representative in this country, the Governor General, the following words, which were pronounced at the opening of parliament in 1897:

Immediately after the last election, the government of Manitoba was invited to hold a conference with my ministers on the subject of the grievances arising out of the Act of that province relating to education. Three members of the Manitoba government came to Ottawa, and, after many and protracted discussions, a settlement was reached between the two governments, which was the best arrangement obtainable under the existing conditions of this disturbing question. I confidently hope that this settlement will put an end to this agitation which has marred the harmony and impeded the development of our country, and will prove the beginning of a new era to be characterized by generous treatment of one another, mutual concessions and reciprocal good-will.

Later, the question was asked by Mr. LaRiviere, now a senator, who was then a member of this House, and reply was given by the then Prime Minister, who is now the leader of the opposition. Let me quote that also:

Mr. LaRIVIERE asked:
By whom was the settlement of the school question signed, after the same was agreed upon by both the federal and provincial governments, and why are not the names given in the copy brought down?
The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier.) I have alrealy stated to the honourable gentleman that the negotiations which took place between the Canadian and the Manitoba government were confidential. When they were

concluded, the terms of the agreement were communicated to the press and taken back to Manitoba by the commissioners of the Manitoba government, and afterwards embodied in the Act of the legislature.

However, it was discovered later that the agreement which was brought down without any signature, contained two signatures —those of Wilfrid Laurier and Thomas Greenway.

Before closing what I may call the historical part of my remarks, I wish, once again, in the year 1912, to put on 'Hansard' something which was said in this parliament when the Liberal government came into power. Sir Charles Tupper, the man who went to the election, with his government, to have a judgment of the Privy Council and the constitution of this country upheld, who was defeated in that manly, courageous, and righteous attempt, stood up in the House, and spoke thus:

In the future, as in the past, the cardinal principle of the party to which I belong, will be: Equal justice to all, without respect to race or creed. I am glad to know that the responsibility of settling this question—an important question—I am glad to know that the responsibility no longer rests upon my shoulders, but upon those of the honourable gentleman who is now the First Minister of the Crown. I can only say that I trust and hope that he will be most successful in obtaining such a settlement of this question as will do justice and give satisfaction to all parties. I can assure the honourable gentleman not only that he has my most cordial wishes for a happy, and early, and fair settlement of this important question, but that anything I can contribute to that end will be at all times most cheerfully done.

A most noble and patriotic move, which has not, I think, its parallel in the history of this country. These words were uttered at a moment when the new leader of the new government, (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) could do alone what he had promised to Quebec, but, for fear that he might be handicapped in some way, this great statesman, who had just fallen in the accomplishment of his duty, turns to the man who had profited by the sacrifice, and tells him: "I will not do as you have done, on the contrary, I will help you for the sake of the cause."

I hope the right hon. leader of the opposition will not be offended if I now put him and Sir Charles Tupper side by side, and ask this country to make a comparison between the two. The comparison will be made anyway in the history of this country, and we may as well have it now.

You have now, Mr. Speaker, the facts of the past; they had to be stated in order to show the present state of affairs. These facts are so closely connected with the consideration of what we are told should have been inserted in this Bill now before us that they must be recalled in order to thoroughly understand the position which I take in this matter.

It is now suggested that this battle be fought over again, in respect to the district of Keewatin. If it has to be, in the first place I may say, and say emphatically, with due respect and deference, that there are two things about which I am sure and about which I will not have one moment of hesitation. With my experience of the past, I am not prepared to leave the rights of any minority, either Protestant or Catholic, to the tender mercies of the leader of the opposition and his friends. I would rather leave them in the hands of the Roblin government. If future facts show that in doing this I have erred, I will stand the consequences. I am prepared to do so because I believe from the bottom of my heart that I am right. I shall have to again refer to that later.

Mr. MACDONALD. Has my hon. friend any understanding with the Roblin government?

Mr. PELLETIER. That is too thin. I am going to answer the question fully by and bye. The Minister of Public Works has answered it and what the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) wants is to enable the Toronto 'Globe' to-morrow to say: Roblin has purchased the consent of the Roman Catholic members of the government. He will not have that chance.

Mr. MACDONALD. I do not want it. All I want my hon. friend to do is to tell me the truth.

Mr. PELLETIER. You are going to have the whole truth. The other thing about which I am sure is that it would be most unjust to tell us here to-day that we will be just as bad as the leader of the opposition if we do not give the people of Keewatin more than he gave the people of Manitoba. In the first place, the cases are not alike, and moreover the settlement of the Manitoba school question on just and fair terms was a very easy thing in 1897. The then leader of the government was not only pledged to it, but the opposition offered to help in the settlement, but the present leader of the opposition refused to do anything fair and reasonable.

He decided not to fulfil the promises contained in his Quebec speech, but to stand by his Massey Hall 'no coercion' programme, and to educate the people of this country on those lines. For the last fifteen years, this has been considered by the people of this country as a good and sound policy. The law of the land has been put to one side, due to that attitude of the leader of the then government and his party. The very constitution has been trampled under foot. A remedial order,

which the Privy Council has declared to be a valid and legal remedy, was ignored, and the Liberal party of this country is responsible for all this. Now, I am not here to say that this should be forever continued, and that this should endure forever. I would say: let us put an end to it now and come back to the sane and sound principles which obtained in the past, and which are the safeguard of every citizen of this country, but in the name of the most elementary principles of justice and fair-play. I ask those two questions: If there is to-day within easy reach, a possible way of settling this vexed question should we, in the first place, be asked to uselessly run upstream against the torrent which the Liberal party has set running from the mountain; should we give a chance to the Liberal party to set this country ablaze a second time with one appeal to Quebec and another appeal to Ontario? Shall we thereby take upon ourselves the responsibility of asking our political friends to go down to defeat once more to the detriment of the minority, and for the benefit of those who have ignored it yesterday, and who would, to-morrow, continue that same policy?

Again, I say that if the purpose in view can be obtained in some other ways, this would be nonsensical and suicidal. I am not prepared to help the gentlemen opposite to continue their policy of setting race against race, and creed against creed in this country. Why, Sir, where would this end? Yes, where would it end? I put this question here as a good Canadian. I have been told that I must resign, that there must be a big crisis. Well, Sir, let me tell these gentlemen who speak thus, that there is not enough in that portfolio for a man to forget his honour and his principles, and were it not that I consider I have here a noble duty to perform, it is not one, nor ten portfolios which would make me stand the torrent of abuse, organized and unorganized, which is showered upon me. There has been created, during the last fifteeen years, a certain state of public opinion, people have been educated to believe that, year in and year out, what is right shall be ignored, and what is wrong will triumph and that minorities have no rights. And when a part of the public mind has been so moulded during so many years, I am asked to undo all that in a few months, nay, in a few weeks. A certain part of the public mind misled by the men in power, and their newspapers has, in some respects, to be recast, and a new definition has to be made of what, in certain respects, is right or wrong, and it it the duty of the successors of the Fathers of Confederation to do it. Why, Sir, the Grit newspapers of this country will lie to raise a race cry about the name of a country post office. They will say that Bourassa has ordered the change, and they will organize indignation meetings. Other men will have the audacity to ask me to decide questions in a certain way, not because it is right, but because this or that man is a Catholic or an Orangeman. For the last four weeks the Grit press of Ontario shout that Borden will yield to Bourassa, and impose separate schools in Keewatin, and the Quebec Grit press say we are going to betray the Catholics by not having separate schools.

Now, can this be? And will it be tolerated by the people much longer? As I understand it, one of the noble aims of this government is to try and bring all the people of this great country together; to make Canadians love one another more and to make the people understand that if you are a Christian, one of the very first of the Christian principles tell you not to do unto others what you would not like done unto you. I am here to try and help in this most noble work. If I have to suffer for that, I will, and am prepared for it; but I am not going to be 'stampeded' by a temporary outburst of public opinion which should not exist and which I believe is most unfortunate. With my back to the wall, I shall face it like a man, and wait for better days and a more sober judgment.

Some very good people are very much concerned about the people in Keewatin. So am I, but it is a fact—is it not?—that what is involved in Keewatin at the present moment is a large area of territory with almost no population. I am more concerned about the people who are alive who are up and doing in Manitoba. There were two courses open to me; I might have gone and told Manitoba: 'You will remain the postage-stamp province of this country for all time, if you do not consent to have for Keewatin, school laws as I want them.' This is one course. What is the other? It is to expect from the people of Manitoa themselves that the Catholics of that province, both for Manitoba and Keewatin, will not pay a double tax if they want to have their children educated as their conscience dictates.

The first of those two courses resembles somewhat what the Catholics tried in 1896, but it had a lamentable fate, because politics interfered in a question which ought to have been put on a higher plane and advocated from a broader point of view.

At that time, as I said a moment ago, the battle could have been won, and won easily. Up to that moment, the great political men of both political parties when enacting laws, had been mindful of the rights of minorities, and it was a very easy thing to have clauses put in any statute, protecting those rights. The fathers of

confederation put it in the British North America Act, and a long series of statutes have been adopted on the same lines.

The statute of 1875 relates to the territories. There you find the same thing enacted in a law, at the request of a Liberal government, but of a government in which were such men as Edward Blake (who has just been called to his reward and who was a great Canadian). However, all this came to naught and became a perfect wreck, when the people of this country were told that the pact of confederation could be ignored for the purpose of putting a certain political party into power. The people of this country know now that the government of a province can, in defiance of the clear terms of the constitution, enact a law which will do away with the very basis of that constitution, and the people of this country know now that this hitherto inconceivable attempt will be successful, if, thereby, a political advantage can be obtained. In view of all this, if the minority can be otherwise protected, the attempt to force educational laws on Manitoba does not appeal to me as being the best course to follow.

The other course is to expect that the men in power in Manitoba, who are the successors of the fathers of confederation, who have been the friends of the minority over there, will settle this matter once and for all, at home, as they have the power of doing.

Mr. MACDONALD. How are they going to do that, will the hon. minister tell us?

Mr. PELLETIER. How sorry the hon. member (Mr. Macdonald, Pictou) would be if this question were taken once for all out of politics, and if he no more had the opportunity to raise cries of race and creed. But I will come back to the point later.

There is another important point to which I want to refer now. I said a few moments ago that I was more concerned with Manitoba than with Keewatin, because the needs of Manitoba are far greater and much more pressing than those of Keewatin. Let me now state the fact that I have made a careful study of the different problems which have arisen, and one of them, the most important, to my mind, is whether the school rights of the Manitoba minority which have been given away by the late government, can to-day be restored by this parliament? Let us look into the facts: Those rights unquestionably existed; the Privy Council has said so; and there is, consequently, no possible doubt in that respect; it cannot be denied that they have been put aside.

There is no doubt that they could have been restored in a certain way, provided for by the constitution; this is also undeniable, because, again, the Privy Council has so declared. The way they could have been restored was by an appeal such as the one which was made. Such an appeal was made, and it is precisely at this moment that the question goes through an interesting phase. The appeal was by the minority to the Governor General in Council, and it was then 'lis pendens' between two well-known parties; one of them, the appellant, was that same minority, and the other party, the respondent in the case, was the provincial government; the justices were the ministers of the Crown here. They were so to speak, constituted a court of justice to hear that appeal. The appeal was heard and decided in a certain way, and the constitution did not allow of an appeal from their decision, which was a final one. The ordinary courts of this country and every country have been invested with power to see that their judgments are executed and obeyed, but, in this special case, the law gave the Governor General in Council the right to decide in a certain way and the law went just a little further and said: 'When you have decided you will issue an order to the province 'which has lost its case, and there your powers will end.'

It is presumed that the men who enacted that law fully expected that that judgment or order would be obeyed, that there was a moral certainty that it would be; judging from a high sense of justice, they probably had reason to expect that a government would not set at defiance the judgment so rendered. However, the Manitoba government took upon itself this responsibility. What next? Did not the Governor General in Council become 'functus officio' when the judgment or order was rendered and served upon the province of Manitoba? If so, that case, in which the litigants were the minority on the one side and the provincial government on the other, became a thing of the past, and the power of the Governor General in Council ceased. Another remedy was then provided for, but this remedy was no longer in the hands of the Ministers of the Crown alone, and it could be used only if the majority of the members of both Houses of parliament were in favour of it. This was the remedial legislation, and when it came to remedial legislation, the parties in the case were the government of Manitoba on the one side, and the members of the government of Canada on the other; and parliament was the judge, as the King's advisers in this country, the government submitted a Bill to implement the legislation which Manitoba refused to enact. The remedial order had been disobeyed, this remedial legislation had fallen through when the new government which was, constitutional-

ly speaking, the continuance of the preceding government, came into power in 1896. They could have done either of the two following things: Ask parliament to enact remedial legislation, or, by persuasion or otherwise, induce the Manitoba government to obey the remedial order, they had it in their power to do so, they were the only men, or body of men who could do so. What did they do? They decided that remedial legislation was not the proper thing. They thought they would sit down and settle this question by obtaining a partial acquiescence from the Manitoba government to the remedial order, and they decided to abandon the other part of that remedial order and throw it to the winds. Those are hard, historical facts. Can it be pretended at this moment that this settlement, unfair and inadequate as it is, can be legally and constitutionally set aside? Let us look at the way in which it was arranged. Members of the Dominion government called to their office the members of the provincial government; there, we have face to face the people who, constitutionally, issued the remedial order, and the people who disobeyed it.

There they make a hard and fast bargain which the Manitoba legislature put into the form of a statute, and of which the Governor General of Canada, speaking from the Throne in parliament says: 'This question is now settled forever. Both Houses of Parliament assent to that.' The question I might now ask is: is it final or is it not final? I am not going to say that it is or that it is not. I am not going to admit that it is final, because I do not wish to prejudice the case or anything which might crop up in future. I shall remember that I am one of the men who govern this country for a time; that I, like other men, will, some day or other, be called elsewhere as God will decide, and I shall not say anything which might prejudice any future claim, but I am bound to go so far as to say that this right of appeal, this remedial legislation which was a very easy weapon at hand in 1896, has now become much more involved and much more difficult of access.

Now, what is the upshot of all this? It is clear that whatever is done here for Keewatin will not apply to Manitoba. Why not leave it to the government and legislature of Manitoba, where they can remedy the situation both for Manitoba and Keewatin? Is this not the better course if there are hopes, amounting to moral certainties, that at this moment, when Manitoba becomes a great province, there will be a general desire that all the citizens, Catholics and Protestants, should be happy, contented, and that there shall exist between them brotherly love, mutual esteem and deep-laid gratitude. I will be told, and I have been told, that I only have hopes, and that hope often results in disappointment. It is true that there is no bargain. The government of Manitoba has not purchased the acquiesence of the Roman Catholic members of this government to the extension of their boundaries, but I have faith, because I believe that the Hon. R. P. Roblin is a fair, honest, righteous, broad-minded, patriotic Canadian, and this, I think, is of more value and importance than guarantees on paper, which experience has so often shown to be valueless.

Whilst the Manitoba law is a hard one for the minority, the men who have the confidence of that people, have administered that law, as far as it lay in their power to do so, to alleviate its hardships, to make the minority in Manitoba understand that they were not their persecutors. This statesman, Hon. R. P. Roblin, his late colleague and his friend, Hon. Robert Rogers, stand high in the opinion of the minority.

So you see my hope is a great one, it is abundant, it is without limit. I will stand or fall by it. I have faith, and we are told that faith, will remove mountains.

Mr. MACDONALD. When my hon. friend speaks of mountains, does he mean that the Roblin government is the mountain?

Mr. PELLETIER. If it is, it is a mountain of good, but the member for Pictou will not make me say any more than what is true and I have told him that no promise has been made.

Mr. PROULX. Does the Postmaster General believe that the Manitoba government is not going to be changed?

Mr. PELLETIER. My hon. friend (Mr. Proulx) was about to make a speech when the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) rose, and now he has swallowed his contemplated speech. But there are other reasons which give us a right to hope in the justice of a good government. I understand that there are a certain number of public men in the province of Quebec and elsewhere who have taken the stand that the Catholics in Keewatin have certain vested rights in separate schools, and that this Bill ought to contain a clause making it clear that those rights shall continue to exist.

Now I am not resting my case only on hope for relief from Manitoba. There are other reasons which, it seems to me, make this, by far, the best course. I understand that a certain number of important public men from the province of Quebec and elsewhere, have taken the stand that there are vested rights in favour of separate schools in Keewatin, and that those rights would be thrown to the winds if this Bill did not contain a clause, making it clear that these rights shall continue to exist. Let us face

the situation squarely and let us meet it unhesitatingly. Are there such vested rights in Keewatin now? I may say that I have looked into this question with a great deal of care, I have read all the legislation on the subject, and I am bound to say that at a given moment I found a very strange state of affairs. The Northwest Territory Act, passed in 1875, provides for separate schools, but that statute excludes Keewatin from its operations. Moreover, this law of 1875 did not come into force until 1876, by proclamation of the Governor General in Council and before this Bill of 1875 came into force, there was another Bill passed by this parliament in 1876, containing all the enactments which the parliament of that time thought necessary for Keewatin. Whilst the Bill of 1875 contained a clause about separate schools the Keewatin Bill contained no such clause. If you read the debate in 'Hansard' of 1876 about this you will see that the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie, then Prime Minister, declared that this was no oversight. Hon. L. R. Masson, one of the important members of parliament at that time, put the question to him. His answer was: It is not necessary to provide for education in Keewatin. I am not going to discuss whether his reasons were good or bad, I simply refer to Mr. MacKenzie's words to show that I made no mistake in declaring that there was no provision for separate schools in the Keewatin Act.

It is useless for me to dwell at any length on the consequences of that statute, because something else occurred. That Keewatin statute disappeared from what is admittedly the law of the country, viz.: The Revised Statutes of 1906. The manner in which it was done is indeed very strange. The Keewatin Act was never repealed by any special statute, it contained a clause which reads as follows:—

> Provided always, that the Governor in Council may, by proclamation published in the 'Canada Gazette,' at any time when it appears in the public interest to do so, detach any portion of the said district therefrom and re-annex it to that part of the Northwest Territories of Canada not included in the said district, and the portion so detached shall then be subject to the same government and laws as that part of the Northwest Territories of Canada to which it is re-annexed.

It is to be noted that this clause gave the Governor General in Council the power, when it appeared to be in the public interest, to detach a portion from another portion of Keewatin. It is quite clear that this clause never gave the power to annex the whole of Keewatin. In the year 1905, the then government had a Bill before this House, dealing with Keewatin, and providing that it should be part of the Northwest Territories. At that time, there was a good deal of discussion and trouble about the Alberta and Saskatchewan Bills, and it is a fact of public notoriety that certain members of the government of that day were not great friends and that there were serious rows around the council table over the famous clause 16. At a given moment, the Keewatin Bill, which would probably also have caused trouble, was withdrawn, and four days after the session had closed, that same government, which had withdrawn the Bill, and had told parliament that it was not necessary to deal with the situation in Keewatin, passed an order in council in which they formally said: We have, under the law, a right to detach from Keewatin some portion of it and in virtue of the power so given to us to divide Keewatin into two portions and annex one portion to the territories; we, the government, declare that we annex to the territories the whole of Keewatin. Here is the text of the order in council, as it appeared in the 'Canada Gazette':

> Whereas, in and by the Act, chapter 53, of the Revised Statutes of Canada, commonly known as the Keewatin Act, amongst other things, in effect enacted, that our Governor in Council may at any time when it appears to the public advantage so to do, detach 'any portion' of the district of Keewatin 'therefrom' and re-annex it to that part of the Northwest Territories of Canada not included in the said district, and that portion so detached shall become subject to the same government and laws as that part of the Northwest Territories of Canada to which it is re-annexed;
>
> And whereas it has become expedient that the said district of Keewatin should be again annexed to and made subject to the same government and laws as the Northwest Territories;
>
> Now therefore know ye that, by and with the advice of our Privy Council of Canada, and under and by virtue of the powers by the said in part recited Act, and of all and every powers and powers in that behalf in any manner otherwise in us vested, we do by these presents declare and proclaim that on, from and after the first day in September, in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and five, the 'whole' of the said district of Keewatin shall be annexed to that part of the Northwest Territories not included in said district;
>
> Of all which our loving subjects and all others whom these presents concern, are hereby required to take notice and govern themselves accordingly.
>
> In testimony whereof, &c. . . .

Is there a student-at-law who will say that this can be done under the clause which I have read to the House? Certainly not. The government have the right in the public interest, but the public interest has to be stated. However, we will not trouble about that for the present. If you have the right to take a part of this table and put it outside, with a certain

number of books which are on it, are you going to take the whole of it?

Mr. GUTHRIE. May I ask my hon. friend a question?

Mr. PELLETIER. I am going to finish my sentence. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Guthrie), was going to be Minister of Justice at one time, and he knows he must wait. What is the legal effect of that? My hon. friend will pardon me——

Mr. GUTHRIE. I think that my hon. friend might have been a little more courteous in his reply.

Mr. PELLETIER. Then go on.

Mr. GUTHRIE. No, I'll——

Mr. PELLETIER. We will make friends to-morrow. I would regret it very much if I have not been courteous, but my hon. friend will understand that when following the trend of a legal argument, if you are interrupted in that way it is not fair. I do not mind interruptions, my hon. friend knows that, but there is a certain time at which to interrupt.

I presume that the House understands the situation thoroughly. Here is a government which feels justified in presenting a Bill dealing with Keewatin, and providing for its annexation to the territories; this Bill is withdrawn from the consideration of parliament, and this same government pretends to annex to the territories all the territory, when they have the power to do so only for a portion of that territory. However, this did not repeal the Keewatin Act of 1876, which was still in the Statute-book. When the statutes were revised in 1906, the men who were entrusted with the work, and who had been appointed by the government, finding themselves in presence of that complicated situation, were not going to tell the government who had appointed them that their order in council was a nullity, and they thought the best way to deal with the matter was to put in the appendix of the statutes a few words, that the Keewatin Act had become effete. There were quite a number of laws which became useless because of consolidation, they were all put in a special schedule at the end of the revised statutes, the Keewatin Act was lodged there, and then they put in a clause abolishing all the laws mentioned in that schedule, and that is the way the Keewatin Act has disappeared without the people or parliament practically knowing anything about it. Now, we are told by very important people that the settlers in Keewatin, be they numerous or not, had a right to expect that they would come under the law governing the Northwest Territories and that a moral contract was entered into with the settlers as far back as 1875. The facts show that this is a complete mistake and fallacy.

If Keewatin has ever become part of the Northwest Territories, it is not under the law of 1875, but in virtue of the operations which I have just mentioned and this would not go any further back than 1906. All this has created, as far as Keewatin is concerned, an intricate situation, about which lawyers and constitutional readers might and will differ; there never were any laws and ordinances passed for separate schools in Keewatin specially, and the question to-day and a very serious one is: are there any laws now in force in Keewatin, except those comprised in the Keewatin Bill of 1876? This Keewatin Act has disappeared, but nothing has replaced it. Theoretically, Keewatin would be in the Territories since 1906, but, have the Keewatin laws of 1876 ever been replaced by the law of the Territories?

I will refer in a moment to the law which governs such cases. I do not believe it necessary to go any further on this point, because I do not consider the question to be a practical one at the present time. I have come to another conclusion which is clear to my mind and it is this: Whether there are or there are not in Keewatin now vested rights to separate schools, it does not make a particle of difference if we do or do not put a clause in this bill dealing with them; these vested rights exist in Keewatin or they do not exist. If they do not exist, it would seem idle to proclaim from the house-tops that some one has consented to their disappearance and has, therefore, failed in his duty. If, on the contrary, those rights are in existence, you must have a law to do away with them, and no such enactment is to be found in this Bill. It is a well known principle of law, and one which, in fact, is undisputed, that the laws of a country or part of a country or territory which is conquered or annexed remains in force so long as they are not changed by competent authority. Lord Mansfield says:

> The laws of a conquered country remain in force as long as they are not changed by the conqueror; the absurd exception with regard to the pagans, mentioned in the Calvin case, show the antiquity and universality of the maxim.

Chief Justice Marshall says:

> With regard to the transfer of territory, it was never deemed that the relations of the inhabitants among themselves were not changed. Their relations with the first sovereign are dissolved and new relations are created between them and the government which has acquired the territory, the law which can be called political is necessarily changed, although what governs the relations and general conduct of the individuals

amongst themselves subsists until it is changed by the power of the state newly created

To further illustrate that rule I will quote Blackstone, whose authority is great in matters like this. He speaks on the subject in a characteristic manner:

In conquered or ceded countries, again, that have already laws of their own, the Sovereign may indeed alter and change those laws, but, till he does actually change them, the ancient laws of the country remain, unless such are against the law of God.

Thus, the laws of Spain, Holland and France are still wholly or partially in force in the colonies which have been acquired from those powers. Nor are there wanting instances in which the laws and usages of ceded and conquered territories, though inconsistent with and even repugnant to those of the parent state have been permitted to survive their annexation to the British Empire? Thus, in the celebrated case of General Pictou, the question was much argued, though not finally decided, whether obtaining evidence by torture was legal in Trinidad; polygamy has been tolerated in Ceylon, the burning of widows in India, and slavery in American dependencies.

To recognize, remodel or altogether supersede the laws of a conquered country, is thus part of the prerogative of the Crown and the same powers belong to the Sovereign with respect to ceded territories, unless his right has been restricted by the articles of the cession, which by the law of nations are sacred and inviolable until altered by the legislature of the territory itself.

The conclusion of this is obvious, if there are laws in Keewatin now, this Bill will not make them disappear, and those laws cannot be repealed except by the authority or power which has enacted them.

What are the schools which are in existance now in Keewatin? The facts are well known, there are several schools but they are public schools. There is only one private school attended by a few Catholic children. There never were any separate schools established in that country, and we have been told why none were established. The commissioner of the Northwest Territories reported that the thing could not be done; here is that part of his report referring to that:

Ottawa, 18th November, 1910.
Memo. re Schools in the Northwest Territories.

* * * * *

The Very Reverend Bishop Charlebois, Vicar Apostolic of Keewatin, has recently made inquiries with a view to the establishment, with government assistance, of a separate mission school at the Pas for Catholics only, and has asked what advantages the government would offer for this kind of school, and what obligations would be incurred on his side.

His Lordship is evidently under the impression that the school ordinance of the old Northwest Territories is in force in the new Northwest Territories. It is an Act containing 232 sections with schedules and many forms—and quite unadaptable to the present conditions in the new Northwest.

Respectfully submitted
(Sgd.) FRED WHITE,
Commissioner.

Could we in the face of that report, establish those schools which would probably have been a nullity? It seems to me it would have been childish, unworthy of serious men to do that at the very moment when it was a well known fact that Keewatin would shortly become part of Manitoba, when there are in the journals of this House since two years, resolutions unanimously adopted, declaring that Keewatin is to be annexed to Manitoba. That we should have created a so-called separate school, at such a moment, a school, the legal existence of which would be open to doubt, and that we should have done this just as Keewatin is going to be made part of Manitoba, might not have been considered a fair and square deal. I believe this would have been ill advised. It would have simply brought trouble, great trouble, and I think there is more to be gained for the minorities by not trying to do things like that.

I wish to specially call the attention of this House to the fact that, whilst there are to be found in some of our laws enactments under which, if separate schools are abolished, there is an appeal to the Governor in Council for a remedial order and remedial legislation (and those are the clauses of which the minority availed themselves in 1896) there is nothing in the Northwest Territories Act, as it stands today in the statute-book of 1906, which gives any such remedy; the only clause of this Act which refers to separate schools is clause 10, and it reads as follows:

The Commissioner in Council, if authorized to make ordinances respecting education, shall pass all necessary ordinances in respect thereto; but in the laws or ordinances relating to education it shall always be provided that a majority of the ratepayers of any district or portion of the territories, or of any less portion or subdivision thereof, by whatever name the same is known, may establish such schools therein as they think fit, and make the necessary assessment and collection of rates therefor; and also that the minority of the ratepayers therein, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish separate schools therein, and in such case, the ratepayers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic separate schools shall be liable only to assessment of such rates as they impose upon themselves in respect thereof.

It is obvious that it would have been necessary to appoint a council and this has not been done before the adoption by this House two years ago of the resolution declaring that Keewatin would be annexed or ceded to Manitoba. As far as we are con-

cerned I may say that we received a similar request sometime in December last. Those who made that demand were not desirous enough that it should be granted to take the trouble of speaking about it for even five minutes with any of the four Catholic members of this government.

If that council had been appointed, it would have had to pass ordinances and after the ordinances would have been passed, it would have become necessary to establish separate schools and tell Manitoba: 'Now you just wait until all that is done and then we will annex Keewatin.' I put it to all reasonable men: Could a provincial government be found anywhere who could have accepted such a proposition as that?

Now, let me refer again to clause 10 of the Statutes of 1906; this clause, upon which some people rely to protect something in Keewatin, is not one which creates separate schools; it declares that separate schools may be provided for, if ordinances are passed; as I said a moment ago, no ordinance having been passed, what existing right is there that we could protect? Surely it cannot be pretended that if we inserted clause 10 in this Bill, it could be acted upon. It provides for an administrator and a council, can we reasonably ask for one part of enlarged Manitoba that public affairs will be carried on by an administrator and a council as in the Northwest Territories and the other part of Manitoba governed by the same government as all the provinces have? Could a majority be found even in Quebec to say that this would be a fair demand? The people who have spoken to me about this, have not seriously contended that this could be put forth, except as a means of getting something else.

There is going to be a great province there after this Bill is passed. Can we ask this parliament that there shall be one law on the south side of the fence where the Manitoba boundary is now, and another system of law for the other side of the fence, where Keewatin begins, one law for the northern part, and another law for the southern part of the same province? I am confident of one thing, and that is, that when the Manitoba legislature will have to enact laws for Keewatin, they will, under the good government it has, make just laws; but whatever they are, the laws for Keewatin, annexed to Manitoba, will ultimately be in spite of any clause here or there, the same for the whole territory of the enlarged province.

We are told that another Grit government might come into power and again upset that, but is it not obvious that if a Grit government begins that over again that new law would again be subject to an appeal for a remedial order and remedial legislation under the Manitoba Act? The Greenway law has not abolished the Act, creating Manitoba, which can always be invoked. It is based on the British North America Act and the British North America Act should be adhered to, as the best protection for minorities.

I have said, Mr. Speaker, that I had great hopes. Have I not more? It seems to me that if we put no idle clause in this Bill, the minority are better protected than if it be there.

At the instance and suggestion of well-meaning persons and of the newspaper 'Le Devoir,' Mr. Henri Bourassa's paper, some of our electors are sending us petitions and letters informing us that we must be energetic and that we must not sacrifice the rights of our people. I have the greatest respect for Mr. Bourassa's opinion. He is one of the leading men of the province of Quebec, a most clever and a most patriotic citizen, and it is a matter of deep regret to me that I cannot see eye to eye with him on this question, but I feel so sure that I am right that I have to follow my own course. Let us wait for some time, and time will tell.

This case is, of course, absolutely different from the Alberta and Saskatchewan cases which were dealt with in 1905. The law is absolutely different when you erect a new province and when you annex a territory to an existing province. In the first case, this parliament has the right to give to the new province so erected, the constitution which it thinks fit, provided that it does so in accordance with the British North America Act. The province to be erected has nothing to say, except that its citizens may make representations and demands which may or may not be granted. But, in a case of extension of territory or boundaries, the extension cannot be made, except on such terms and conditions as are agreed upon between the parliament of Canada and the legislature of that existing province; consequently, we cannot impose upon Manitoba, conditions and terms which they would not accept; we do not impose any such terms for the extension of Ontario and Quebec, why should we try it on Manitoba? It may be said, and rightly so, that Ontario and Quebec have never defied the law and the constitution of this country, and that Manitoba misled at a given moment, did that most regrettable thing. I admit that there is a great deal in that; but, are we going to suppose or presume that Manitoba will continue to act in that way? A Conservative government has not done, and I believe will not do that. The people who believe the contrary are probably right in asking for guarantees. I do not believe it. Again I say and I repeat that I have confidence in the men who govern that province. They belong to the party who have made our

country what it is to-day, and that party has not in its history anything to justify that fear. The minority have trusted to the great men of that party the whole of their national life; they have placed in the same hands, and with confidence, what is most dear to them and they have not been deceived. When the minority have suffered at the hands of others, they have found, in the successors of Sir John A. Macdonald, champions of their cause and of their legitimate grievances. Am I going to tell them now that I have lost confidence in them, that I distrust them? Would that be a fit and proper reward for what the great and good men of that day did for us in 1896?

No, Sir, they took chances then; I am taking chances now. There would be no responsive chords in my heart if I did not do so. In doing so, I think I am not running any very great risk, and I am putting something to the credit of the Sir George Etienne Cartier side of the Macdonald-Cartier great book. If I am mistaken, then, let our common Lord and Saviour extend heavenly wings over the future of this country. While I do this to-day, I will have a right, it seems, at any time, to look for the same treatment from our English-speaking friends, as we have already received in time of need.

A good many bad things are said in the province of Quebec, about the 'bad' Tories of the province of Ontario; we must see to it that this prejudice disappears, that something is done to make it disappear and that our friends from all over the country will stand up in the future, as they have done in the past, like men and patriotic citizens.

There is no use in expecting and believing that because some people are the minority, they might as well be trampled upon; we should remain together and upbuild this our common country; this should be our aim. I think ultra Protestants and ultra Catholics will get the best of it if they mutually respect one another's convictions and religious beliefs; one religion is right in the minds of one and it is wrong in the minds of the other. But what can you do? These differences have to exist. They never were and never will be settled with a club or a bludgeon. We differ in the way and the manner in which we adore God, but, after all, do we not adore the same God, even if we do not all worship at the same altars?

Mr. Speaker, when we, before our everyday work, pray together in this House, what do we say? With bowed heads, we all say the same prayer, and we repeat together the words, the heavenly words, which were given to the world from the top of the mountain. Why then, when we sit down, should we turn to one another with clenched fists and say: 'You wretched Protestants, You cursed Catholics.' I see no reason for it; we are here for another purpose, we are here in this great temple of labour to work for our country. Let us open the portals of a great and brilliant future, let us write a great page in the history of this country—a page of toleration and good-will—Let us re-write one for the other the message of good-will and peace to all men which was brought to this world two thousand years ago. Let us give a chance to every one, Protestant or Catholic, to join hands and do something of which we may be proud. Let all good, broad-minded men, of every class, religion and nationality form the great procession which will enter the gates of the future and let us leave to one side the very few who will choose to continue harping and barking to create trouble and discord." We must have peace in this country, religious peace, civil peace, and we will have it by following always, and at all times, without one exception, the glorious traditions of the Conservative party.

In bringing down a measure of relief, the Manitoba parliament would be simply extending the 'glad-hand' to the minority. The minority believe that they should have their children educated in a certain way; this is for them a matter of conscience, no one should interfere in questions of conscience; it is stronger than the will of man.

The great country which is known as the British Empire, believes in fair-play for minorities. When this country ceased to be under the flag of France, to live under the Union Jack, the King of England told his new subjects that they were free, as far as their religious beliefs were concerned.

Do you think then, Sir, that the province of Manitoba would be disgracing itself by doing what the King of England has done? Do you think that the Manitoba legislature would not do honour to itself if, after fifteen years, it decided to amend its laws, the way the Privy Council declared that it should?

Why, Sir, any true Britisher ought to desire that this should be done. If the legislature of Manitoba did that, it would carry out a wish which, on another occasion, was formulated on another matter by the man on whose shoulders is to-day the mantle of Sir John A. Macdonald. Here is what the leader of this government said on the 29th of August, 1907:

> In my native province, the rights of the minority have been preserved and safeguarded without any legislative enactment. I had no reason to believe nor do I believe that the people of the new provinces would be less generous, less fair or less honourable than the people of my own province.

At every page in the history of England, what do we find? At every period in that

great history, when new territories were being added to the immense empire, over which to-day the sun does not set, the Mother country always took care to see that the national and religious aspirations of the people in the new territories should be respected. This is the great, broad policy which has made us loyal to the empire, and which has brought Louis Botha, one of the generals who had fought in the Boer war, to the council of the empire, at the foot of the throne. Strong and sturdy races will not disappear. It is useless to encroach upon their rights. Live and let live. Let this be the pass word of the future, and that future will be a great one.

Mr. A. A. MONDOU (Yamaska). I deem it my duty to let the House know the position I took upon the vote this afternoon on the amendment to the Bill proposed by the right hon. gentleman who leads the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I did not vote on that amendment for the following reasons: The Bill now before the House is an Act to provide for the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba.

This Bill has its financial aspect and its religious aspect. So far as its financial aspect is concerned I have every reason to believe, so far as my information goes, that both political parties have agreed, except so far as immaterial matters are concerned. But when I heard the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) state, in moving his amendment that, so far as the religious question was concerned, he would stay within the lines of 'Torres Vedras,' I thought I had better wait a little and see whether there was a very strong position in 'Torres Vedras' or not. I claim that the leader of the opposition has no right, after putting such an amendment as this before the House, to take the stand he took this afternoon. That is the reason I did not vote on the amendment because the financial aspect of the Bill is not directly under discussion now. It may be discussed when the Bill is considered clause by clause in committee. But now we are dealing with the principle of the Bill on the second reading. And I accept the authority of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), under whom at Laval I once studied the constitutional law of this country, and it has not been proven to me by the speeches so far made that there is such Federal authority in this House as has been contended. We may not agree absolutely upon the special conditions put in the Bill, but now we are called upon to vote on the principle of the measure which provides for the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba. And I state plainly here that I have no objection to the boundaries of Manitoba being extended. So I am proud to support the present government. Being a new member of this House, I was rather disposed to favour the amendment, if I could have found in that amendment elements of truth, faithfulness and a real desire to serve the minority in Keewatin. But seeing in it a double-faced policy in a double-faced amendment, I could not vote for it.

I wish to be very brief in my remarks, but to give my own statement of the position taken by the Postmaster General. I have some information in regard to the matter. In 1878, the Conservatives brought before the country the National Policy. In 1882, in 1887 and in 1891 they appealed to the people on that policy. And what was the policy of the Liberal party? It was a changing, an indefinite policy. But when it came to the election of 1896, the Liberals were in favour of a policy of reciprocity, but the Conservatives still stood before the people on the National Policy. The Liberals came into power with the present leader of the opposition at their head, but he knew, as everybody knew, that he had not the support of the country on his tariff policy. So, he stood by the National Policy, because he knew that elections were won for his party on a double-faced policy on the Remedial Bill. This was understood plainly in this House and in the country. So elections were carried by his party with one policy for Quebec and another for Ontario —a policy stated in Jacques Cartier hall for Quebec, and in Massey hall for Ontario. But favouring a policy of protection, they carried the elections of 1900, 1904 and 1908. And in 1911 they came before the country again on a policy of reciprocity. I state without fear of successful contradiction that for the last twenty years the public vote of Canada has pronounced unquestionably in favour of the protective tariff.

Now, all this may seem to be a digression. But it is only to show that behind the walls of Torres Vedras there is a man who is not sincere and who wishes to play a double game. Mr. Speaker, it has always been my sincere desire that I might have the opportunity to stand before the present leader of the opposition and tell him plainly what I thought of the position he occupies in this raising of national and race cries in the province of Quebec. The seed of discord that had been planted came first to fruition in 1896. We perfectly know that the relations between the people of this country are not as they should be. We plainly understand our position. But, after the sincere explanations given to this House by the Minister of Public Works and the Postmaster General calling upon sincere and broad-minded people to stand by us in the present fight, to stand by the government, and I hope and trust——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONDOU. Authorities have been cited before this House. But, Mr. Speaker, I still accept my professor on constitutional law. That hon. gentleman, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) stated that there were no vested rights at present in the Keewatin district. Of course, so far as my knowledge of legal science is concerned, it is not very considerable to-day.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MONDOU. It is a good thing when you are ready to admit that what you have not very much learned you do not know. I plainly state that, after due consideration, I come to the conclusion that there are not vested rights in the Keewatin district. I hope and trust, however, that we will meet on certain questions with Torres Vedras, when the Bill goes into committee, and stand both in our fortresses with them.

Mr. LEMIEUX moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Borden, House adjourned at 12.30 a.m. Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 6, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 121) respecting the Rainy River Radial Railway Company.—Mr. Beattie.

Bill (No. 122) for the relief of William Hollaway Adams.—Mr. MacNutt.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

ASSISTANT ELECTRICIAN CUILLERIER.

Mr. BOYER:

1. Have any charges or complaints been made to the Department of Railways and Canals against assistant electrician Cuillerier?
2. If so, has any report as to such complaints or charges been made to the department by the chief electrician on the Soulanges Canal?
3. If such charges or reports have been made, does the government intend to make an inquiry as to the truth of the same?
4. If such inquiry should be made by whom will it be considered, and when and where will it be held?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. No.
2. Answered by Number One.
3. Answered by Number One.
4. As no charges have been made, it has not been necessary to decide when and where and by whom an inquiry will be held.

NAVAL DEFENCE OF PACIFIC COAST.

* Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Is the government aware as to whether or not a resolution in the following terms has been adopted by the legislature of British Columbia:

Whereas the government of Canada has decided that any scheme of naval defence to be effective, must be by co-operation with the mother country and the other parts of the Empire; therefore, be it resolved, that the Dominion government be urged that, in view of the great importance for the immediate and adequate protection of the Pacific coast of Canada, the question of naval defence be considered at the earliest possible date?

2. Has the attention of the government been called to any such resolution?
3. If so, has the government been informed as to whether or not such a resolution was adopted on the motion of the Premier of British Columbia, Mr. McBride?
4. Has a copy of such resolution been received by this government from the government of British Columbia?
5. If so, does the government propose to move along the lines suggested in said resolution? If so, when? If not, why not?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. The government has no information as to the mover of this resolution.
4. Yes.
5. When the government has formulated its naval policy, it will lay it before parliament.

DISMISSALS.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has M. J. Lepage, Esq., preventive officer in His Majesty's Customs at Rimouski, been dismissed? If so, at whose request, and for what cause?
2. Is the Minister of Customs aware that this officer is said to have denied under oath having taken any part in elections?
3. Has he been denied the right of an official investigation? If so, why?

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. M. J. Lepage, collector of customs, Rimouski, has been dismissed for active political partisanship, on the statement of the member for parliament for Rimouski.
2. No.
3. The usual course has been followed in this case, the charge having been made by a member of parliament.

Mr. CARVELL:

1. Was George Chubb, of L'Etete, Charlotte county, N.B., dismissed from the position of Customs officer in 1905 or 1906?
2. If so, on whose recommendation and for what reason?
3. Was any charge preferred against him? If so, what, and was it proven or did he plead guilty thereto?

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. Yes.
2. On the recommendation of the Minister of Customs for alleged violation of the Canada Temperance Act.
3. There was an information laid against Mr. Chubb before a commissioner of the parish of St. George civil court. Mr. Chubb states that the facts in this case were that his son, who was working in the store with him, sent to St. John for three bottles of whisky for some of his neighbours about Christmas time, and that he was not personally accountable for the ordering or the distribution of the liquor, but as he did not desire to figure in the courts, he sent his son to St. George before the trial and paid the fine of $50 and $7 expenses. Mr. Chubb's statement is confirmed by one of the neighbours, who describes himself as a Liberal.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has Louis Pouliot, of Amqui, been dismissed? If so, what was the cause of his dismissal?
2. Has an investigation taken place? If not, why not?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. (a) Yes.
   (b) Political partisanship.
2. (a) No.

THOMAS HALE, WESTVILLE.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Who has been appointed to succeed Thomas Hale, of Westville in the county of Pictou, as correspondent of the 'Labour Gazette'?
2. If none has been appointed yet, will anyone be appointed?

Mr. CROTHERS:

1. Lawrence Howard McKenzie.
2. Answered by No. 1.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of the news sent up to date to Magdalen Island by the weekly correspondent appointed by the Postmaster General; also for a copy of the instructions given said correspondent at the time of his appointment.—Mr. Lemieux.

For a copy of all letters, complaints, charges, and other papers and documents in the possession of the Post Office Department relating to Tracadie road post office, Guysborough county, Nova Scotia.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a copy of all papers, complaints, letters and other documents connected with or relating to the dismissal of John McLeod as postmaster at Denmark, Colchester county, Nova Scotia, and the appointment or suggested appointment of D. McLeod to the vacancy.—Mr. Macdonald.

PELAGIC SEALING.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask my right hon. friend whether letters of ratification have been exchanged for a treaty with reference to pelagic sealing, and are they before the House?

Right hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister). I understand that letters have not been exchanged, and the treaty is now being considered by the United States.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. KYTE. I desire to ask the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) when I may expect certain returns moved for on the 5th of February having reference to breakwaters at Port Richmond and Charles Forest's Cove, N.S.?

Mr. MONK. I will make a note of my hon. friend's request, and try and get the report down.

Mr. KYTE. There are several other orders outstanding having reference to other departments of the government, and I will be glad if they are brought down as early as possible.

Mr. MONK. Send me a memorandum of them.

PAYMENT OF ELECTION ACCOUNTS.

Mr. TURRIFF. I would like again to call the attention of the Secretary of State (Mr. Roche) to the fact that I am still getting communications from my constituency claiming that the accounts in connection with the election held now almost six months ago, have not yet been paid. A part only of the money has been sent, but in such a way that the returning officer is not able to pay it out, and practically nothing has been paid in connection with the election. In connection with the census, also, there are still a number of accounts outstanding, and I would like to draw the attention of the government to the fact that it is now a great deal more than six months since the census was taken, and these accounts are still unpaid.

Mr. BURRELL. I did not quite catch all my hon. friend's remarks, but I understood them to be a complaint that a lot of the census enumerators had not been paid. Was that it?

Mr. TURRIFF. Some of them—yes.

Mr. BURRELL. I am informed by those responsible in the department that all the accounts would have been paid at the end of last week but for the fact that vouchers for some had not been received. I believe that explanation to be correct. I think my hon. friend will find that all were practically settled last week. If my hon. friend will go back to the last census he will find that the work has been expedited this year probably more than it was ten years ago.

Mr. ROCHE. With regard to the election accounts, that is a matter which comes under the jurisdiction of the Auditor General, with whom I have had some communication in which he informs me that if there are any unpaid accounts it is invariably due to the fact that they have not been rendered or there is some dispute in connection with them. I will get the particulars of these accounts to which my hon. friend has referred.

ST. JOHN VALLEY RAILWAY.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would like to ask my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) if the agreement regarding construction and operation of the St. John Valley railway has yet been signed. My hon. friend was good enough to say that as soon as it was signed he would lay it on the table of the House.

Mr. COCHRANE. It has been signed by myself and the order in council was passed yesterday. As soon as the order in council is signed by His Royal Highness the Governor General I will be glad to bring the papers down.

EXTENSION OF BOUNDARIES—MANITOBA.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Borden for the second reading of Bill (No. 115), to provide for the extension of the boundaries of the province of Manitoba.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Rouville). Mr. Speaker, the question which is now before the House is one of great importance indeed and of far-reaching consequences from the national point of view, and, I might perhaps add, from the imperial point of view. We are engaged in the process of carving out from the vast domain of Rupert's Land new territories for three great provinces of this Dominion. Whilst we are engaged in thus carving out these new territories we might, perhaps, be inclined to forget the men who secured for Canada the great Rupert's Land, obtaining it through the good offices of Downing street for a paltry sum of money. I have heard during this debate warm compliments paid to the memory of Sir John A. Macdonald, who was declared to be a great statesman because, in the early days of confederation, he had thought proper to enter into negotiations with the mother country in order to secure these territories for the Dominion of Canada. I do not begrudge, Sir, the compliments to which the great giant of our Canadian public life, Sir John A. Macdonald, is entitled. But, we must not forget, now that we are comparatively far away from those events of confederation days, that there were other men too who did their best to obtain the union of the various provinces and to found this great confederacy, and who, with Sir John Macdonald, merged their party strife and party spirit and obtained for Canada the territories of the northwest from the Hudson's Bay Company. I refer especially to the old Liberal chieftain, George Brown and Alexander Mackenzie, to whom we owe much for confederation and for the retention of this land for the Dominion.

With this piece of legislation which we are now considering stands on the order paper concurrent legislation, which will be moved in a few days by my right hon. friend who leads the government (Mr. Borden). There are two resolutions on the order paper in one of which it is enacted that what remains of the territory north of Ontario, and the portion of Keewatin that is not allotted to Manitoba, shall go to the province of Ontario. In another resolution it is also enacted that the far away district of Ungava, shall henceforth belong to the province of Quebec. Sir, let me say at once to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister that, speaking as a Canadian, I heartily approve of that legislation. I believe that Ontario is entitled to the land north of Temiskaming as far as the shores of Hudson bay and I unreservedly rely on the good sense of the province of Ontario to administer that new region as well as it has administered the district immediately adjoining. I also approve of the annexation of Ungava to the province of Quebec. It rightfully belongs to the province of Quebec. My hon. friends, the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier), and the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), yesterday, opened their remarks by laying emphasis on the fact that Ungava would be allotted to the province of Quebec. Presumably they were desirous of accommodating their remarks as much as they could, to the sentiments of their followers in this House. But their followers and the members of this House must not forget that both the territory to the north of Ontario and Ungava territory were offered some years ago by a Liberal government to the two largest provinces of the Dominion. Ontario did not see fit at the time to accept the terms of the resolution which was moved in this House by my right hon. friend who leads

the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), but long ago, Quebec, through the instrumentality of the Premier, Sir Lomer Gouin, accepted Ungava on behalf of his province. So, it is no new thing and Ungava cannot suffice to soothe the sentiments of the followers of hon. gentlemen opposite. They must give something else. At all events, Sir, I congratulate the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) not on having given these portions of the northern territories to the two great provinces of Ontario and Quebec, but rather do I congratulate him upon having only implemented legislation brought before this House three or four years ago.

Let me say now, how far I disagree with the right hon. gentleman in regard to the legislation which he has submitted to this House. There is another order in council which will be embalmed in the statute book, I suppose, as part of the Bill. This order in council has reference to the projection of a line five miles in width through the northern territory of Manitoba as far as Port Nelson. I cannot help saying with all due respect to my right hon. friend, that this is a most unseemly and most extraordinary piece of legislation. It paves the way for future conflicts between the provinces of Manitoba and the province of Ontario. It gives sovereign rights to the province of Ontario on that thin red line on the map, whilst it keeps away from Manitoba proprietary rights in the lands adjoining.

I say it paves the way for future conflicts between these two great provinces. True, the Prime Minister can answer that the Premier of Manitoba is satisfied, and that the Premier of Ontario, who is supposed to voice public opinion in that province, is equally satisfied, and that the government supporters at Ottawa are satisfied, and that the opposition in this House are the only persons who are dissatisfied.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Well, that is no argument. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister is supposed to know public opinion in this country and he ought to realise that he cannot repeat the victory he won on the wave of the 21st of September last. He may believe that, but, there was once a king of Poland who, when he was intoxicated, believed that all his subjects were intoxicated with him. And, as regards this unseemly projection of the province of Ontario in a thin red line on the map towards Port Nelson, I say with all due respect for Sir James Whitney, for whom I have great admiration——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I say that notwithstanding all his ability, while he may be satisfied with that thin red line projected over Manitoba to Port Nelson, there are others deeply interested in the province of Ontario who are not satisfied. I know of a man who in his day and generation represented public opinion in Ontario in no less degree than does Sir James Whitney; I refer to Sir Oliver Mowat.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I know the fight and the successful fight that Sir Oliver Mowat made for the boundaries of Ontario against Sir John A. Macdonald; and I know that if Sir James Whitney is satisfied with this, Sir Oliver Mowat would not be satisfied were he alive to-day.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). May I ask a question ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, sit down.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I just want to ask a question.

Mr. BUREAU. Take your medicine like a man.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) has the floor.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am now in the vein of paying compliments to the Prime Minister and that stalwart friend of his, that future cabinet minister——

Mr. BUREAU. Now, you have got him.

Mr. LEMIEUX. He should not interrupt me even 'pro bono publico.' I am, I say in the vein of paying compliments to the right hon. the Prime Minister, and coming to the boundaries of Manitoba I say that I approve of the boundaries as set forth in this Bill. I approve because it is a vindication of the policy pursued by Sir Wilfrid Laurier when he was in office. That right hon. gentleman himself mapped out with his colleagues what extensions should be made to Manitoba north and east, but for years and years the Manitoba government who were not in sympathy with the right hon. gentleman, marked time. They sent to Ottawa delegation after delegation, and when they were not satisfied with the boundaries they were satisfied with other parts of the offer made to them, but it was always found that if something was satisfactory something else was sure to be unsatisfactory in the terms offered by the Liberal government. By far, the most important matter was the provision with regard to the boundaries, and it is a vindication of the policy of Sir Wilfrid Laurier that exactly the same boundaries have been given to Manitoba in this Bill as he proposed. And, if the present Prime Minister, in addition to extend-

ing the boundaries of Manitoba and giving new wheat fields to the farmers of that province, could insert in that Bill a provision that with respect to the new crops that will be raised on that extended territory he would give to the western farmer a market in which to sell them I would say that this legislation was almost perfect. Be that as it may, the Prime Minister did another thing by this legislation to which I strongly object. I need not repeat the arguments that have been adduced by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley). With his usual eloquence he dealt with this subject and he criticized with all the vigour and ability with which he is endowed the financial terms that are offered to Manitoba by this Bill. I agree entirely with the remarks he made. I say that the financial terms are exorbitant. I say that they are not what they should be, considering the position of Manitoba relative to the other provinces, and when we know that in 1885 there should have been a finality in this matter. The policy of the government as regards the arrears is also unsound and calculated to bring about regrettable results. I agree on these two questions with my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley). In giving the enormous amounts which are being handed over to the province of Manitoba by this arrangement I cannot help thinking of the sad position in which the provinces by the sea are left. I cannot forget that the maritime provinces helped just as much as did Ontario and Quebec in the founding of this Dominion. I cannot help remembering that their delegates were united with the delegates of Ontario and Quebec, and that they thought when Canada was made a Dominion they would have an equal chance with the other provinces to develop and to increase. But what are the facts? As Quebec has increased her territory, as Ontario has increased her territory, as the provinces in the west are increasing their territory, the little provinces by the sea which cannot be extended are decreasing in population, while their financial burdens are ever increasing. Have not these provinces in the east done as much for confederation as have the new provinces? I have travelled in the west and I say here that the real pioneers are the men who came from the maritime provinces and from Quebec and from Ontario. You may go into any seat of learning in the west; you may go to any high school in these new territories, and there you will meet men from Prince Edward Island, men from Nova Scotia, men from New Brunswick, teaching the younger generation. Go into the banking institutions, into the insurance companies, into the largest financial establishments, and at the head of these institutions you will find men from the far away provinces by the sea. But, Sir, the provinces by the sea will have no added territory. Then, under such circumstances, before carving out finally what remains of our Canadian Dominion, the right hon. gentleman should have summoned to Ottawa a conference of the premiers of the various provinces and have given our friends by the sea a chance to exist and to live.

Mr. Speaker, the Bill is perhaps more important for what it does not contain than for what it contains. We were treated right royally last evening to the new issue of the eternally famous school question By whom has this question been imported into the debate? Not by the Liberal party, not by the Liberal press, not by the Liberal orators throughout the country. The question which was imported into the House last night must be assigned exclusively to the Nationalist wing of the coalition government. Indeed, I do not know why I should presently address myself to my friends on the other side of the House. They know more about this feud than we know. I ought to enlighten my friends on this side of the House who come from various provinces as to this family quarrel—because it is nothing more and nothing less than a family quarrel. My hon. friend the Postmaster General complained last night that he was being called names. He said: 'They call us names; they implore us French Canadian ministers, hand over your portfolios; and we are branded as arch traitors.' Of course, Sir, the hon. gentlemen will not hand over their portfolios, and my hon. friend must stand being called names for many years to come. Turning towards his Tory friends sitting behind him, he said, "They call us arch traitors." By whom are they called arch traitors? As regards myself, I know what name to give the hon. gentleman. For twenty-five years in public life I need not invent any new name. He is called arch traitor by whom? By his own friends. Mr. Bourassa, in an interview published two days ago, said that the conduct of the hon. gentlemen who form the Nationalist wing of the coalition government made his British blood boil in his veins; and Mr. Armand Lavergne, the leader of the hon the Postmaster General, said of him not later than yesterday, "I am ashamed of him." Arch traitors, Mr. Speaker? Arch traitors to their own friends, whom they led not into the promised land of integral Nationalism. Arch traitors to their own friends, to their own promises, and to their apparent convictions on and before the 21st of September last. I say again, Mr. Speaker, we did not raise the issue. We are simple onlookers. We are witnessing the quarrel, and we are evincing much pleasure at the sight. No, we did not raise the issue. The best evidence of that is the able and eloquent speech delivered last night by a sincere

believer in Nationalism, the young member for Nicolet (Mr. Lamarche) a speech Sir, which deserves commendation from every member of this House, because it was lofty. What did the hon. member for Nicolet say? He said that he felt in duty bound to separate himself from his ministers who had led him astray before the 21st of September, as he had promised if elected he would restore separate schools to Manitoba and would give separate schools to the minority in Keewatin. By whom was he induced to make that promise to the electors of the county of Nicolet if not by the Minister of Public Works, if not by the Postmaster General, and by the Minister of Inland Revenue? I repeat—and I am in the judgment of my fellow Liberal members from the province of Quebec—who induced the bright young men who separated themselves yesterday from the ministerial party—who induced them during the last four years, in their respective constituencies, to advocate and promise the restoration of a system of separate schools in Manitoba and in the district of Keewatin, if not the Postmaster General the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Inland Revenue with their incendiary speeches? The quarrel is between those who yesterday separated themselves from the ministerial party and the three Quebec ministers is this, that the young Nationalists are sincere, while the three ministers are not and were not sincere. Sir, I have listened with a great deal of interest, with rapt attention, to the impetuous speech made by the Postmaster General. It was a plea pro domo.

The hon. gentleman was defending his own gates, he was defending his own lines, in a word he was defending his portfolio. But, Sir, do you suppose that this speech, hurling defiance as it did against the ex-Prime Minister, was addressed to the right hon. gentleman. Sir, the Postmaster General's bold rejoinder went far beyond the walls of this parliament: It was addressed to that Samson of the Nationalist party, that Samson that no Delilah could approach, and whose locks no Delilah can clip or fleece. The indignant speech of the hon. gentleman was addressed to Mr. Bourassa, who is now desecrating the ministerial temple by acting in such a way that we can already hear the columns toppling and tumbling to pieces within that edifice.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, Mr. Speaker, that speech was not directed against the right hon. gentleman who leads the opposition, make sure of that. The Postmaster General's indignant accents went far beyond the walls of this House. They were addressed against Mr. Bourassa, who dared to be logical after the 21st of September as he was before that date. They were addressed against Mr. Lavergne, the would-be leader of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pelletier). They were addressed against the editors of the Nationalist press—against the editor of 'Le Devoir,' of 'La Croix,' of 'Le Nationaliste,' 'L'Action Sociale,' against the four leaders of public opinion in the Nationalist party, who are all denouncing the action of the Postmaster General at the present time. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman and his colleagues from Quebec are primarily responsible for this school agitation and they will reap their reward sooner or later.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX. They are denounced by those they have misled. They will also be condemned by the electorate at the very first opportunity. Last night I heard something which is new to my ears. I listened to the laboured speech of the Minister of Public Works. I pinched myself during the delivery of that speech. I could not believe that it was the Minister of Public Works who was speaking, but beyond doubt he was the speaker. He said, Mr. Speaker, that he always understood—and he made the statement in his usual mellifluous tones—that the school question had been finally settled, and he added, remembering no doubt that he once was a professor at Laval University, 'We are functi officio.' It sounded like a legal sermon. The Minister of Public Works during the last 15 years has been representing quite another constituency than that of Jacques Cartier; his constituency was the Nationalist element and some of the young clergy in the province of Quebec. I do not know what the Nationalists would have said during the last campaign, with the programme I have in my hand, when the hon. gentleman was apparently so much concerned about the maintenance of the federal pact of 1867 as regards the protection of all minorities in order to ensure contentment among all classes—if he had told them that the Manitoba school question had been settled.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not know either, what reception he would have had from a certain section of the French-Canadian clergy if he had answered: 'functi officio sumus!' Ah! Mr. Speaker, we were great criminals in the province of Quebec. The right hon. gentleman who leads the opposition, with his French-Canadian colleagues in the late cabinet, and the French Canadian members in the last parliament were great criminals in the eyes and in the judgment of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk). True, at the same time whilst he was ingeniously

carrying on his racial agitation, by promising remedial legislation, by promising the restoration of Catholic schools in Manitoba, in Saskatchewan, and in Alberta, true it is that during his 15 years of stewardship in this parliament the hon. gentleman never moved a motion of censure against the settlement which was made in 1897. But one can speak one way before the House of Commons and the other way before the electorate; and we had the evidence of this during the last 15 years. Let me recall a few instances. Those whose righteous principles were elastic enough to accept the Manitoba settlement made by the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in 1897 could perhaps be stirred up in their patriotic feelings against the hon. gentleman's naval policy as formulated in this parliament, and, therefore, the Minister of Public Works made a formal alliance with the Nationalist party. With some of them he rode the separate school horse, with some others he rode with flying banners against the Canadian navy. And in order to give the public an impression that he was sincere, what did he do? He severed with eclat his connection with the right hon. gentleman who now leads the government.

He did that in order to give the Prime Minister a little more freedom elsewhere and to make himself a little more free in the constituencies of the province of Quebec. Many in this House were present in the county of Drummond and Arthabaska two years ago who have not forgotten the incident which took place during the speech of the hon. Minister of Public Works on that occasion. He was fiercely denouncing the naval law he was fiercely denouncing the school settlement promulgated at the instance of the right hon. gentleman by the Greenway government in Manitoba, when suddenly, from the crowd, a voice shouted 'what about Borden?' My right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) will pardon me if I re-echo the very discourteous interjection, but great men are only known by their family names? Some one shouted from the multitude 'What about Borden?'

Some hon. MEMBERS. He is all right.

Mr. LEMIEUX. He is all right? He may be all right to-day——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX. He may be all right to-day, but on that day he was all wrong. What was the answer of the Minister of Public Works? Let my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) a doughty fighter of the Conservative party, listen to this. When he was asked: What about Borden? he turned around and, nearly sobbing, as he sobs when he passes his estimates, with tears in his voice and in his eyes, said: Borden? Have I severed my connection with the Conservative party to be told that I am a partisan of Borden? He was all wrong, Mr. Speaker, on that day.

I say, Sir, that the stand of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) on the school question for the last 15 years,—and you, Sir, are a witness to this—was on a par with his stand on the naval question at the opening of this session. You remember, Mr. Speaker, in 1909, on the 29th March, a resolution was passed by this parliament praying for the establishment of a Canadian navy. You remember that the hon. gentleman who is now Minister of Public Works, from his seat in this House, denounced that policy and declared himself opposed to that resolution. During the campaign his constituency of Nationalists listened to him. According to Mr. Bourassa and his friends he was the only one in this House who had spoken the true language of a patriot. The elections took place, and that hon. gentleman was selected as one of the colleagues of the Borden government. He came back to this House, he was asked how the change had come about, what bargain he had made with the right hon. the Prime Minister, to merge his opinions, anti-naval, with the opinions, pro-naval, of his Prime Minister. What did he answer? He answered that he had never wavered, that he had always been in favour of a naval policy. He went so far as to say that he had supported the resolution of March 29, 1909, and I had to read him his ipsissima verba from the 'Hansard.' He did not dare answer when I established clearly to this House that he had differed completely from his colleagues on that occasion.

The Postmaster General made a lengthy speech containing some more or less witty references to the right hon. gentleman who leads the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), which, perhaps, could be forgiven, if they had been made on the platform or at Billingsgate, but I say that the reflections he cast on the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will put the Postmaster General on a level where he really stands in the judgment of this House. Sir, let not my friends who belong to the Tory party believe for one moment, that this staunch defender of Tory faith, has always been a dyed-in-the-wool Tory. I know the hon. Postmaster General from A to Z, and when I say from A to Z, I know whereof I speak. The hon. gentleman reminds me of that little animal mentioned somewhere in the Roman law, known in common parlance as the chameleon, but known in the Roman law as the salamander. In the Roman law a man who has a fraudulent debtor was called a salamander or a chameleon because he could change at his own sweet will. The

hon. gentleman is the Postmaster General. of Canada. Has he always been such a faithful follower of the Conservative party, has he always held the same contemptuous opinion which he expressed yesterday of the right hon. gentleman who leads the opposition? I tell my hon. friends on your right, that I have known the Postmaster General for nearly 25 years. I have listened to him when he was a humble, a very humble follower of the right hon. gentleman who leads the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). In 1885 on the Riel question, the hon. gentleman left the Tory party, joined the ranks of the Liberal party, and ran as the candidate of the Nationalist party of the time, in Three Rivers.

Mr. HENDERSON. The Liberal-Nationalists.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The hon. gentleman who always refers to his loyalty and his sturdy opposition to reciprocity, was a humble follower of the right hon. gentleman who leads the opposition, when the Liberal party in 1891 unfurled the banner of unrestricted reciprocity. He supported that party from 1887 until 1891. In Lotbiniére county, in the elections of 1908, when he ran against my hon. friend who sits for Lotbiniére, he did not run as a Conservative candidate, he stood as an independent candidate. He wanted to come into this House—and I was present on the platform to unmask him—he solicited the votes of the men of Lotbiniére county, as he said, that he might come into the House of Commons as a follower of the right hon. gentleman. The district of Quebec is my witness, my hon. friend from Lotbiniére is my witness; the Postmaster General wanted to come into this House to support, as he said, the right hon. gentleman who was then the Prime Minister, and the only fault he found with the right hon. gentleman was, that he was too much under the sway of Mr. Sifton on the Manitoba school question. Sir, during the last election, in the month of September he delivered a speech in the county of Quebec, where he was brought as a candidate by whom? By Mr. Lavergne. Let me quote from 'L'Evenement,' his own organ:

On the 17th of September, speaking in the county of Quebec, Mr. Pelletier paid a tribute of gratitude to Messrs. Bourassa and Lavergne for what they had done for their country.

And in his grandiloquent style, with that tragic countenance which he assumed yesterday, reminding us of Talma or Coquelin, he said:

The people love you, Lavergne, because you have loved the people. Bourassa and yourself, Lavergne, have written a unique page in the annals of our country. I have offered myself as a candidate, because I had the support of Armand Lavergne.

Mr. LEMIEUX.

And speaking of the multitude:

When you, gentlemen, on the 21st of September next, elect me, you will sing the victory of Pelletier and Lavergne. (Loud and prolonged cheers).

Do you think, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Lavergne, on the 17th of September last, gave utterance to views similar to those that were expressed by his follower last night in this House? We all know as a matter of history, and you, Mr. Speaker, better than any one else, that the reason why Mr. Lavergne severed his connection from the Liberal party was, first, because on the Autonomy Bills of 1905, he deprecated the substitution of clause 16, No. 2, to clause 16 No. 1. He started a campaign with Mr. Bourassa throughout the province of Quebec against the school policy accepted by this government, and by the Liberal party; and then, later on, to the many faults, to the many weaknesses which he found in the Liberal ranks, he added the naval policy in his arraignment of the Liberal party. Mr. Lavergne, in the province of Quebec—and I am in the judgment of the Liberal members of this House—Mr. Lavergne denounced the government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier on the school question, and on the naval question. And when my hon. friend the Postmaster General ran as a candidate in Quebec county he ran imbued with the ideas, with the principles, with the professions of faith made by Mr. Lavergne; he was the follower of Mr. Lavergne, as he rightly stated at that meeting. What a change since the 21st of September. It may be said, however, Mr. Speaker, that not all of the Nationalist editors had faith in the hon. gentleman. I read in 'La Croix,' one of the most influential clerical and Nationalist papers in the province of Quebec, a very fierce denunciation of the hon. gentleman. In the last number of 'La Croix,' on March 2, it says:

The present Bill will not be debated in the House until Monday next. What will then be the attitude of the Catholic members of the House, of the ministers, Messrs. Pelletier, Monk and Nantel? Will they throw down their portfolios on the green cloth of the table, at the feet of their leader, if that leader persists in his refusal to insert in that Bill a clause preserving the rights of Catholics in Keewatin to their schools? Have they already insisted on that right? We do not know, events which will occur in the House of Commons next week will teach us what has happened. But from Pelletier, notably, we expect nothing good.

I have too much admiration for the ability of my hon. friend to read the other sentences.

Mr. PELLETIER. I never read it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. 'La Croix' will teach you to read it.

Mr. PELLETIER. Never. I know those people too well.

Mr. LEMIEUX. You are speaking of clerics.

Mr. PELLETIER. I am speaking of 'La Croix.'

Mr. LEMIEUX. You are speaking with much boldness. I am afraid there will be a mandement issued against you shortly.

Mr. PELLETIER. 'La Croix' is not a respectable paper.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is not a respectable paper since it differs from my hon. friend, but it was a respectable paper before——

Mr. PELLETIER. Never.

Mr. LEMIEUX—when it denounced my right hon. friend as being subservient to the Protestants, and my hon. friend used 'La Croix' for his own political purposes.

Mr. PELLETIER. Never.

Mr. LEMIEUX—against the Liberal party.

Mr. PELLETIER. I never used that paper in my life.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend is very nervous; I do not know why he should be so nervous.

Mr. PELLETIER. I am not nervous.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Let him take his medicine. This Bill is a very hard and bitter pill to swallow. Again I say to my hon. friend, let him take his medicine; the end is not in sight yet. My hon. friend has given a new version of the history of the Manitoba school question. Let me refer for a minute to this question which is better known probably from my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers) than from any other member of the House of Commons. There was a school question from 1890 to 1897. but I understood last evening from the Minister of Public Works that it had been finally settled. The Postmaster General stated in so many words last evening that it was not settled and that he relied on his friend, Mr. Roblin, to give justice to the minority of Manitoba. It is well known that in 1890 a Grit government in Manitoba abolished the separate school system. It is also a matter of history that this legislation, passed by the Manitoba government in 1890, could have been disallowed within two years of its sanction. It was not disallowed, and I quite agree with my hon. friend that it would have been a very severe remedy to have used against that legislation. Sir John Macdonald, we are told, refused to entertain the idea of disallowing that legislation in Manitoba. He had had his experience with that province of Manitoba; he knew that disallowance might be in the statute-book, but that it is never wise nor prudent for a statesman to enforce it. It was no more wise to use the power of disallowance than, in such an extreme position as the Manitoba school question was placed in 1896, to use the remedial order which was sent forward from the then government to the Manitoba authorities. If we cannot blame the Conservative government in 1890, 1891 and 1892 for not having used the power of disallowance, we cannot blame the Laurier government of 1896 for not having insisted on the remedial order being accepted by the Manitoba authorities, and I will explain why. The great mistake—I will not use the word 'crime,' because according to Thiers an error in politics is sometimes worse than a crime—the great mistake made by the Conservative party in 1890 was, instead of boldly facing the issue and entering into negotiations with the Manitoba government, to dally with the question, to send it from court to court, from the Supreme Court of Manitoba to the Supreme Court at Ottawa, from the Supreme Court at Ottawa to the Privy Council in England, from there again back to Manitoba, and to follow in the same way a second time to the Privy Council in London. During that time the agitation went on, becoming fiercer and fiercer every day, until, in 1895, this country, as you know, Mr. Speaker, being a contemporary yourself of the events which took place during those memorable years, 1895 and 1896, was ripe for civil war and we were, practically speaking, on the verge of national disintegration. What happened then? The judgment of the Privy Council came to the Conservative government and they enacted the famous remedial order. Looking back at those events as they appear in history to-day, is there a man in this House who, in his sober senses and in good faith, would pretend for one minute that the remedial order could have been enforced as against an unwilling legislature in Manitoba? I assert that it was impossible. Sir Charles Tupper, during the session of 1896, after the Liberal government came into office, admitted that it was impossible to enforce that remedial order. There is a saying in law—and again I address myself to an old professor of constitutional law who will pardon me if I use Latin words—summum jus summa injuria. We know that under the saving clause of the Manitoba Act you could enact remedial legislation, but by enforcing that legislation against an unwilling legislature in 1896 and in 1897, you would have caused

civil war in Manitoba. Then, Sir, do you suppose, as my hon. friend the Postmaster General said yesterday, that if my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition won the elections on the 23rd June, 1896, it was due to appeals made to his fellow countrymen on the school question? Do you not rather believe, Mr. Speaker, you who are one of the stalwarts of the old Conservative party of those days, that the crisis which took place in the cabinet in 1895 and 1896, when seven ministers on the eve of a session and of a general election, threw up their portfolios and abandoned their leader, reacted in the country and had the effect of opening the minds and judgment of the electors? No doubt the school question was a factor in the election of 1896, but after the Conservative party had been eighteen years in office, after having lost their great chieftain, Sir John Macdonald, after having been deprived of their other leader, Sir John Thompson and having in the last resort recourse to the ability, I must say, but the old age of Sir Charles Tupper, do you not believe that, the Conservative party having against it the buoyancy of the Reform party and the Liberal wave sweeping the country from one end to the other, the time was ripe for a change in spite of the school question? At all events I am in the judgment of this House in stating that as regards the school question the attitude of my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition from 1890 until 1897, when the settlement was accepted by Manitoba, was lofty, Canadian-like and patriotic.

What did he say during that crisis; what was the watchword of the Liberal party—yesterday my friend used the word slogan—what was the watchword of the Liberal forces then? It was: no coercion against Manitoba. Sir, provincial rights have been emblazoned on the banner of the Liberal party; provincial rights have been vindicated by the Mowats, the Blakes and the Lauriers. Our cry was: no coercion against Manitoba, but a policy of conciliation, of mutual concession on every question of an irritating character as must necessarily be the school question or the language question. Yes, that was the policy of the Liberal party. No coercion, again declared our leader on the Autonomy Bill, when the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) was trying to impose the French language as an official language on the legislatures of Saskatchewan and Alberta, although there was but one French Canadian a member of these two legislatures at the time. No coercion, said Sir Wilfrid Laurier, but a policy of conciliation on this language question. And, the right hon. gentleman added: I have faith in the generosity of my English speaking fellow citizens, and I know that if the time comes when there are several French Canadian members in these two legislatures, as very likely it will, then the English speaking people of the western provinces will be generous enough to give them the opportunity of using their own language in addressing the legislative chamber. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that the policy of the Liberal party from 1890 to 1897 in these years of crises was a policy of conciliation. My hon. friend opposite has quoted a speech said to have been delivered in Quebec, and contrasted it with a speech delivered at Toronto by the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Well, there are just two or three words in the last sentence of the Quebec speech which do not sound like the usual utterances of the right hon. leader of the oppoistion, and as to the balance of both speeches, I recognize the expression of his well-known principles of justice of fair-play and freedom for all the people of Canada irrespective of race or creed. And, Sir, I declare here without fear of contradiction that whether in Ontario or in Quebec the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier has always advocated only one policy: a policy of conciliation and mutual concession. But we do not lack authority other than newspaper reports which are not always accurate; we have here the book of books; we have here 'Hansard,' and in 'Hansard' will be found the policy enunciated by the Rt. Hon. gentleman, when leader of the opposition, sitting in the very seat he now occupies, vindicating Liberal principles against a Conservative majority from 1890 to 1897. We were told last night that he appealed to the passions of the Quebec electorate. Let me remind the younger members of this House of a certain letter, which, on the eve of the general elections in 1896 was addressed to the right hon. gentleman by an old missionary, venerable, and highly respected, not only in Quebec, but throughout the entire Dominion. The letter I refer to was written by Father Lacombe, and addressing the Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, he said:

> I inform you with regret that the episcopacy like one man, united to the clergy, will rise to support those who may have fallen to defend us. Please pardon my frankness which leads me to speak thus. Though I am not your intimate friend, still I may say that we have been on good terms. Always I have deemed you a gentleman, a respectable citizen and a man well able to be at the head of a political party. May Divine Providence keep up your courage and your energy for the good of our common country. We do not ask you to vote for the government but for the Bill which will render us our rights, which will be presented to the House in a few days. I consider, or

rather we all consider, that such an act of courage, goodwill and sincerity on your part, and from those who follow your policy, will be greatly in the interests of your party especially in the general elections.

There the chance was offered to the right hon. gentleman that if he would support the remedial legislation he would in return receive the support of the Catholic clergy of the province of Quebec. And, we were told from the government benches yesterday that Sir Wilfrid Laurier had appealed to the religious prejudices of his fellow countrymen in 1896. How dare any man make such a statement? We have 'Hansard' here, and we have the words spoken by the right hon. gentleman before the elections, spoken not in a little hall in the back concessions of Quebec, nor in the back concessions of Ontario, but here on the floor of this parliament, addressed to the country and conscious that his words would be unmistakably heard by the people at large, and what did Sir Wilfrid Laurier answer to that invitation of Father Lacombe? Mark his words:

Not many weeks ago I was told from high quarters in the church to which I belong, that unless I supported the school Bill which was then being prepared by the government and which we have now before us, I would incur the hostility of a great and powerful body. Sir, this is too grave a phase of this question for me to pass it by in silence. I have only this to say: even though I have threats held over me, coming, as I am told from high dignitaries in the church to which I belong, no word of bitterness shall ever pass my lips as against that church. I respect it and I love it; but Sir, I am not of that school which has been long dominant in France and other countries of continental Europe, which refuses to ecclesiastics the privilege of having a voice in public affairs. No, I am a Liberal of the English school; I believe in that school which has all along claimed that it is the privilege of all subjects, whether high or low, whether rich or poor, whether ecclesiastic or layman, to participate in the administration of public affairs to discuss, to influence, to persuade, to convince; but which has always denied, even to the highest, the right to dictate even to the lowest.

Was that an appeal to the passions of his fellow countrymen? Listen to the right hon. gentleman further:

I am here representing not Roman Catholics alone but Protestants as well, and I must give an account of my stewardship to all classes. Here am I, a Roman Catholic of French extraction entrusted, with the confidence of the men who sit around me, with great and important duties in our constitutional system of government. I am here the acknowledged leader of a great party composed of Roman Catholics and Protestants as well, in which the Protestants must be in the majority as in every party.

Am I to be told—I, occupying such a position—that I am to be dictated to as to the course I am to take in this House by reasons that can appeal to the consciences of my fellow-Catholic members, but which do not appeal as well to the consciences of my Protestant colleagues? No! so long as I have a seat in this House, so long as I occupy the position I do now, whenever it shall become my duty to take a stand upon any question whatever, that stand I will take, not from the point of view of Roman Catholicism, not from the point of view of Protestanism, but from a point of view which can appeal to the consciences of men, irrespective of their particular faith, upon grounds which can be occupied by all men who love justice, freedom and toleration.

That programme—because it is a programme—became the banner of the Liberal party, French and English; it became the bond of union of all liberty-loving Canadians. It defeated the Tory policy, a policy which in Ontario vociferously denounced the right hon. gentleman for certain reasons, which I need not give, and which in Quebec, denounced him no less vociferously, and perhaps much more ingeniously, from quite other motives. The government of the day resigned, and as a result the right hon. gentleman, then became the Premier of this Dominion. He was immediately called upon to formulate a policy on the school question. Of course we hear much less denunciation against the Postmaster General and the Minister of Public Works than were made in 1896 against the right hon. gentleman. He had to give justice immediately to the Catholic minority of Manitoba, as the demand was pressing. It took a few months. He had some pour parlers with Mr. Greenway. He used the influence of his colleagues, Sir Oliver Mowat, and others, and finally an agreement was reached. The Minister of Public Works declared last night that that agreement was acceptable to him to-day. The question in his judgment, is finally settled. According to the Postmaster General, it was a poor settlement. Sir, the Postmaster General paid a great compliment to the memory of the old leader of the Liberal party, who has just passed away, the Hon. Edward Blake, and I join him in those compliments. If, according to my hon. friend, the Laurier-Greenway settlement was a poor one, one for which the right hon. gentleman should have been condemned 15 years ago, how is it that Hon. Edward Blake, a great legal luminary probably the greatest jurist in the British Empire at any rate, strongly approved of that settlement? In a letter which he addressed on January 20, 1897 to the Solicitor General of that day, the Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick, the Hon. Edward Blake gave as his opinion that the settlement was a broad and fair settlement, and should be accepted by the minority in Manitoba; and we know that Mr. Blake

was a friend of the minority, for whom he he had been selected as council before the Privy Council. Let me quote the words from Mr. Wilson's book:

Mr. Blake said that if, in order to succeed in the appeal, he had found it necessary to maintain that the separate school system should be absolutely restored, he would have failed, and that it was only by taking much more limited ground that he had induced the court to touch the question at all. The judicial committee had simply decided that the Governor General in council had jurisdiction in the matter, and had left to the political authorities the question of how the jurisdiction should be exercised. He considered the terms of the settlement more advantageous to the Catholic minority than any remedial Bill which it was in the power of the parliament of Canada to force on the province of Manitoba.

I quote these words, just to show that, according to an unbiased and judicial mind like that of the late Hon. Edward Blake, the school settlement was considering the circumstances a fair one for the minority of Manitoba. The agreement was accepted by the Manitoba legislature, but did the agitation stop there? No, but ever since Mr. Roblin took the reins of office, the agitation has gone on continuously in the province of Quebec. This agitation has been stirred up day in and day out, in every general election, and those who are responsible in the first degree for that agitation, are the hon. gentlemen who sit to-day in the coalition government. When the agreement came before this House on the only occasion on which it came before this House, because it was never taken exception to by any of the members of the Conservative party, the right hon. gentleman who was then Prime Minister, said:

When we came into power, we approached that question in the only way in which it should have been approached, and if it had been approached in that way first, this country would have been spared the years of agitation, which have brought it almost to the verge of civil war. We went to the government of Manitoba and said to them: 'The legislation of 1890 has inflicted a grievance upon the minority of Manitoba. You have the authority of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council that such is the case. Repair the grievance yourselves.' Sir, they undertook themselves to repair that grievance. We thought, and still think—and upon that issue I am ready at any time to take the verdict of the country—that the smallest measure of conciliation was far preferable to any measure of coercion.

But, as I said a moment ago, the agitation went on. If the words are not too strong I may say, and say very boldly, that during a period of 15 years Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his fellow members of the Catholic persuasion in the province of Quebec were simply crucified by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) because they supported that agreement. That is not new in the history of the Liberal party. The question of whether a French Canadian in the province of Quebec can be a Liberal or not is as old as the province of Quebec itself. For 50 years we were denied by our opponents the rights which belonged to the humblest British subject. It was argued by them that a Liberal could not be a good Catholic, and no man could be elected, even to a position on a municipal council, if he claimed to be a Liberal. To such an extent was the agitation against us carried on that it eventually culminated in 1897 in the Liberal members of parliament who belonged to the Catholic faith appealing to the supreme chief of Catholicity. We pointed out to the Supreme Pontiff that we were British subjects, and that we were entitled to our civil rights, and we wanted a judgment from His Holiness as to whether or not we could as British subjects be members of the Liberal party and be considered as Catholics. We all know what happened. The judgment was given. But somehow or other the fight began over and over again at every election. And the Postmaster General is one of those who most assiduously and ingeniously appealed to the prejudices of the Catholics against the present leader of the opposition. This is not new. The same thing was done in the days of Dorion, in the days of Letellier in the days of Blake, in the days of Mercier. For years and years the Liberal party in the province of Quebec could not count a baker's dozen in either of the legislatures. We could not be elected, we could not go before the electors, because some agitator would rise and say that we, the Liberals of Quebec, were like our compeers of Continental Europe—that we were opposed to religion, to the liberties and the tenets of the Catholic church—and they so misconstructed the word Liberalism in politics until finally it was defined by the Supreme Pontiff himself. Sir, the same quarrel has gone on in France.

We belong to the British school of Liberalism, and not to the French school of Liberalism. We admire the French school of Liberalism, as represented by Montalembert, and Lacordaire. Montalembert in a book, which was published not too long ago, stated that he himself found a wide difference between the Liberals of England and the Liberals of France. His grandfather was a Scotch Liberal. He had been educated by that grandfather in England, and then at the age of 17 or 18 he came to France. It was at a period when revolutions in continental Europe were rife. In Paris especially at every lyceum and

every school there was quite a demonstration amongst the young men in favour of Liberal ideas, but he found, as he says, quite a difference between the French Liberalism and the English Liberalism. The young French Liberals were opposed to religion and to the liberties of the church. They were not only opposed to the church, but he tells us that one day in class a ballot was taken to ascertain how many believed in the existence of the Almighty, and he mournfully discovered that the Almighty had carried the day only by a majority of one. This shows the wide gap between the ideas of French doctrinaire Liberals and those of English Liberals. I repeat that it is with such a thin construction of the word 'liberal' that the Liberal party was kept in opposition in Quebec for 50 years. It is with such methods that we have been fought at every election. But, thank Heaven, we have won the battle, and now the province of Quebec knows no difference, religiously speaking, between a Liberal and a Conservative.

The Postmaster General and the Minister of Public Works have, through a long labyrinth of arguments, summed up their position in the following words: 'There are no vested rights for the minority of Keewatin.' They have found that set out in the statute-book. Even the ingenious Minister of Public Works has gone so far as to say that the word Keewatin has disappeared from the statue-book, and that as there was no Keewatin hence there were no vested rights; consequently there was no school question, and thus he could consistently keep his portfolio. However, it is the opinion of a gentleman who, if he is not a full-fledged member of the cabinet, is a semi-ready member, I refer to the hon. the Speaker of the Senate, the co-editor and co-propriteor of 'L'Evenement' of Quebec. That gentleman has given his opinion and he finds that there is a Keewatin in the statute-book, that there are vested rights, and that there is a school question. How do you reconcile that? How do you reconcile the saying of the already made minister that there is no school question, with the statement of the semi-ready minister that there is a school question? Does the latter anticipate that the already made minister will resign and that he will step into his place?. However, it is the opinion of the Speaker of the Senate. It is also the opinion of a man whom I respect and revere, His Grace the Archbishop of Manitoba, Mgr. Langevin, who has declared on many occasions that the minority in Keewatin has rights that must be respected. Sir, using the words of His Grace the Archbishop of St. Boniface, the Deputy Speaker of this House addressing a meeting at Three Rivers last summer, stated that there was a school question, and that he intended to resurrect that much dreaded issue.

Speaking at Three Rivers on the 7th of August, your deputy, Sir, used the following language:

> The supreme resource of the government is to say of a question that it is dead and buried. Dead and buried? The school question of Manitoba, in spite of the eloquent voice which cries: 'I am eternally wounded and my grave is my cradle'. Dead and buried the question of South African contingents where your sons were called to shed their blood on the African veldt?

No, no, not dead and buried, quite alive. However, the dissenting ministers state now, that there are no vested rights for the minority of Keewatin, and that no threat should be made to Manitoba, especially at the present moment, when this government have just come into office and they are asked by their Quebec followers to stand by their pledges. No threats should be made to Manitoba and besides no two school systems could co-exist in Manitoba. How would it do, said my hon. friend, for one section of Manitoba to have public schools and to import into the annexed territory a system of separate schools? No two school systems can co-exist, says the Postmaster General. He says besides that there are but a handful of Catholics in Keewatin and that, at all events, we should trust the Roblin government. He used quite different language during the elections. It is not for me to look at the statute book and to point out the clauses which give or do not give to Catholics in the Keewatin territory rights, as hon. gentlemen opposite said during the last general election, they had rights, It is not for the right hon. gentleman, who leads the opposition, to frame a policy for that great genius who took for himself all the glory of overthrowing this government in the district of Quebec; it is for the right hon., the leader of the government (Mr. Borden) and he knows what he has to do. His Bill is before the House, there is no school clause in it, and it is for the hon. gentleman to induce the right hon. the leader of the government, to frame a policy, it is not the duty of the leader of the opposition. One thing is sure. Mr. Greenway is dead, his government has disappeared; the Laurier government is out of office; the Borden government is in office and the Roblin government is in office; these are two friendly governments. Mr. Roblin has been in office since 1899. How is it, I ask the Postmaster General, that if the remedial order could have been enforced in Manitoba at the time the right hon. gentleman, who leads the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was Prime Minister, Mr. Roblin never put it in force? How is it that he has not improved the condition

of the French Canadian and Catholic minority in Manitoba? Was he prevented by the right hon. gentleman from implementing the terms of the agreement of 1897? On the contrary, but we know that Mr. Roblin was not quite willing.

Oh, but the hon. gentleman knows that Mr. Roblin unfurled the British flag on every school house in the province of Manitoba, and I commend that policy. We must teach the young men to love and respect the flag. I say that the British flag is the symbol of justice, of tolerance and of liberty. We Liberals trust in the flag more than in Mr. Roblin. It should be an easy matter then for the three Nationalist members, unwilling to surrender their portfolios in order to protect the sacred rights of the minority, to settle with Mr. Roblin under the folds of the British flag.

Rt. Hon. R. L. BORDEN. (Prime Minister) Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Lemieux) has entertained the House at very considerable length with a number of reminiscences very delightfully rendered and of a more or less amusing character. I shall come to some of these a little later on but for the moment I will take up one or two observations of my hon. friend in the early part of his address. He is good enough to congratulate the government upon having placed upon the order paper of this House resolutions providing for the extension of the boundaries of Ontario and Quebec, adding, however, that our action in that regard is only by way of implementing a resolution passed by this House under the leadership of my right hon friend who sits opposite; and when he reminds us of that it might be worth while to inquire why it is that these resolutions have remained as waste paper ever since the 13th of July 1908 and whether or not the remarkable and unexplained delay has anything whatever to do with the extension of the boundaries of the province of Maniltoba.

Then my hon. friend was good enough to lament the harsh treatment which, as he claims, has been meted out to the province of Ontario. Does he realize, when he makes that statement, that the boundaries proposed by this government are exactly the same as those for which he voted in 1908?

Does he realize that although Ontario, through her ministers of the Crown, went before the government of which he was a member, she was denied the relief which this government is giving her by the present measure? If my hon. friend is of the opinion that Ontario is not getting fair-play to-day, does he mean to say that it was to the credit of his own government that it gave to the province of Ontario no right whatever to a port on the Hudson bay? I should regard it as venturesome not to say audacious, for my hon. friend, under the present proposal which secures to the province of Ontario a port on the Hudson bay, to contrast for one moment the treatment accorded to that great province by the present administration with the treatment accorded it by the administration of which he was a member.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There is a misconception, perhaps I did not clearly express myself. I quite approve of the new boundaries given to Ontario, as I approve of the boundaries given to Manitoba. What I intended to speak of, was the projection of Ontario to Port Nelson.

Mr. BORDEN. My hon. friend was complaining on behalf of Ontario.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I said that Sir James Whitney might approve of that projection, and that the Conservative party might approve of it, but the people might not.

Mr. BORDEN. Does my hon. friend realize that it is a great deal more than he was willing to give to Ontario? Will my hon. friend be good enough to state whether he does or does not object to that consideration being granted to the province of Ontario? That is a plain question. My hon. friend does not seem to be very ready with an answer.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I objected to that projection of the province of Ontario into Manitoba, and I still object to it.

Mr. BORDEN. My hon. friend a moment ago was complaining on behalf of Ontario. Now he has shifted his ground, and is complaining on behalf of Manitoba. Has my hon. friend really made up his mind whether he desires to complain on behalf of Ontario or on behalf of Manitoba?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I said it would lead to conflicts between Ontario and Manitoba. My hon. friend will read my remarks in 'Hansard' to-morrow.

Mr. BORDEN. Yes, and I will find exactly what I have stated, and I do not think I will get much enlightenment as to the exact position of my hon. friend.

Now my hon. friend bewailed the sad position of the provinces by the sea. We did not hear much about that in 1908, when these resolutions were passed. I would like to tell my hon. friend that he is not speaking by the letter when he says that the maritime provinces are declining in population. They are not declining in population. It is true, they have not made the same advance in population that some of the other provinces have made, nevertheless they have made a substantial advance in population; and I have not the slightest doubt that, under the progressive and fav-

ourable policy of the present administration, they will make very much greater advances in the future than they have made in the past.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What I meant was, that they had decreased in population because they were losing their representation in this House. By the present census they are liable to lose a few seats in this House.

Mr. BORDEN. I am aware that they lost representation in the House of Commons in 1901, and I am also aware that the late administration did not do anything to redress any of the grievances of the maritime provinces in that regard. Of course, every one of us realizes that it is because those provinces entered confederation without any provision that their representation should not be decreased that they are in that unfortunate position to-day. As a matter of fact, the only province on whose behalf such a stipulation was made when it entered confederation was the province of British Columbia, which has never required it.

However, I will pass from that to deal with another point to which my hon. friend invited attention. I shall not attempt for a moment to follow my hon. friend in the very rambling address which he delivered this afternoon, and which was largely composed of taunts hurled against my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) and my hon friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk). I would like you, Mr. Speaker, and hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House, to observe this one thing at least, that the Postmaster General and the Minister of Public Works have had the courage to stand up in this House and state where they are on this question. But my hon. friend, after speaking an hour and three-quarters, left us as much in ignorance as to what his own attitude is on this question as we are in ignorance of the attitude of his leader. My hon. friend reproaches my colleagues with desiring to keep their portfolios, he reproaches them with a change of heart, with a change of mind; he reproaches my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works with having changed his mind on the naval question. Has my hon. friend from Rouville any recollection of the letter he wrote in regard to the naval question on the 4th of August, 1902, and may I ask whether he stands to-day where he stood when he wrote that letter?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Exactly in the same position.

Mr. BORDEN. Then I will read it, or a portion of it:

Permettez-moi cependant d'exprimer mon étonnement de ce que les délégués des Chambers de Commerce du Canada, et de la province de Québec en particulier, aient cru devoir appuyer une résolution qui affirme un principe absolument faux, à savoir: l'obligation pour les Colonies de participer à la défense de l'Empire.

Translate that into English—I need not read the rest of it:

Permit me, however, to express my astonishment that the delegates of the Chamber of Commerce of Canada, and from the province of Quebec in particular, have thought fit to support a resolution which affirms a principle absolutely false, namely, the obligation of the colonies to participate in the defence of the empire.

Now has my hon. friend still the courage to stand up in this House and reproach the Minister of Public Works with respect to his position on the naval question in 1909? I have only read one paragraph from the hon. gentleman's letter, I will leave it to other members of the House to read the whole letter, I have read such portion of it as is relevant to this debate. I say that the citation of that one paragraph of his letter puts my hon. friend absolutely out of court when he endeavours to level any reproach against the Postmaster General of the Minister of Public Works in respect to their attitude upon this question.

Now my hon. friend has spoken in reply to a criticism which was levelled by the Postmaster General against the right hon. leader of the opposition. There is one remarkable thing about my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Lemieux). Whenever he quotes from a newspaper which does not exactly coincide with his views, he makes all due allowance for inaccuracies of reporting; but when he comes to quote a newspaper containing some alleged speech of a member on this side of the House, he has no misgivings whatever about its accuracy.

Well, my hon. friend referred to what had been said in Quebec on the one hand and in Massey hall on the other by the right hon. leader of the opposition. He qualified his observations upon the Quebec speech by saying that the concluding sentence or two did not sound like the words of the right hon. gentleman who leads the opposition. He had a good deal of misgiving about that. I think he might perhaps have been a little more accurate if he had stated that the concluding sentences of the Quebec speech did not sound very much like the Massey hall speech. Let us contrast the language of the two speeches. My hon. friend argued that they were entirely consistent. This was delivered in the Jacques Cartier hall, Quebec, on the 7th May, 1896, and I am reminded by my hon. friend from Dundas (Mr. Broder) that the elections were held on the 23rd June in the same year.

Finally, if conciliation does not succeed, I shall have to exerise that constitutional recourse which the law furnishes, a recourse which I shall exercise completely and entirely.

The other remarks at Massey Hall have been placed in contrast with that by my hon friend the Postmaster General. They are these:

He was a Roman Catholic and a French Canadian, and therefore, must have strong sympathy for the minority, but as he himself would not be coerced by anybody, so he would not consent to force coercion upon any one.

It is absolutely impossible to reconcile the two statements. My hon. friend knew that and therefore he qualified his observations in regard to them by stating that the concluding sentences of the Quebec speech, which, as far as I know, have not been denied by the right hon. leader of the opposition, did not sound like the right hon. gentleman's usual utterances.

Now, my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) dealt with a great many matters in the course of his address as to which it is not necessary for me to speak. But, as his speech was undoubtedly designed for the purpose of furnishing ammunition of a certain sort which has not been without its use to my hon. friends on the other side of the House, I think it is only right to comment rather briefly, but perhaps somewhat pointedly, on the attitude of the opposition in regard to this measure. My right hon. friend the leader of the opposition left this question, as to which his press in Quebec are not silent, to the concluding part of his speech and then alluded to it in a few, brief sentences. In the course of these sentences he declared that he was within the lines of 'Torres Vedras.' My hon. friend the Postmaster General well stated that my right hon. friend has been there many times before, and that it has been a very usual resort in times of stress for him. My hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) has also resorted to the lines of 'Torres Vedras,' but the only difference between them is that he is a little farther within those lines than even his leader. We were told by the right hon. gentleman that whenever this question was raised in the House he was ready to discuss it. I would have supposed that that remark would have applied to his chief lieutenant or, at all events, to one of his chief lieutenants. Yet, after this question has been raised, and after my hon. friend the Postmaster General, and my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works have spoken upon it, we find that the hon. member for Rouville occupies nearly two hours of the time of the House and fails, from beginning to end of his speech, to state his own position upon this question. My hon. friend the member for Rouville has said that his leader in 1896 stood for no coercion. He has endeavoured to deal very gingerly with this question. Why did he not state whether he stood for coercion to-day or for no coercion? That would have been a very plain statement. He asks that the government should define its policy. The government has defined its policy by the Bill which is now before the House, and it would have been the proper and constitutional course for my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition, when he came to deal with this question, to have attacked that Bill on account of what it did not contain as well as on account of what it did contain. What course did he take? The course which he took was to allude to but not to deal with this question and to place before this House a cunningly devised amendment which he thought might be of advantage to him from the political point of view, while he himself remained within the lines of 'Torres Vedras.' Then, Sir, his own press in Quebec is making an attack upon this government, and an attack upon the Bill that the right hon. gentleman does not see fit to make, because, although he is willing to wound he is afraid to strike. The hon. member for Rouville has spoken of this as a family quarrel. Let me tell him, if I may venture to do so, that charity begins at home, and that he had better see to the quarrels within his own party.

Now, I will come to some of the matters that have been referred to in connection with the policy of the government on this question, and let me point out, in the first place, that I appreciate very much what was said by my hon. friend from Nicolet (Mr. Lamarche), who spoke in a very reasonable and moderate way, whose speech on this question was worthy of this House and, from the standpoint which he took, was a reasonable, a moderate and forcible speech. It is a speech that deserves consideration from the government, and a speech to which I propose to give some consideration. Let me say that the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, were proclaimed and came into force on the 31st day of January, 1907. I pass by the question alluded to by my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works and will simply advert to the fact that in July, 1905, an order in council was made by the late administration which, in so far as I have said, was entirely beyond their powers, inasmuch as it exceeded the authority that the statute had bestowed upon them. However, when the Revised Statutes were placed before this House in the following session that order in council was made good in terms by the Revised Statutes, and these statutes are undoubtedly the law of the land to-

day. By section 2, subsection (a) of the statute to which I refer, the Northwest Territories include all the territories formerly known as Rupert's Land and the Northwest Territories except such portions thereof as form the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta and the Yukon Territory.

It is, therefore, plain that Keewatin is included in the expression 'Northwest Territories' as used in this statute, and we must look to its provisions to see what right may exist in any body or community of people with respect to educational matters in these territories. This statute was in force from the 31st of January, 1907 until the present administration came into power on the 10th of October, 1911. Now, what was necessary for the purpose of carrying into effect the educational provisions which had for some years previously been existent in the Northwest Territories. In the first place, by section 6 of the Statute:

The Governor in Council may from time to time constitute and appoint such and so many persons, not exceeding four in number, as are deemed desirable to be a council to aid the commissioner in the administration of the territories; and a majority of the council, including the commissioner shall form a quorum.

Section 10 reads:

The Commissioner in Council, if authorized to make ordinances respecting education, shall pass all necessary ordinances in respect thereto; but in the laws or ordinances relating to education it shall always be provided that a majority of the ratepayers of any district or portion of the territories, or of any less portion or subdivision thereof, by whatever name the same is known, may establish such schools therein as they think fit, and make the necessary assessment and collection of rates therefor; and also that the minority of the ratepayers therein; whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish separate schools therein, and in such case, the ratepayers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic separate schools shall be liable only to assessments of such rates as they impose upon themselves in respect thereof.

Now, there were two things necessary before that legislation should become operative. In the first place: that the government of this country should appoint a council of four, to assist the commissioner. From the 31st of January, 1907, up to the tenth of October, 1911, no such step had been taken by the administration which preceded us. The next thing necessary was that the Commissioner in Council should be authorized to make ordinances respecting education, and, from the 31st of January, 1907, up to the time we came into power, no such step was ever taken by the administration which preceded us. Consequently, it follows directly, that during the period which intervened between the 31st of January, 1907, when this law came into force and the day on which this government came into power, no steps, preliminary or otherwise, had been taken by the Liberal administration for the purpose of making operative in the Northwest Territories, the provisions I have read with regard to separate schools. I trust I make myself thoroughly understood by every hon. gentleman within sound of my voice in regard to that matter. Something had been done with regard to education during the interval, but it was done under a mere tentative arrangement and not under the authority of the statute. We find in the records of the Minister of the Interior this memorandum made on the 20th of June, 1907:

Ottawa, 20th June, 1907.

Memorandum re Schools in the Northwest Territories.

Two applications have been made for assistance:—one from 'The Pas' which is in the nature of a mission school, and can remain in abeyance until after the return of Dr. Cash, M.P., who is to visit the locality in August, and has promised to make full inquiries.

The other is from Barrows, on Red Deer Lake, about six miles north of the boundary of Manitoba, where a sawmill is in active operation, and there are between 35 and 40 children for whom there is no school; nor would it be possible to organize a school under trustees and other conditions required by any schools Act—and yet the children should not be deprived of education.

As a temporary arrangement the undersigned recommends that, provided three responsible persons organize themselves into a school board and engage a teacher who would be qualified to teach in the public schools of Alberta, Saskatchewan or Manitoba, an allowance equal to 75 per cent. of the salary of the teacher be made from public funds, on evidence that he or she has received from the trustees the remaining 25 per cent.—payment to be made quarterly; the arrangement to be for one year, subject to renewal; the school to be strictly non-sectarian, and the salary of the teacher not to exceed $600 per annum.

This is approved, the undersigned would ask the authority of the minister to pay the amount from the appropriation for schools for the Northwest Territories.

Respectfully submitted,
(Sgd.) FRED WHITE,
Commissioner.

Approved,
(Sgd.) F. Oliver,
21st June, 1907.

That, so far as I understand, is the only provision (and it is a provision entirely of a temporary nature) made by the late administration with respect to schools in these territories up to the time we came into power.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it must be apparent to you under those circumstances, that so far as these statutory provisions respecting separate schools in the northwest are concerned, they were absolutely inoperative, for the reason, in the first place, that no members of the Council had been appointed so as to create a body known as the Commissioner's Council, and in the next place, because the commission had not been authorized—even though councillors had been appointed—to make any laws or ordinances whatsoever with respect to the establishment of schools in these territories. The situation when we came into power was this: that for three years there had been upon the records of this parliament, resolutions declaring that the boundaries of Manitoba, of Ontario, and of Quebec, ought to be enlarged according to certain defined limits which were expressed in these resolutions. What was our duty under the circumstances? We know very well indeed that a great deal of negotiation had gone on between the government of Manitoba and the late Liberal administration with regard to the enlargement of the boundaries of that province, and, there are those of us who are free to believe that the delays with respect to all these provinces were due to a certain peculiar policy of the Liberal government in connection with the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba. When we came to power, we conceived it to be our duty to carry out that policy which parliament had declared in 1908, and we proceeded to carry it out. I ask any hon. gentleman in this House whether or not it would have been a reasonable thing for this government—after that matter had stood for nearly four years without the appointment of any council, without authority to the commissioner to put into force these provisions respecting education—I ask whether or not it would have been a reasonable thing for us to undertake to do that without which these Northwest Territories had got on very well for three and-a-half years at least. And, to do that, remember, on the very eve of carrying out a proposal to which parliament had given its unanimous acceptance on the 13th of July, 1908. Why, Mr. Speaker, I think it would have been the very worst thing we could have done in the interests of all concerned if this government had seen fit, on the eve of enlarging the boundaries of Manitoba, to take any such step as that which has been suggested. I come from a province where separate schools do not exist by reason of any statutory provisions; I come from the province of Nova Scotia, and I would like to tell my hon. friends in this House from the province of Quebec and from every other province in Canada, that although there are no provisions in that province establishing separate schools for Catholics as a matter of right, the relations between Protestants and Catholics in the province are, I believe, at least as cordial and as friendly as they are in any province of Canada, and I do not believe that the Catholics in the province of Nova Scotia have anything to complain of in respect of the treatment which they receive from their Protestant brethren. I believe they are fairly, and justly and honourably treated, and I think I can appeal to my Roman Catholic friends from the province of Nova Scotia to bear witness to the accuracy of what I now state.

What are the arguments of the right hon. leader of the opposition in 1896? That this matter had better be left to the people of Manitoba; and, following the advent of his party to power, certain negotiations were carried on between his government and the government of Manitoba. I am not disposed to-day to enter into a consideration of how far the agreement arrived at, was or was not satisfactory; but I do say that the Roman Catholics of the province of Manitoba constitute a larger proportion of the people of that province, than the Roman Catholics of this Dominion constitute of the population of the Dominion as a whole; and we cannot for a moment, suppose that the influence of the Roman Catholics in the province of Manitoba in the advocacy of what they consider to be their just rights and for the redress of any grievances from which they suffer will be any less powerful than it would be in relation to the enactment of ordinances under the provisions of the Northwest Territories Act, chapter 62, of the Revised Statutes of Canada. I trust that I make myself perfectly clear. The Roman Catholics of the province of Manitoba are in a minority in that province; but they are a more powerful minority in the province of Manitoba than the Roman Catholics, as a whole, are in this whole Dominion, and I have absolutely no doubt that the majority of the people of Manitoba will be disposed to deal fairly, honourably and generously with them, just as the people of the province of Nova Scotia, without any statutory provision whatever, have dealt fairly, honourably and generously with the Roman Catholics of that province.

Then a suggestion has been made that it would be desirable for the parliament of Canada, in enacting this measure, to attempt to place restrictions upon the legislative authority of the legislature of Manitoba in respect of the territory proposed to be added. In the territory there are at the present time, not more than 165 white people, 400 or 500 half-breeds, and the balance of the population are Indians. Now, a proposal to place any such restriction upon Manitoba would seem to me to be an impossible one, for two reasons. In the first place, I

do not believe that it is politically possible, because I do not believe that Manitoba would accept the extension of her boundaries coupled with any such restriction. In the next place, I do not think it is constitutionally possible. I would like to point out to hon. members, to whose attention this may not have been brought, that the provisions of the British North America Act, of 1871, with regard to the constitution of a province in the first instance, are very different from those contained in the clause of the same Act, providing for the alteration of the boundaries of a province. Section 2 of that Act is as follows:

The parliament of Canada may from time to time establish new provinces in any territories forming for the time being part of the Dominion of Canada but not included in any province thereof, and may, at the time of such establishment, make provision for the constitution and administration of any such province, and for the passing of laws for the peace, order and good government of such province and for its representation in the said parliament.

But when we come to the third section of that statute, we find that the language with regard to increasing the area of a province, is in very different terms. It is as follows:

The parliament of Canada may from time to time, with the consent of the legislature of any province of the said Dominion, increase, diminish, or otherwise alter the limits of such province, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the said legislature, and may, with the like consent, make provision respecting the effect and operation of any such increase or diminution or alteration of territory in relation to any province affected thereby.

We have in the one section direct authority for this parliament to determine the constitution of a province. In the other section we have not any such thing, and it seems to me absolutely impossible to conceive that you can have a province in Canada, such as Manitoba would be after this Bill had passed, which would be governed as to one part of it by one constitutional provision in respect of education, and in another part of it, by another constitutional provision in respect of education. I do not believe that the British North America Act of 1871 contemplated any such thing. To my mind, it is inconceivable, and I do not find warrant for it in the statute. It is inconceivable that you could have one constitutional limitation in old Manitoba and another constitutional limitation in the part of Manitoba which we now propose to add. But whether I am right or wrong in believing that that is constitutionally impracticable, I am absolutely certain that it is politically impracticable; and I venture to say that the people of Manitoba, imbued as they are with a big, broad, generous spirit, would be inclined to deal with their fellow countrymen who may be of a different faith in the same broad-minded and generous spirit as that which has been evinced in other provinces of Canada where no constitutional provisions of this kind exist. So, Mr. Speaker, I venture to say that this Bill which we have submitted to the parliament of Canada is along the right lines—along the lines of observing the constitution of Canada as it is embodied in the British North America Act, of 1867, and in the British North America Act of 1871. My hon. friend the Postmaster General last evening cited competent authorities for the position that in so far as any rights do exist in the territory which we propose to add to the province of Manitoba, those will remain to be dealt with by the parliament of Canada in so far as such matters appertain to the parliament of Canada or by the legislature of the province of Manitoba in so far as they appertain to the legislature of the province of Manitoba. I venture to think that the course which the government has taken in that regard is one in the best interests of all concerned, and will commend itself, not only to the majority of this parliament, but to the majority of the people of Canada as well.

House divided on motion for second reading of the Bill.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Achim,	Kidd,
Aikins,	Lalor,
Alguire,	Lancaster,
Ames,	Lavallée,
Armstrong (Lambton),	Lennox,
Armstrong (York, O.),	Lesperance,
Arthurs,	Lewis,
Baker,	Macdonell,
Ball,	McCurdy,
Barker,	McKay,
Barnard,	Marshall,
Barrette,	Merner,
Beattie,	Middlebro,
Bennett (Calgary),	Mondou,
Bennett (Simcoe),	Monk,
Best,	Morphy,
Blain,	Munson,
Blondin,	Nantel,
Borden,	Nicholson,
Boulay,	Nickle,
Bowman,	Paul,
Brabazon,	Pelletier,
Bradbury,	Perley,
Broder,	Porter,
Burnham,	Rainville,
Burrell,	Reid (Grenville),
Chabot,	Rhodes,
Clare,	Robidoux,
Clark (Bruce),	Roche,
Clarke (Wellington),	Rogers,
Clements,	Schaffner,
Cochrane,	Sexsmith,
Cockshutt,	Sharpe (Lisgar),
Coderre,	Sharpe (Ontario),

Crocket,	Shepherd,
Cromwell,	Smith,
Crothers,	Stanfield,
Currie,	Staples,
Davidson,	Steele,
Doherty,	Stevens,
Donnelly,	Stewart (Hamilton),
Edwards,	Stewart (Lunenburg),
Elliot,	Sutherland,
Elson,	Thoburn,
Fisher,	Thompson (Yukon),
Foster (King's, N.S.),	Thornton,
Foster (Toronto, N.),	Tremain,
Fripp,	Walker,
Gauthier (Gaspé),	Wallace,
Girard,	Webster,
Goodeve,	Weichel,
Hartt,	White (Leeds),
Hazen,	White (Renfrew),
Henderson,	Wilcox,
Hepburn,	Wilson
Hughes (Victoria, O.),	(Wentworth) and
Jameson,	Wright.—114.
Kemp,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Béland,	Loggie,
Bellemare,	Lovell,
Bickerdike,	Macdonald,
Boivin,	Maclean (Halifax),
Bourassa,	MacNutt,
Boyer,	McCraney,
Brown,	McCoig,
Buchanan,	McCrea,
Bureau,	McKenzie,
Cardin,	McLean (Sunbury),
Carvell,	McMillan,
Cash,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Champagne,	Marcile (Bagot),
Chisholm (Antigonish),	Martin (Montreal,
Chisholm (Inverness),	Ste. Mary's),
Clark (Red Deer),	Martin (Regina),
Cruise,	Michaud,
Delisle,	Molloy,
Devlin,	Murphy,
Douglas,	Nesbitt,
Emmerson,	Neely,
Ethier,	Oliver,
Fortier,	Pacaud,
Gauthier	Papineau,
(St. Hyacinthe),	Paquet,
Gauvreau,	Pardee,
Guilbault,	Proulx,
Guthrie,	Reid (Restigouche),
Hughes (King's,	Robb,
P.E.I.),	Ross,
Kay,	Sevigny,
Knowles,	Sinclair,
Kyte,	Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Lachance,	Tobin,
Lamarche,	Turgeon,
Lanctot,	Turriff,
Lapointe	Verville,
(Kamouraska),	Warnock and
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	White (Victoria,
Law,	Alta.)—76.
Lemieux,	

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Messieurs	
Heggart,	Gordon,
Northrup,	Demers,
Meighen,	Carroll,
Boyce,	Richards,
Bristol,	Charlton,
Carrick,	Lapointe (Montreal),
Smyth,	Clarke (Essex),
Forget (Sir Rodolphe),	Wilson (Laval),
Fowler,	Pugsley,
Taylor,	German,
McLean (P.E.I.),	Seguin,
Osler (Sir Edmund).	Brouillard.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House went into Committee thereon.

At six o'clock, Committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

On section 4, financial terms,

Mr. PUGSLEY. I beg to move the following amendment to subsection 1 of section 4:

That subsection 1 of section 4 be struck out, and the following substituted therefor:

4. Inasmuch as the province was not in debt at the time that the province was established, it shall be entitled to be paid and to receive from the government of Canada by half-yearly payments, in advance, on the first days of January and July in each year, an annual sum not exceeding $381,584.19, being the equivalent of interest at the rate of five per cent per annum on the sum of $7,631,683,-85, the difference between a principal sum of $8,107,500 and $475,816.15 heretofore advanced by the government to the province for provincial purposes; and such amount shall be fixed and determined by the Governor in Council after the holding of a conference by the federal government with the premiers of the different provinces of Canada in respect thereto, and also in respect to any increases in the debt allowance which it would be just and equitable to make to the other provinces of Canada in connection with the increase of the debt allowance to the said province of Manitoba.

My hon. friend will see that the amounts are exactly the same as in the section as proposed. The only difference is that the Governor in Council may pay an amount not exceeding this, the amount to be settled after there has been a conference between the federal government and the premiers of the different provinces of Canada called to consider this matter and also to consider what allowance, if any, it would be just and equitable to make to the other provinces of Canada in connection with the increase in the debt allowance to the province of Manitoba.

I think that the idea of a provincial conference to consider and if possible to settle and determine what shall be the subsidies granted to the different provinces of Canada is one which ought to commend itself to every member of this House. We know that a good many years ago there

was a conference of the provincial governments held at the city of Quebec in, I think, the year 1886. That conference was not called by the federal government, it was convened at the instance of the two larger provinces and certain resolutions were passed looking to a readjustment of the subsidies from the Dominion to the provinces. Their resolutions were sent to Ottawa, but they were not acted upon and so far as the public records show they were not even considered. In 1906 there was a new departure and the government determined to call the premiers of the different provinces of Canada in conference with a view to considering the various claims that were being made by the provinces upon the Dominion and more especially to consider the question of increasing the subsidy allowances to the different provinces. I think that was a move in the interests of the whole Dominion. The different provinces are like a family, they together constitute this nation and I cannot imagine anything more calculated to promote harmony and good will between the different provinces of Canada and to allay dissatisfaction than for the federal government to summon the different provincial governments in conference with a view to talking over matters which are of common interest and to settle any questions that may exist in relation to the financial status of the different provinces. That was the first time in the history of confederation that such a conference was called by the federal government. The act of summoning the conference was received with universal approval by the people of Canada. All the governments of Canada responded to the invitation and the provinces were all represented at that conference. They entered upon their deliberations with a sincere desire to come to conclusions which would be just and equitable to all the provinces and which would be in the general interest of Canada.

I think myself that the government could not take a step more in the interest of the whole people of Canada than to follow the example which was set in 1906, and now summon a conference of the Premiers of the different provinces. To-day we have this spectacle of one province coming to the federal government and claiming that the arrangements which were made twenty-five years ago with that province are at the present time unsatisfactory, and claiming what in effect is an additional subsidy; because, no matter how we may speak of it, there is no doubt that the addition to the debt allowance is an addition to the subsidy of the province. It is in no way connected with the question of ownership of the public domain, it is a question which pertains as much to all the other provinces of Canada as it does to Manitoba. We have also the spectacle to-day of the province of British Columbia coming to this government and appealing for better terms, and we have a proposal on the part of this government, in effect, to leave the claims of that province to arbitration under an arrangement by which this government would appoint one commissioner, the province of British Columbia another commissioner, and these two commissioners appoint a third. Now, it does seem to me that instead of dealing with each province by itself, there ought to be a conference of the Premiers of all the provinces meeting here in Ottawa, who would confer from day to day with the federal government, and who, I am sure, would enter upon that conference with a disposition to deal justly and fairly the one with the other, and to reach conclusions which would be in their nature final, and would give general satisfaction to all the provinces of Canada.

Mr. BLAIN. Has my hon. friend overlooked a statement made by the Prime Minister on the second reading of the Bill, dealing exactly with the question to which he is now referring?

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is that?

Mr. BLAIN. I will read it if the hon. gentleman will permit me. The Prime Minister said on March 4, page 4350:

> And I would like to repeat what I have already said in speaking upon the resolutions in that regard, that when we do come to consider that proposal I think it will be just and necessary to give some consideration to the maritime provinces whose boundaries cannot be enlarged by reason of their natural situation, to call them into our councils and give to them a just voice as to the terms upon which these lands should be handed over, and especially with regard to what compensation, if any, should be given to the three maritime provinces by reason of the transfer of these lands to the governments of Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I had that well in mind, I had not overlooked it at all. But my hon. friend will see that these remarks of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister apply simply to the question of giving compensation to the maritime provinces by reason of handing over at some time in the future, whether the near future or the distant future, the public domain of the three prairie provinces. Now, that may be a long time hence, that cannot be done without some arrangement with these three provinces by themselves. As the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers), admitted when he was addressing the House, when it comes to dealing with that question, it would be for the governments of those provinces to say what amount of money

they would return to the federal treasury in exchange for the lands to be handed over to them. That is a matter that can only be dealt with by arrangement with the three provinces. It was stated by the Minister of the Interior that there are a good many people in the prairie provinces who would prefer to have the money instead of the lands, the money which they can use for ordinary purposes of public improvement, and they would prefer to let the Dominion government administer the prairie lands and give them away to the settler free of any charge, as they have been doing in the past. Many people in the prairie provinces believe that instead of making the prairie lands a source of revenue, they should be given away absolutely free to the man who is prepared to come into that country, and make a home for himself and his family. Therefore, it may be many, many years before that question would come up if it is only to come up as suggested by the Prime Minister.

Mr. BARKER. Is the hon. gentleman disposed to leave to the dim and distant future the settlement of all these questions with the provinces by the sea?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I am not disposed to leave it to the dim and distant future. I say that now, when we are altering the situation of three important provinces of Canada, when we are trebling the area of the province of Manitoba, when we are almost doubling the area, if not quite doubling the area, of the province of Ontario, and when we are almost quadrupling the area of the province of Quebec, when we are altering the financial terms under which the province of Manitoba for 26 years has been in the confederation, I say that now is the time to take up the question as to what, if any, consideration should be given to the maritime provinces.

Now, if ever, is the time to take up the question of what should be done in regard to the representation of the maritime provinces. It does seem to me that those of us who are here representing the maritime provinces can appeal with great force to the representatives of those great, strong and growing provinces of Canada, to give fair and reasonable consideration to the claims of the maritime provinces, not only the financial claims but their claims in respect to representation. My hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) suggests that we should leave it until the time comes to deal with the public domain of the three prairie provinces. Why, Sir, within a year or two at the outside, there ought to be introduced into this parliament a redistribution Bill. Under that Bill, unless some provision is made with regard to the representation of the maritime provinces, these three small provinces by the sea will lose five representatives; the province of Nova Scotia will lose two, New Brunswick will lose two, and Prince Edward Island will lose one. That small province of Prince Edward Island, small though it may be, is yet a province composed of men the equal of any of the people of Canada, that province which, when solicited to join the union, declined to enter unless it was assured of a representation of six members, a representation which the people of Prince Edward Island were led to believe would never be reduced; that province today will find, as a result of the redistribution which must before long be passed through this parliament, her representation in the House of Commons reduced by one-half the representation which it was stipulated she should be allowed by the Act when she entered confederation. Now in New Brunswick we shall find as a result of the redistribution that our representation will be reduced to eleven, and that of Nova Scotia will be reduced to sixteen. I say, therefore, that now is the time, when we are dealing with these important constitutional questions, to take up this matter and endeavour to settle it. We know that the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia have asked for a conference of the Premiers of the different provinces for the purpose of considering this question of representation.

They all feel in the strongest possible manner that that question ought to be dealt with at a conference of the provinces. Would it not be entirely opportune, that, in connection with the financial question and in connection with the extension of the boundaries this question of representation should be taken up? It will not delay this measure very long. It would only mean that it would stand over until the next session of Parliament. A conference could be called very soon after Parliament rises, representatives of the provinces could easily be got together and all these important matters could be gone into by the premiers of the different provinces in consultation with the federal government. I have sufficient confidence in the good judgment and in the spirit of generosity of the various provincial governments to believe that they will consent to an arrangement which will give—and this is all we ask—to the lower provinces that representation that we had when we entered into the union, all we ask is that our representation should not be reduced below what it was when these provinces entered the confederacy. We do not ask for any increase. We are willing to let our rights to an increase depend on an increase in population. In saying that I speak, not for Liberals, not for Conservatives, but for the whole people of New Brunswick and I believe I speak the united voice of the whole people of

the maritime provinces, when I plead—I suppose I cannot demand, because the older provinces have the right, perhaps on their side, to stand by the strict terms of the Act of Union—for fair play in the proper sense of the word. I plead for doing away with the injustice from which we are suffering and for removing many of the disadvantages which are pressing upon our people. I desire to express my most sincere thanks to my hon. friend who sits on my right (Mr. Lemieux) who, this afternoon, in a true spirit of generosity, in a spirit which makes for the advantage of the whole people of Canada, said that he would welcome the day when justice would be done to the maritime provinces with respect to its representation and when an Act would be passed which would prevent its suffering any loss in representation. Let me appeal to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen). I have heard him before on this question and I have heard him speak in eloquent terms of the injustice from which the maritime provinces have been suffering and the great necessity of doing something to take away this injustice and the certainty of continued loss in representation. Let me ask him whether he has taken the question up with his colleagues and, if he has, if he entertains the same view to-day which he entertained when he was a member of the provincial legislature. Let me ask him if he can conceive of any better time than now to take up this question of the representation of the maritime provinces, if he can conceive any better time for its consideration by a conference of the provinces when they might be summoned, as they could be summoned now, if this measure stands over, to consider all these questions, to consider how the enlargement of the territories of three great provinces of Canada affects the smaller provinces, to consider how the alteration in the financial terms affects the smaller provinces, and to consider whether or not in its material aspects the alteration of the constitutions of these three provinces affects the question of representation and ought now to be dealt with. In my humble judgment there never was a time in the past so appropriate as now to take up this question of representation and there never will be a time so opportune in the future as is the present occasion for taking up the subject and dealing with it.

My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers) sought to justify this special dealing with the province of Manitoba by the statement that all the members of the Interprovincial Conference approved of these claims on the part of Manitoba, and he said that Manitoba had no greater friend at that conference than myself. Well, Mr. Chairman, I have always, I am proud to be able to say, been a friend of Manitoba. I was one of the pioneers of Manitoba. My hon. friend speaks of the pioneers, and my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. White) speaks of the pathfinders. When I went to Manitoba there were many pathfinders, but of later years, and I believe since the time when the hon. Minister of the Interior went into Manitoba, the hardships have all passed away and there is no pleasanter place in which to live than Manitoba. The people suffer no more hardships there than they do in the other provinces of Canada. Manitoba is an exceedingly prosperous province. But while I was then a friend of Manitoba and desirous of doing justice to that province as one member of the Interprovincial Conference, yet I beg to differ from my hon. friend and to say to the committee that the records show, if I read the records aright, that my hon. friend is entirely mistaken when he says that the members of the Interprovincial Conference approved of these claims of Manitoba. I can prove what I say by the record. If the members of the committee will take up the sessional papers of 1907 they will find a full report of the proceedings of the Interprovincial Conference. I refer them specially to sessional paper 29a.

Report of proceedings in conference between members of the government of Canada and of the various provincial governments assembled at Ottawa, October, 1906:

At that conference the first and principle question which was dealt with was an increase in the subsidies to the various provinces, and if hon. gentlemen will look at the return they will find, upon the fourth page 'Resolutions of the Conference,' dealing with this subject of an increase in subsidies. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior has endeavoured to make the committee believe that, while these resolutions were agreed to, yet, at the same time, the members of the conference approved of the special claims which the province of Manitoba was making. I say they did not, and I speak as a member of the conference, not only from my recollection but from the record as contained in that return which was brought down to parliament. This is what the conference resolved:

Therefore it is unanimously resolved that the subject matter of the resolutions adopted by the conference of the representatives of the several provinces held at Quebec, in December 1902 and which was shortly thereafter presented to the government of the Dominion and which were ratified by the legislature of the then existing provinces except that of British Columbia, be now pressed upon the government of the Dominion for immediate and favourable action, under reserve of the right of any province to now submit to such government, memoranda in writing concerning any claims it may have to larger sums

than those set out in the said resolutions, or to additional consideration or recognition.

My hon. friend did not give that weight to the word 'now' which the conference intended should be given to it and which must necessarily be given to it. What the members of the conference did was, first, to pass a resolution in regard to a general increase of subsidies amongst the different provinces. Then they said: We are prepared to consider the special case of any province and we reserve to the government of any province the right to now submit a memorandum of any special claims which they may have. The province of British Columbia did submit its claim for additional consideration. That memorandum applied as well to the province of British Columbia as to the province of Manitoba and to every other province in the Dominion. British Columbia, as I have said, submitted its claim and what did we do with it? The conference unanimously rejected it, and the two representatives from the province of Manitoba, Mr. Roblin and Mr. Campbell, joined in an unanimous recommendation that the claims of British Columbia should not be conceded. That is the way in which the conference dealt with that special claim—a claim in respect to which these reasons apply just as much as they do to the claim of the province of Manitoba. The conference rejected, as I have said, the claim of British Columbia, but, in view of the exceptional conditions in that province, in view of its being a mountainous country and road-making being exceedingly expensive, and in view of other considerations which were put forward in the memorandum and which will be found in this return, the conference recommended that the Dominion should give to the province of British Columbia an additional allowance of $100,000 per year for a period of ten years.

Mr. BORDEN. I do not quite understand how these matters are settled by the conference; do they vote by provinces or by individual membership?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They voted by individual membership, but I may say that they were unanimous.

Mr. BORDEN. Was the membership for each province restricted.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, the representatives for Ontario were Sir J. P. Whitney, Mr. Foy, and Mr. Matheson; for Quebec, Sir Lomer Gouin, Mr. Turgeon and Mr. Weir; for Nova Scotia, Mr. Murray and Mr. Drysdale; for New Brunswick, Mr. Tweedie and Mr. Pugsley; for Prince Edward Island, Mr. Peters and Mr. George E. Hughes; for Manitoba, Mr. Roblin and Mr. Campbell; for British Columbia, Mr. McBride; for Saskatchewan, Mr. Walter Scott and Mr. Calder; for Alberta, Mr. Rutherford and Mr. Cross. For each of the larger provinces there were three representatives and from the other provinces two representatives each, except British Columbia which had one representative in the person of the Prime Minister. So far as I remember the resolutions at the conference were passed unanimously. In order to show that the conference had no thought of approving of any additional claims of the province of Manitoba I find in the return a memorandum which was submitted by Sir J. P. Whitney, the Hon. J. J. Foy, and the Hon. A. J. Matheson, in which there is this language:

> We urge that in the future no special grant at any rate should be made to any one province. We repeat that in our opinion an agreement which will render impossible periodical applications for the rearrangement of the subsidy is feasible and should be determined upon. It is possible that such an arrangement might be fixed and positive and at the same time elastic, working automatically so as to speak as the Dominion census from time to time would determine.

There you have a strong protest on the part of the representatives from Ontario, which protest was concurred in by the members of the conference against in the future making any special grant to any one province. And, so I say, at that conference it was intended to deal with the various claims that were submitted and to make a finality of them so far as the conference could do. The conference was of the opinion expressed by Messrs. Whitney, Foy and Matheson that in future there should be no special grant to any one province.

Mr. BORDEN. Did the conference come to any resolution on that question?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, not so far as the returns show. The only exception from that was with respect to British Columbia where they thought that owing to special circumstances they should recommend an additional allowance of $100,000 a year for ten years. My recollection is that the representatives of Manitoba with the representatives of the other provinces, felt that the Dominion was dealing generously at that time with the different provinces, but at all events the special claim of Manitoba was not further mentioned at the conference, and we were not called upon to deal with it. The conference having agreed upon the general resolution as to the increase in subsidy then reserved the right to any province to, at that time, not in the future, submit its claims to the government so that the conference might deal with them. In response to that invitation the province of British Columbia did submit its claim which was dealt with by the conference in the manner I have described, but the province of Manitoba did not re-

spond to the invitation and did not present any other claim, and I was under the impression that the representatives of Manitoba went home perfectly satisfied that they had received the same generous treatment which the other provinces had received in connection with the adjustment of the subsidies. I do not know that it would be of any advantage to take up the time of the committee in urging that there is no fair ground whatever for now dealing specially with the one province of Manitoba any more than there is for dealing with any other province of the Dominion which might be picked out. Reference has already been made to the fact that it is now proposed to arbitrarily give to the province of Manitoba a sum of about $32 a head upon a population of about 250,000. Why not make it the actual population of 450,000? In the case of British Columbia it was fixed on a population of 60,000, and although British Columbia to-day has a population of about 350,000, I am not aware that it has received any increase other than the general increase which was made in 1884. The government fixed upon a population of 250,000 for Manitoba, because they say that parliament in 1905 made a debt allowance based upon a population of 250,000 for the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. But, you ignore British Columbia, you ignore Ontario, you ignore Quebec, you ignore Nova Scotia, and simply because in 1905 when two new provinces were being created, these provinces were given an estimated population of about 250,000, you say it is right to do the same thing now in respect to an old province which has been forty years a member of the confederacy. The government ignores absolutely the fact that this eight million dollars which it is proposed to give to the province of Manitoba does not represent one single dollar of expenditure made before Manitoba became a member of the confederacy.

They admit that Manitoba had no debt when she became a part of the union. They ignore the fact that every dollar of the debt allowances of Ontario and Quebec, if I remember rightly, represented money of the people of the old province of Canada which had been paid out for the construction of public works which were handed over to the Dominion, and which form to-day a most valuable asset of the Dominion, such as the great system of canals which are essential factors in the system of national transportation, and in respect of which those provinces did not receive one dollar of interest, because that allowance simply goes to pay the interest on the debt which they incurred before confederation, in order to construct public works which are for the general advantage of Canada. They ignore altogether the fact that the larger part of the debt allowances for the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick was incurred in respect of works of a national character which passed over to the Dominion, works which, if those provinces had not constructed them before confederation, such as custom houses, post offices, railways, harbour works and lighthouses, would have had to be constructed and paid for by the whole people of Canada. Hon. gentlemen ignore these facts altogether, and treat the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia in this light and cavalier manner, just as if they had no claim for consideration in a readjustment of the debt allowance of a province. The hon. gentleman said that there was a precedent for this. What was the precedent he cited? He cited the case of the province of Nova Scotia in 1869, when an increase was made to the debt allowance of that province. The members of the government of that day most of whom had taken part in drawing up the compact of confederation, said: We recognize that this is something which ought not to be done except in a case of the gravest possible necessity. But they admitted that a mistake had been made in respect of Nova Scotia. Nova Scotia's debt allowance was based on what was assumed to be her actual expenditure on public works up to the time of the Quebec conference; but between that time and the time of her coming into the union, she had expended $2,000,000 or $3,000,000 in extending her railway system; and it was agreed that because of that mistake, parliament ought to interfere and put her in the position in which she would have been placed if that mistake had not taken place. Sir Charles Tupper, then Dr. Tupper, made a strong argument in favour of rectifying the mistake, and showed how it had occurred. This has been done also in the case of Manitoba, under circumstances which were explained during the debate on the motion for the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. BORDEN. I understand that the government of which the hon. gentleman was a member made an offer of certain financial terms to Manitoba?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN. Was there any conference before that was done?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Those terms were simply based upon the necessities which would arise by reason of the addition of territory.

Mr. BORDEN. Why were not the other provinces entitled to be heard?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am prepared to admit that they ought to have been heard, but we cannot always have our own way. My

right hon. friend who leads the opposition will remember that I urged almost from the day I came into the government that some steps should be taken to secure the representation of the maritime provinces at the numbers at which it stood at the time of confederation. I did not succeed at that time, but I had a great hope of succeeding when the time came for dealing fully with this question of boundaries. The time had not arrived when the late government was in power, although my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition went a considerable distance in that direction when a resolution was passed to enlarge the boundaries of the province of Quebec, and a clause with his approval was added providing that the increased territory should in no way affect the representation of the other provinces; in other words, that, in estimating the 65 members who form the pivot upon which the representation turns, the added territory should not be taken into account at all. That was quite a step forward, and I had certainly strong hope that when we came to deal effectually with the matter, the claims of the maritime provinces with regard to representation would be recognized. A short time ago, I think in the discussion on the address in reply to the speech from the Throne, my hon. friend from Queens, P.E.I. (Mr. McLean), took strong ground that something ought to be done. Is his voice to be heard now, or is he going to allow this Bill to pass without raising a protest on behalf of the province from which he comes, and which is suffering so much by reason of loss of representation? We heard at the same time from my hon. friend from Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler), who, I regret, from circumstances over which he has no control, is not able to be here to-night; and I had hoped that he also would raise his voice against the continuance of the present condition of affairs with respect to the representation of the maritime provinces. There is nothing more that I can say; the facts are plain. With respect to the province of New Brunswick, the Dominion of Canada has an asset which cost that province upwards of $5,000,000, and which to-day is yielding a revenue to this country. That is charged as a part of the debt account, and New Brunswick is not receiving one cent of interest in respect of that indebtedness. All that the Dominion has done has been to pay the interest on the indebtedness incurred in the construction of that revenue-producing property. In respect to Manitoba, hon. gentlemen propose to-day to fix arbitrarily $8,000,000 as her allowance, and to grant her on this account $400,000 yearly out of the Dominion treasury. I may be unduly prejudiced as representing one of the smaller provinces down by the sea, but it does seem to me that there are claims in respect of those provinces—financial claims and claims in respect to altering the basis of representation—which ought to be considered. If my right hon. friend passes all the legislation now proposed, and leaves unsettled these questions, which are believed by the people of the maritime provinces to be vital to their future, he is going to have great difficulty in dealing with them in the future.

As I have said now is the time, when we are dealing with these important constitutional questions, to call together the government of the different provinces of Canada to a conference, confer with them, let them meet with each other—the representatives of all parts of Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific—let them confer together, in conjunction with the members of the federal government, and I am sure they will bring to bear their best intelligence, bring to bear their mutual desire to make an arrangement which will promote peace and harmony among all the people of Canada. If that is done I have every confidence that they will work out a plan which will be satisfactory to all the provinces, and which will be satisfactory to this parliament and to the government of Canada.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings County, P.E.I.) I have very great pleasure indeed in seconding the motion which has been made by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), and I agree with every statement he has presented to the committee. I think that I can make some other statements that will appeal to the fairness of this committee, particularly with regard to the province of Prince Edward Island. I am bound to say that there are many features of this Bill which appeal to me as being fair and reasonable. The statements made on behalf of the government that, in the preparation of this Bill and in the giving of financial terms to the province of Manitoba they desired to put that province on a footing of equality, so far as regards financial terms with the sister provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, appeal to me. That desire appears to me, so far as I understand it, to be fair and reasonable provided you do no injustice to any of the other provinces in the making of that arrangement. Sir, I look upon the confederation as a partnership, a partnership of nine members. Every one of these members has a private business of his own which he is carrying on, and if you take from the partnership funds a large sum of money and give it to any one of the partners for the purpose of his own private business you necessarily, to that extent, do

some injustice to all the other partners unless they receive compensation in some other way. Sir, unless this confederation, this partnership, is carried on by the application of principle of the strictest justice it would appear to me that it cannot be carried on at all satisfactorily, that you are introducing a system that sooner or later will have very dangerous results. Now, while the granting to Manitoba of additional territory so that its area will be practically the same as that of the sister provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta appeals to me, and while I think that by placing all these prairie provinces on a similar financial basis you are not going far astray, at the same time to date these payments to Manitoba back to 1908 appears to me to be quite unjustifiable. That is the feature of this Bill that I cannot understand and cannot see the justice of. I want to consider the case of Prince Edward Island and to refer to the special conditions connected with that province. Prince Edward Island never had any Crown lands or mines or minerals, and in that respect she stands exactly on the same footing as the three prairie provinces. Therefore, I think that when large additions have been made to the finanical resources of Manitoba, that the position of Prince Edward Island ought to be specially considered. We will take up one item in this Bill, which I think will prove that a very great injustice will be done to the province of Prince Edward Island unless this special provision is taken into consideration. I refer now to the sum that is to be paid to the province of Manitoba in lieu of the public lands. The sum of $562,500, based upon the population, is to be given to Manitoba in lieu of public lands, and that sum is to be increased from time to time. That payment amounts to practically—as near as I can figure it out—$1.25 per head of the population of Manitoba at the present time. When Prince Edward Island came into confederation her allowance because of the fact that she had no public lands was $45,000, which amounts to less than 50 cents per head of her population. If we want to be fair to the province of Prince Edward Island we must I think—and in this matter I appeal to every member of this committee—increase the allowance to that province to make it correspond with the payment which we are now giving to Manitoba. Prince Edward Island, therefore ought to receive $1.25 per head of her population by reason of having no public lands, mines or minerals. That would be an addition of $75,000 to her present subsidy. Furthermore, if you pay these subsidies to the province of Manitoba from the year 1908, by every reason of justice and fair play you ought to likewise pay this additional subsidy to the province of Prince Edward Island from that year.

Mr. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.). This would give her arrears of $300,000. It seems to me that that is a fair and businesslike statement which ought to appeal to the fairness and justice of the Minister of Finance. I might also state, as it has been referred to by the member for St. John, that when the older provinces came into confederation they brought in with them their public works for which they had paid. The same thing applies to the province of Prince Edward Island. We built our own railway in Prince Edward Island before we came into confederation and paid for it, and the cost of that railway was charged to us in the allowance that was given to us at the time of confederation. At the time of our entry into confederation the debt of Canada was $49.40 per head of the population, and Prince Edward Island was given a debt allowance of $50 per head of the population. That was charged to her, and the province was also charged with every dollar expended on public works and we have since that time paid the interest on our debt, which includes the cost of building the railway, and our share of the debt of the Dominion of Canada. That is a fair arrangement, and I have no fault to find with it, but it has been sometimes said to me, and the view is held even by some members of this House, that the Dominion of Canada built the railway on Prince Edward Island and presented it to the province as a gift. Nothing of the kind. We came in under exactly the same conditions as the other provinces of Canada.

A word with regard to representation. That is a question of very great importance to the smaller provinces of this Dominion. Some few years ago, when I had the honour of a seat in this House, I brought that question each year to the attention of the House and was glad to find that each time it was received with better attention and received greater support and when in 1907 I moved a resolution asking that an address be presented to His Majesty praying that he would submit a measure to the imperial parliament changing the British North America Act to the exent that none of the three Atlantic provinces in the Dominion of Canada should have fewer representatives than it had at the time it entered confederation, my resolution receive very generous support from hon. gentlemen opposite, including the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden), the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain), the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Lalor), the hon. member for the Niagara District

(Mr. Lancaster), and I think the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Stanfield).

Mr. STANFIELD. I moved a motion of that kind and the government turned it down.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.). They have a provision of that kind in the constitution of Australia, and British Columbia secured such a condition under the terms of her entrance into the confederation. The time has surely come when the government of this country should seriously consider this problem in relation to the maritime provinces. I want the Minister of Finance to consider what I have said with reference to the financial terms in regard to the position of Prince Edward Island. It appears to me that the case need only be stated for its justice to be apparent, and that the claim of Prince Edward Island for treatment similar to that now being given to Manitoba is insuperable. I feel sure that the members of the government will not see injustice done to any province, particularly to any of the smaller provinces, and it must be remembered that Prince Edward Island stands in exactly the same position, as far as public lands go, as Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. I submit this matter with all confidence to the consideration of the government and hope that they will deal with it. For that reason I have seconded the motion made by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley).

Mr. HAZEN. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) made some remarks with reference to the representation of the maritime provinces in the parliament of Canada, having regard to the fact that after each decennial census for some decades there has been a decrease in the representation of those provinces. The hon. gentleman made a direct reference to myself and stated that he had heard me in the past speaking in very strong language as to the injustice that was being done to the lower provinces in consequence of their losing representation because of the fact that the population in the lower provinces was not increasing as rapidly as that of the other provinces in confederation.

Therefore, under the terms under which we entered the confederation in 1867, we were losing representation, as we were not holding our own proportionately with the population of the province of Quebec. My hon. friend asked me if I still entertained the same views on that question which I entertained at the time to which he referred, which was a time when my hon. friend and myself both occupied seats in the local legislature of the province of New Brunswick, and in which, on several occasions, this question of the loss of representation was discussed. I would say to my hon. friend that I still hold precisely the same views that I held when I was a member of the legislature of the province of New Brunswick. I think it is a most desirable thing, and an act of simple justice, that some effective action should be taken under which there should be provided at least an irreducible minimum so far as the representation of the maritime provinces of Canada is concerned. My hon. friend brought the matter to the attention of the New Brunswick legislature on several occasions when he was a member of a government of that province. On one occasion he made the contention that if a case was properly submitted to the highest court in the empire he believed that court would hold that the proper interpretation of the word 'Canada' in the British North America Act, in the clauses concerning representation of the various provinces, was that Canada consisted of the four original provinces of the confederacy, and that as a result of such an interpretation we would not lose any part of our representation, and that what we had lost would be restored to us. My hon. friend then Attorney General of the province of New Brunswick, carried the matter first to the Supreme Court of Canada, and afterwards to the Privy Council; but the Privy Council failed to uphold the contention of my hon. friend, I regret to say. His contention was that the word 'Canada' mentioned in the British North America Act, was the Canada consisting of the four original provinces of the confederacy; that contention was dismissed by the Privy Council, and it was held that the loss of representation which we had sustained was justified under the British North America Act. Now, my hon. friend has referred to the fact that it is a matter of great regret to us in the lower provinces that this is the case. It is indeed a matter of great regret to us, irrespective of party. The provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick were two of the original provinces of the confederacy, whose consent made it possible to bring about the union, and which at that time did not anticipate the tremendous growth and expansion of the west, and it is, I say, a matter of regret to us that our representation after every census has been reduced, and we fear that perhaps that reduction will continue to go on in the future. Now, this question is not a new one in the parliament of Canada. We find that on January 31, 1910, a resolution was moved in this House by the hon. gentleman who then and now, represents the county of Richmond in the province of Nova Scotia (Mr. Kyte). That resolution was in this language:

That in the opinion of this House the maritime provinces of Canada should have preserved to them the representation in the House of Commons that they now enjoy. That in the redistribution of the constituencies to be made after the next decennial census the number of representatives to be returned from the said provinces should not in any case be reduced. And that an humble petition be presented to His Majesty praying that the British North America Act be amended in accordance with the purport of this resolution.

That resolution was debated, and an amendment was moved by an hon. gentleman who at that time, represented the county of Queens, Prince Edward Island, (Mr. Warburton), and it was seconded by Dr. Daniel, then representing the city of St. John. That amendment read as follows:

Each province in the Dominion of Canada should have as a minimum representation in the House of Commons the representation it had upon becoming a province of Canada. That in the redistribution of the constituencies to be made after the next and after every future decennial census, the representation of each province should be not less than that minimum. And that a humble petition be presented to His Majesty praying that the British North America Act be amended in accordance with the purport of this resolution.

The resolution moved by the member for Richmond was to the effect that the representation of the provinces should not fall below the representation which they had at the time this resolution was moved. The amendment of the hon. member for Queens, Prince Edward Island, was to the effect that the representation of none of the provinces of Canada should at any time, fall below what that representation was at the time they entered the union. That amendment was debated in this House, a number of hon. gentlemen took part in the debate, and among others, was my hon. friend from the city of St. John (Mr. Pugsley). I am a little surprised to find, on referring to his speech, that it lacked in large measure, the enthusiasm that we used to hear him express on this subject, when he spoke upon it in the legislature of the province of New Brunswick. Those who heard the extremely strong views which the hon gentleman entertained before he went to the Privy Council, and the even stronger views to which he gave expression after he returned from the Privy Council, when in that legislature, he criticised the judgment, and pointed out wherein he thought it was weak, and maintained that the province had a grievance which called for redress, believed that when the hon. gentleman came here, and became a member of the government of Canada in the year 1907, only a short time would elapse before he would so influence his colleagues in the House and in the government, that some remedial legislation would be introduced to redress the grievances under which he and many of us felt, that we were labouring under in the lower provinces. But we find that the hon. gentleman, so far as the record goes, did not lift his voice or use his great influence in that direction. We find that when the hon. gentleman addressed the House on the resolution moved by the hon. member for Richmond, and the amendment moved by the member for Queens, Prince Edward Island, that enthusiasm which had so marked the hon. gentleman's speeches in the House of Assembly of New Brunswick had practically disappeared, that a change had come over the spirit of the hon. gentleman's dreams, and he no longer talked of the injustice that was being done to the lower provinces. Let me quote some of the remarks of the hon. gentleman on that occasion:

In my opinion the way in which this matter should be presented is rather along the line taken by my hon friend (Mr. Richards) than along that taken by my hon friend from York (Mr. Crocket). My hon. friend from York said that a great injustice was done the maritime provinces, and he claims that these provinces were not here asking for a favour but demanding as a matter of right that a change should be made in the representation.

Mr. CROCKET. If my hon friend will pardon me, I said we were demanding the restoration of a right of which we had been deprived.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understood the hon gentleman to say, and I think I understood him correctly, that it is not as a matter of favour, but rather as a matter of right that the representation should be restored to what it was. But it seems to me that my hon. friend from Prince (Mr. Richards) has put the matter on the only ground on which it can be put, and that is that it would be a generous thing for the larger provinces to recognize the dissatisfaction existing in the maritime provinces and which is bound to increase as our representation declines. It would be an act of broad generosity for the larger provinces to recognize that fact, to deal in this spirit with the smaller provinces, and to restore the representation to what it was at the time of confederation and below which the people then thought it never would fall.

The reason that I say it cannot be said that an injustice has been done to the lower provinces is that we have no right to complain of what is the interpretation given to the constitution by the highest court of the realm.

It will, therefore, be seen that the hon. gentleman, speaking of the resolution in this House, took a distinctly different ground from the ground which he took in speaking on a similar subject in the legislature of New Brunswick at a time when he was a member of the government of that province. This resolution, as I

say, was discussed by a number of members from the different provinces, and all the speeches were distinctly sympathetic. The right hon. the leader of the opposition, then first minister, addressed the House. I have not had time to go through the reports as I did not know the question was coming up to-night, but I did read the report of the debate some years ago, and I believe that every man expressed sympathy with the position that was taken by the lower provinces. The right hon. the leader of the opposition said that the question was one which could not be disposed of by this parliament, that the question of representation had been settled by the British North America Act, that it was a compact entered into by the different provinces, that the question was one which would have to be dealt with by the different provinces, and a conclusion come to by them in regard to the matter, before it could be taken up and dealt with by the government of the Dominion, and before a change could be asked for in the British North America Act. Following that session I had a conference with a gentleman who was at that time the premier of Prince Edward Island, Mr. Hansard, now a judge of the supreme court of that province, and as a result of that we called a meeting in the city of St. John which was attended by representatives of the three lower provinces. The hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), who was at that time attorney general of the province of Nova Scotia, attended as its representative in the absence of the premier, who was unable to be present in consequence of illness. Others who were present were Messrs. Hansard and Palmer of Prince Edward Island, Mr. Warburton, who had made the motion in the House of Commons, Dr. Daniel, and one or two public men in the province of New Brunswick. We fully discussed and considered the whole question, passed a resolution embodying our views, and then got into correspondence with Sir James Whitney and Sir Lomer Gouin, and asked them to call a meeting of the premiers and representatives of the different provinces, so as to consider this question which was of vital importance to us. That conference was held in Toronto in the autumn of 1910. Among the representatives present were the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers), Sir James Whitney, Sir Lomer Gouin and representatives of all the other Canadian provinces with the exception of British Columbia. I presume that British Columbia did not send a representative to the meeting because it did not feel interested in the question to the same extent that the other provinces did, as under the Act, under which British Columbia came into the union, there is an irreducible number fixed below which representation in British Columbia cannot fall no matter how small the population of the province should become. In other words, British Columbia, which came into the union, after the four original provinces, and before Prince Edward Island became part of the confederation, had inserted in the Act determining the terms of union a provision that under all circumstances its representation should be fixed at six, and that it should not fall below six; so that if the population of the province should become smaller than it was at the time it entered the union, its representation would still be six members. The conference deliberated in regard to the question very fairly and very candidly. I do not think that I am revealing any secret when I say that there was a very general feeling among the members of the conference that something should be done to meet the case of the maritime provinces so far as their representation was concerned. But when my hon. friend puts forward the statement, as he has done to-night, that the representation of no province should fall below that which it had when it entered the union I am afraid that my hon. friend has not given full consideration to the question. That view was put forward at the conference and at once we found ourselves face to face with this condition of affairs. Under the British North America Act the representation of the pivotal province of Quebec was never to be less than 65 in number. Ontario entered the union with 82 members. The people of Quebec have the expectation that at some day, it may be in the near future or it may be farther away, Quebec will be equal in population to Ontario. That hope and ambition may or may not be realized but see what it would mean if it were realized and there was a clause put in this Act to the effect that the popular representation of the provinces should never fall below what it was originally placed at in 1867 or when the provinces entered the union. It would mean that Quebec would have the same or as large a population as Ontario and yet the representation of Quebec would remain at 65, would not increase at all, while the representation of Ontario would not fall below 82. It looked like an insurmountable objection at first, but there was a very strong disposition among the representatives who came from the west, who came from Ontario, and among the members of the conference generally that some exception ought to be made in the case of the maritime provinces. The conference adjourned without taking action as several of the representatives of the different provinces said that they did not feel like committing their provinces to any course of action on the subject until they had had an opportunity

ments and legislatures. The conference adjourned with the understanding that it would be called together at some future date after the census had been taken and before a redistribution had taken place in order that some decision might be come to along the line of doing something, in so far as the maritime provinces are concerned, in the way of fixing an irreducible minimum for their representation. I may say that, from conversations I have had since with the premiers of different provinces and with gentlemen from different parts of Canada who were present at the conference, I do not at all despair of an agreement being come to between the provinces themselves under which an arrangement will be made that will be eminently satisfactory to those of us who come from the lower provinces.

I fully agree with many of the reasons advanced in support of a contention of that sort. At the time of confederation there were only the four provinces. No man in the wildest flights of fancy, could foresee the greatly changed conditions that were going to come over Canada or anticipate the day when there would be thousands and hundreds of thousands of people flowing into the northwestern country, a country little known at that time and a country that was hardly thought to be fit for settlement. The whole condition and complexion of that country has been changed, and had the men who were delegates to the Quebec conference before 1867 anticipated what was in store they never would have agreed to the terms regarding representation that they did agree to when the conditions were entirely different from what they have become since and when no man anticipated that these greatly changed conditions would come about in the course of a few years. We find the other provinces being added to from time to time, an empire almost being added to the province of Quebec; we find provinces carved out of what was then just prairie land in the west belonging to the Hudson's Bay Company, first the province of Manitoba, followed by the two great provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, and we find a large addition made to the province of Ontario. But, situated as we are in the lower provinces, hemmed in on both sides either by the sea, by the state of Maine or the province of Quebec, there is no possibility of an extension of territory and we feel that this territory out of which these other provinces in the west have been carved has been purchased with the money of the Canadian taxpayers, with the money of the people of the lower provinces, with the money of the people of every other part of Canada and that the land belonged equally to us as it did to the other parts of Canada.

Under the physical and geographical conditions that prevail, no part of that domain can come back to us. But we do claim that on account of the tremendous additions made to the west in territory, a share in the burden of purchasing which we cheerfully bore in the general interests of the whole Dominion, and considering that we were among the original provinces of Canada, which made possible the great idea of a united Dominion from ocean to ocean across the northern part of this American continent, we do claim, I say that we are entitled to generous consideration, and especially so in view of the fact that the devolpment of that western country has attracted from our farms, our workshops and our fisheries, so many of our young men, who, had they remained, would have contributed to the wealth and influence of their native province. In view of all these circumstances and the sacrifices we have made, we believe that we should not be put in the humiliating position of having our pride wounded, census after census, by finding that our representation has to be diminished in this House, and that to-day we are not holding nearly as influential a position in the confederacy, so far as to representation in Canada, as we did in its early years. And, while that general statement is true in reference to the lower provinces, there is an even stronger claim on behalf of Prince Edward Island. There is no question to my mind, that history shows that the men who represented Prince Edward Island when the terms of union were brought about in 1871, firmly believed that provision had been made for the minimum number of six members that would represent that province in this House of Commons. That was at the time a larger number than the population of Prince Edward Island would have warranted, and the representatives of the island distinctly understood and so reported to the people what the terms of the arrangement were, that there was an irreducible minimum of six members below which the representation of the island would never fall. The delegates from Prince Edward Island had before them the fact that only the year before, British Columbia, which then had not as large a population as Prince Edward Island had when it entered the union—secured terms under which it was provided that the representation of British Columbia should be six members in this House of Commons and that it should never fall below that number. That privilege having been agreed to in the case of British Columbia, it constitutes to my mind a tremendously strong argument in favour of a similar provision being inserted with regard to the representation of the lower provinces. I have spoken to-night because I think it is important that this question should be kept before this House and because of the direct personal appeal made to me

by my colleague from the city of St. John (Mr. Pugsley). I understand that the next conference of provincial premiers will be held during this coming summer, and that correspondence on the subject is already taking place between the Premier of New Brunswick and the other provincial premiers. I understand that Sir James Whitney and Sir Lomer Gouin, who are recognized as the joint chairmen, are willing to call a meeting to consider the matter, and I have every hope an agreement will be come to under which it can be arranged that the representation of the lower provinces shall not fall below what it is at the present time. And, while I entertain my opinion about our representation as strongly as I ever did, yet I do not believe that the proper means of accomplishing the object we have in view is by opposing the present measure which seeks to put Manitoba on a plane of equality with the other western provinces of Canada. So far as that measure is concerned it is intended as a measure of fair-play to the province of Manitoba. No one who looks at the map of the Dominion of Canada can see the position Manitoba occupies in comparison with Alberta and Saskatchewan, so far as the extent of territory is concerned, wihout feeling that a great injustice was done Manitoba. Every fair-minded man must admit it is only just that its boundaries should be extended, so that it may become comparable in that respect to the newer provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. Every one must feel that this injustice should not be continued longer to the old province of Manitoba, that has blazed the way and opened up to civilization that western country which has now become so potent and important a factor in the public life of Canada. The proposal in this legislation is to redress these grievances, and I do not think any man in this House should object to that. I have heard nothing to lead me to suppose that Manitoba is being treated with anything less than fair and generous justice if this Bill becomes law. I do not believe that we of the maritime provinces have anything to gain by setting our face against this measure which is calculated to do justice to the western part of this country. Rather, I think we will advance our interests and the case we have at heart—not only in the matter of representation, but in the future as regards the financial terms—by gaining the goodwill and support of our friends in the west if we accord this measure generous support. Let us treat Manitoba now in the broad spirit in which we ourselves hope to be dealt with when the question comes before parliament (as it will in the not far distant future) of better times for the maritime provinces. We have the assurance of the right hon. the Prime Minister that the question of compensation to which the maritime provinces are entitled will be dealt with when the question of giving over to the western provinces the control of their public lands is brought for consideration before parliament, and we will not have to wait until the dim and distant future to see that happy day. We have the assurance of my right hon. leader that when that time comes the claims of the maritime provinces will be fairly and reasonably considered, and we may then expect that we will be placed in as good a financial position relatively as the other provinces are. I do not concur with the view expressed by my hon. friends opposite that it is desirable now to hamper the present question with the consideration of that compensation to which we are entitled in the lower provinces, or by an expression of opinion regarding the representation of the maritime provinces as to which I believe this House is practically a unit now, and which I sincerely hope will be dealt with effectively at the meeting of the premiers to be held during the coming summer. If it is not dealt with effectively at that meeting, the question will arise as to what attitude may fairly be taken, having regard to the constitution, for the purpose of redressing the undoubted grievances we labour under. Only a few years ago, in 1891, Nova Scotia had twenty-one members, New Brunswick had sixteen members, and Prince Edward Island had six members, but to-day there has been a great reduction and New Brunswick has only thirteen members, Prince Edward Island four, and Nova Scotia eighteen. But while my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) is now calling for the redress of these grievances, he overlooks the fact that we lost representation under the census of 1901, and that at that time, while he was not a member of this House, he was an influential supporter of the government of the day. How does it come, that he did not then exert his influence with the government, to have existing conditions remedied?

Nothing was done at that time. We sustained the loss of representation. The census of 1911 shows that we shall sustain a still further loss. But I believe that we from the maritime provinces, uniting on both sides of politics in supporting a claim of this kind, can with confidence appeal to this House regardless of party affiliations, to do what it can to effect a remedy for a state of affairs that so affects our pride, and will affect our status and influence in the future as a part of this confederacy.

Mr. CARVELL. I am afraid that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries possesses a greater optimism in regard to the sense of fair-play of the parliament of Canada with regard to this matter than the facts of the case warrant. My hon. friend has not been in this House during the last seven or eight years and listened to the discussions on this question by hon. members from all parts of Canada. I have listened to his very pleasant speech with a great deal of interest; but I want to point out to him that a conference of provincial Premiers alone will not settle this vexed question of the rights of the maritime provinces. It will require a conference participated in, not only by provincial Premiers, but by the Premier of the Dominion and the federal parliament before we can arrive at a conclusion. If my hon. friend will take the trouble to go over the debates and votes to which he has referred, I think he will find that not a man from the west of Lake Superior, and very few west of the maritime provinces, voted for the motion of the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte), or for the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Queens, Prince Edward Island (Mr. McLean). There were a few from the province of Ontario; I do not think there was one from the province of Quebec; and the remainder were members from the maritime provinces, regardless of politics. Now, my hon. friend has travelled all around the question, and has given, I think, in a fair manner, the arguments pro and con. It is true, he has tried to show that the attitude of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), to-night is not consistent with the statements he made in this House two years ago. But, after all, my hon. friend from St. John was fair in stating the facts as they were in 1910, just as he has stated them to-night. My hon. friend from York (Mr. Crocket), was claiming as a matter of right that our representation should not be reduced below the point at which it exists to-day. My hon. friend from St. John was not claiming that as a matter of right, because he said the Privy Council had decided that as a matter of right our representation must be reduced, and, therefore, the only way in which our present representation could be maintained was as a matter of justice to us by the remainder of the Dominion. We may just as well face this thing as it is. We may as well admit that as a matter of law, on a proper construction of the British North America Act, as settled once for all by the Privy Council, our representation must go down unless our population increases in equal proportion to that of the province of Quebec. There is no use of beating around the bush and saying that we have any legal right in the matter, because we have not. Therefore, we come down to the question: Will the rest of Canada give to us as an equitable right that which we assumed we were safeguarding when we came into the union? I agree with the statement of my hon. friend that if the representatives of the maritime provinces at the Quebec Conference had the faintest idea that our representation would be reduced below what it was as fixed at confederation, they would not have accepted the terms then proposed. But, unfortunately, conditions have changed and our representation has been reduced; and, unfortunately, as the law stands to-day, it will continue to be reduced unless our population increases much more rapidly in the future than it has done in the past. We must have a change in the British North America Act if this reduction is to cease, and how are we going to get that change? My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries says: 'Let this Bill go through; you will only be injuring your case if you raise an objection now, because you will hear from the rest of the people of Canada if you are not friendly towards them.' My experience is that the best time to get anything from another party is when he wants to get something from you. That may be a sordid way of looking at the matter; but my hon. friend will find that if the province of Manitoba gets her boundaries extended and her money grant increased, and if the province of Ontario gets all the rest of the Northwest Territory lying west of Hudson bay, and if the province of Quebec gets all the remainder of the territory lying east of Hudson bay, all of the available land in Canada will have been divided among all the other provinces, and they will have got the financial arrangements that they want, which are grossly unfair to the maritime provinces, he will be reckoning without his host. He will be leaning on a broken reed if he expects that the other provinces, after they have gained all these advantages, are going to turn around and say: You poor people of the maritime provinces have been badly used; we cannot give you more money or land, but we will give you more representation. I want my hon. friend to consider that before he throws his cards on the table. It may be said that I am taking a sordid view of the situation. I think I am taking a commonsense view, and I want my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as one of the representatives of the maritime provinces in the government, to look the facts in the face. If we have a conference of all the provinces, and have the matter discussed in parliament before Manitoba gets her boundaries extended, and before Ontario gets hers, and before Quebec gets the rest of the territory, and

before they all get improved financial treatment, I think we shall be in a much better position to obtain just treatment for the maritime provinces. Therefore, I think, from the standpoint of the maritime provinces and from the standpoint of common prudence, the members of this House would do well to consider, very carefully, the amendment offered by the hon. member for St. John. I do not know that anything I may say will have any influence with my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; but I warn him now, and I warn the people of the maritime provinces, that the bait which the leader of this House is holding out to them may be very useless; it may be something that may not be realized for years to come. As I have already pointed out, it is all very well for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to say, I have faith to believe that this will come in a short time. I know perhaps as much about the feeling on this matter as he does, although I am not a member of the government, and, as I read the political horoscope to-day, the possibility of the three western provinces getting their land is very much farther in the future than it has been at any time in the last ten years; and if the maritime provinces are to be compelled to wait until the land is given to those provinces before they get a readjustment of their financial arrangements, I believe they are doomed to great disappointment before the promised land is reached.

What is true in my statement regarding financial matters, is doubly true regarding my statement as to the question of representation. Therefore, Sir, I say again, it behoves the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who perhaps in one sense ought to be the special representative of the maritime provinces in this case, to look very carefully into this question, and consider it very seriously before he attempts to vote down the amendment proposed by the member for St. John.

Mr. BORDEN. I am not quite able to apprehend the view of my hon. friend who has just taken his seat, that the transfer to the western provinces of their lands is further off to-night than it has been at any time in the past, but I suppose my hon. friend perhaps did not mean it just in that way.

Mr. CARVELL. Pretty nearly.

Mr. BORDEN. You did?

Mr. CARVELL. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN. Then all I have to say is that I do not quite understand the statement. In the first place the resolution which has been moved by the hon. member for St. John does not allude at all to the question of representation, but to the question of financial terms, and the hon. gentleman desires, according to the terms of his proposed amendment, that nothing should be done in respect to placing Manitoba on a basis of equality with Alberta and Saskatchewan until the Premiers of Canada have been called together and held a conference. Well, I am bound to say that I do not exactly see the significance of that. I am not aware that the Premiers of Canada were called together in conference at the time Saskatchewan and Alberta were constituted.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN. I am not aware that the Premiers of the various provinces of Canada were consulted about the financial terms granted to Alberta and Saskatchewan.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN. I am not aware that at any one of the many occasions on which individual provinces have had a change for their advantage made in the financial terms which they received from this Dominion, that there has been a conference of the Premiers. The only conference of the Premiers in regard to which any such action was taken, that I can recall, speaking from memory, is the one which has been already alluded to so many times in the course of this debate. Now, the member for St. John says that this measure proposes to ignore all the other provinces. Well, the other provinces are no more ignored now that they were when Alberta and Saskatchewan were constituted. As far as I am aware the moneys proposed to be paid to Alberta and Saskatchewan were to be paid out of the treasury of Canada, and I do not know any other source from which it was proposed to derive them. Therefore, I assume that there should have been just as good reason for consulting the Premiers of the other provinces of Canada then as now, but they were not consulted. No one of the hon. gentlemen who have urged this point with so much insistence had a word to say about calling any conference of the Premiers of the various provinces of Canada at that time. Then I do not exactly understand how the conference of provincial Premiers is to work out this question. Are they to vote by provinces? Are they to vote by the accidental number of representatives who happen to be present from the various provinces? Are they to vote by population, or how are they to vote?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Would it not be fair to have them present at a conference though?

Mr. BORDEN. Would it not be fair to have them there?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Yes, if they are not satisfied, would it not be fair and just to have them at a conference?

Mr. BORDEN. I do not know that there is any great advantage in calling the provincial premiers together in a conference unless we are going to pay some attention to their conclusions. If we are to call them together in a conference, then surely we are to be governed to some extent at least, by their conclusions. Well, suppose the provinces are not unanimous, are we to be governed by the majority, and if so, by what majority? By the majority of population, by the majority of a number of provinces, or by the majority of delegates who happen to be there incidentally to represent any province. That is what I asked the hon. member from St. John.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). The Minister of Marine and Fisheries says the provincial premiers are going to be called for some purpose or another.

Mr. BORDEN. Oh no, he says they have been called together for the purpose of seeing whether or not the provinces of Canada, other than the maritime provinces, would not all come to an agreement that the representation of the maritime provinces should not be decreased below what it is at the present time, and they failed to come to any such agreement. Some of the provinces, I understand, were willing, and some were not willing. At all events no agreement was reached. Suppose a similar result obtains in regard to this matter, what conclusion are we to adopt? Every hon. member knows that in the end the final conclusion in respect to any such matter as this must rest upon the responsibility of the federal government and upon no other responsibility, just as it rested in 1905 upon the responsibility of the government that was then in power. We are doing no more to-day, as I have already stated a great many times, for the enlarged province of Manitoba than was done for the adjoining provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan in 1905. However, my hon. friend from St. John has moved his amendment, and it is understood that matters of a controversial nature were not to be finally dealt with to-night. I would be very glad, therefore, to let the clause stand, and see if we can make any progress with some of the other clauses of the Bill, and resume the discussion upon this clause if that course meets with the approval of the committee to-morrow, or when the Bill is next taken into consideration.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). I would like to say a word in regard to this matter on behalf of my province, and I must say that I cannot quite grasp the reasoning of the leader of the House when he wanted to indicate that there was no necessity for a conference, that you would not know what to do with that conference if you did get one. Yet my hon. friend two days ago told us that when he comes to hand back the lands to Manitoba and the other provinces, he is going to call a conference of the provincial governments of Canada to consider——

Mr. BORDEN. I beg my hon. friend's pardon, I did not say that.

Mr. MACDONALD. Well, my hon. friend used the expression: We would call them to our counsels.

Mr. BORDEN. I said that we would call the maritime provinces to our counsels whose boundaries could not be extended by reason of their natural situation. I said nothing more.

Mr. MACDONALD. Then my hon. friend when he gets the representatives of the maritime provinces together, is he going to say that Prince Edward Island shall not have as much to say about the matter as Nova Scotia, nor Nova Scotia as New Brunswick, or how are the provinces going to vote?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is another term for a conference.

Mr. BORDEN. I did not say they would vote at all, and I do not propose they shall vote.

Mr. MACDONALD. Then my hon. friend is going to call the representatives of the provinces before him and, when they are here and sitting down at the conference, say to them: 'Although you have been called here I do not intend that there should be anything more than talk indulged in. You cannot come to any unanimous conclusion and you cannot vote on questions with which you are dealing.' I wonder what the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is going to do with the conference that he is going to have this year. Is he going to allow the representatives at that conference to vote?

Mr. HAZEN. The hon. gentleman is wrong. I did not say I was going to have any conference this year.

Mr. MACDONALD. You did not? Then if my hon. friend did not tell us there was going to be a conference of the different provinces of the Dominion to consider the question of representation, I do not know what he did tell us.

Mr. BURNHAM. May I ask whether this conference of the provinces is a Dominion or a provincial matter?

Mr. CARVELL. There is an election coming on in New Brunswick this summer.

Mr. BURNHAM. I see. All right.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend from Peterborough generally manages to throw some light upon any problem which he undertakes to discuss, but I am bound to say on this occasion he has only succeeded in so clouding up the matter that one hardly knows what he means. Certainly there is going to be some kind of a conference according to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries this year, to consider the question of representation. I would like to know when these gentlemen get together how they are going to be allowed to vote, how their judgment is to find expression. Are they to be allowed to come to any decisions at all, are there any votes to be taken, or what are they going to do?

According to the Prime Minister, you cannot have that kind of a conference because when he has his conference he will not allow anything of that kind. The Prime Minister will see on deliberation, that what the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), is asking him to do, is to to have a conference before changing the debt allowance of this particular province in order to consult the other provinces on that subject because it is an important one and one on which they have a right to be consulted, and at the same time, he can deal with the question of disposing of the lands if he wants to. The leader of the government says: I am going to give to Manitoba this subsidy and then I will call a conference in regard to another matter. The Minister of Finance when he came to deal with that question pleaded with the leader of the opposition that he should try to be a statesman and not a politician, and my hon. friend set the pace for all the government, in which he was followed by the Minister of the Interior, but he himself was neither a statesman nor a politician, he was a sentimentalist, willing to grant subsidies to pathfinders. That was about the only reason the minister was able to give to the House for this increased debt allowance. Pathfinders should get more money, because they are pathfinders, and a pathfinding province should get more than any other portion of the Dominion. After you have paid off the pathfinders, then we will have a conference to settle that question, after you have disarranged the debt allowance all over Canada and created a disparity and unfairness of treatment of different provinces, we will sit down and talk it over. That seems to be the attitude of the government in this matter.

My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Hughes) put before us the situation of his province. That province has never had any crown lands, it has had no revenue producing assets of any kind, which are common to all the other provinces of the Dominion. Why should not Prince Edward Island get special treatment in connection with this Bill? It may not be a province peopled with pathfinders, but nevertheless its people are entitled to consideration and consideration now. If we are to have any haste about this thing, if the demand of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers) is so imperious and insistent, that he has to be settled with at once, and all of the other provinces have to wait, Prince Edward Island will have to worry along with $1,028,293.41 a year less than Manitoba. The province from which I have the honour to come, which has 30,000 or 40,000 more population and consequently, more institutions to deal with, will receive under this Bill $738,884.91 per annum less than Manitoba.

Mr. BORDEN. How much more does Saskatchewan receive?

Mr. MACDONALD. My right hon. friend does not want to get away from that proposition and I shall deal with it in a moment. I am saying here, that when the hon. member says to the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) that he would not have a conference until some time in the dim and distant future, that when he called a collection of people together he would not allow them to do anything except to look at him. In the meantime, the other provinces in the Dominion are being treated in this ungenerous way.

Take New Brunswick. Every year from the passing of this Bill that province will receive $42,794.43 less than the province of Manitoba, which has practically the same population. Then why should British Columbia stand and wait? Is the Minister of Interior more powerful than Dick McBride? Is that the position to-day that he can come here and say we must have all we are asking for and we must have it immediately without consultation with anybody and every other province can go hang in the meantime while British Columbia, which is a province of pathfinders and should therefore commend itself to the Finance Minister, will have to struggle along with $756,323.99 per year less than Manitoba, and some time we will call you to our councils, look at you and state what we are going to do about this thing? That is the position to-day, they are handing out to Manitoba this generous gift covering three years of alleged arrears over and above all this disparity that exists in regard to these individual provinces.

The Prime Minister a moment ago wanted to make a comparison with Saskatchewan. Let us look at the problem of how this sub-

sidy should be dealt with. Manitoba as a province of the Dominion has existed since 1870, it took part in all the conferences held with regard to provincial subsidies and, in the meantime, accepted without ever a quiver or complaint in 1906 and 1907, the amount of money which the federal government had voted in accordance with the resolution passed at the conference. Every one who was in the House at the time or who has looked at the debate knows that while there was an aggressive Conservative party in this House from Manitoba no one alleged that Manitoba required or demanded any special treatment, and the Secretary of State sat still and said nothing. The Minister of the Interior yesterday tried to make us believe that the particular claim of his province at that time received special recognition at the hands of the conference. There is not a single line in the whole report to be found in the Sessional Papers that warrants that statement. On the contrary the Premier of Ontario and his colleagues went on record in the strongest possible way in declaring that for the future there should be no special grant of subsidies such as this government proposed to make to Manitoba at this time. Is this confederation a partnership of the different provinces of Canada or is it not? That is the proposition that is at the basis of this whole legislation. One would think to hear these gentlemen talk about these matters that the history of Canada is about written and that our future was not a matter to be considered at all. The only way in which such questions as the extension of boundaries can be fairly solved is the way in which the fathers of confederation did it, when they sat in council at Charlottetown and Quebec and considered the relative positions of each province, what the debt allowance should be and what considerations were peculiar to each province and then attempted to settle the matter fairly. That is what they did in 1906-7, and when under the late government the proportionate amounts to be paid to each province were reconsidered they all met here and dealt with the matter. When my hon. friends come to pick out one province which was to enter confederation after 1867, and to deal with it, they did not attempt to defend the proposition except to say that they were dealing with the matter on a basis of federal readjustment. They come along and say, oh this is a province of pathfinders. The same thing was done when the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan were originated, and now they say that for that and no other reasons you must increase the debt allowance, and make these extra grants to the province of Manitoba. When this question of subsidies was before the House of Commons in 1906-7 the financial critic of the opposition who is now the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) told the House how these things should be dealt with. I ventured to ask the Minister of Finance on the first reading of this Bill whether he had looked at this question from that standpoint, and he told us he was not responsible for the individual views of his colleagues. I think my hon. friend the new Minister of Finance could have gone to school to the Minister of Trade and Commerce in regard to these questions.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). My hon. friend asked me what was the debt of Manitoba to-day. There is no assumption by the Dominion of the debt of Manitoba to-day, and therefore it does not enter into the consideration of this question.

Mr. MACDONALD. Unfortunately for my hon. friend, the Minister of Trade and Commerce did, in 1906-7, lay that down as one of the essential things that should be taken into consideration.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I am satisfied that he did not intend it in that sense at all, because it is not relevant unless the Dominion assumes the debt.

Mr. MACDONALD. I invite my hon. friend to turn up 'Hansard' of that year where he will find what the Minister of Trade and Commerce said upon that question. He discussed very fully the resolutions which were then brought before the House by the then Minister of Finance, asking that the resolutions which had been agreed upon by the provinces should be adopted by the House. The present Minister of Trade and Commerce laid down a great many rules which should be followed, and I will take them up. First he said that before the federal government dealt with this question of subsidies they should consider what are the available sources of revenue of a province, they should examine into the expenditure of the province, and find whether it had been wise and prudent, or whether it was one which was likely to lead to a debt so vast that the province would be compelled to come back to the federal parliament and ask for assistance. If their means of revenue were limited, that also should be taken into consideration. Then there was another consideration: Is this to be the last time of asking? he said: Is the proposition to be a final one? There has been no suggestion in regard to that subject in this case, and that is a subject upon which we ought to know something before this Bill goes out of committee. Hon. gentlemen say that this is the last time Manitoba is coming back. Are we making a full settlement of all financial demands, or will Manitoba be coming back next year? These are things which the Minister of Trade and

Commerce said should be considered. Then he asked: Is it a permanent arrangement? Every Finance Minister, he said, should be careful to see whether it was a permanent arrangement or not. There is nothing here to show that this is a permanent arrangement; on the contrary, we are told that this is not a permanent arrangement. In a year or so we are going to give the lands back to the western provinces, and to make a new deal in which the Minister of the Interior will endeavour to walk off with the larger share of the swag. The result will be that this whole subsidy question will be reopened. Is there any check put on the debt creating power of the province? was a pertinent question asked by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Is there any check, or is the door left open so that every provincial Premier who wants to be extravagant can come back and make another raid? All this language in regard to the debt will be found in the speech of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, pages 5314 to 5319 in 'Hansard' of March 25, 1907. All these considerations were suggested by him as being absolutely necessary before you could determine what was fair and right in dealing with any province of the Dominion. Then he declared that having a fixed sum you could never have finality, and where you fixed a definite amount you could never have finality, and no payment should be made, except it was made on the percentage basis, or you could never have a final settlement as to the rate of payment which is to be applied to every province. All these considerations the Minister of Trade and Commerce declared to be essential in 1907; and not one of them has been observed by this government; there is no pretence, they are all thrown to the winds. There is only one defence—Saskatchewan and Alberta got so much in 1905, and therefore we have got to give to Manitoba that amount to-day. Now, on what possible ground can this proposition be justified? What reason can there be for doing that any more than if you were to say to Ontario to-day, which was one of the original partners of confederation, that because her boundaries are being extended to the Hudson bay, you must give her an additional amount. The principal theory upon which the provinces are to be assisted with provincial subsidies is that larger responsibilities are assumed along with the rights accorded to them under the British North America Act. Certain duties were assigned to each provincial legislature to carry out. They were compelled to look after certain services, and we were compelled to look after certain others. The amount of money that was to be expended necessarily by any province depended upon population and like considerations. Now, because, forsooth, you are adding to the territory of the province of Manitoba a certain area, you say to them: We are going to give you this vast sum of money beginning in 1908, though you had no territory and therefore had no responsibility, and therefore nothing to expend any money for. Manitoba never lost a dollar since 1908 by reason of not having this money, because she never had the territory to spend it on. If the reason for granting this increased subsidy is because you are going to increase the territory of Manitoba, then you have no reason for giving these arrearages, because Manitoba was not spending any money. In 1905 you started out the two new provinces, and from that moment their expenditure began. Along with the rights that were accorded to the provinces under the British North America Act, was a duty imposed upon the legislatures of those provinces, and they had to spend their money. Manitoba has been doing this since 1871 in a limited way, but not a single dollar has she spent since 1908 in addition to what she was spending before, for the reason that she had no more territory on which to spend it. The Minister will search the records of his department in vain previous to confederation down to the present time to find any justification for such a proposition. What are they to be compensated for? If they had the lands, then they would have been expending some additional amounts upon them, because responsibility begins with the acquisition of the lands. It is purely a sentimental arrangement in order that the Minister of the Interior may go back to Manitoba and tell them: See what I have got out of the Dominion treasury for you, although I had no right to get it.

Mr. BURNHAM. Are there no damages?

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend (Mr. Burnham) is a lawyer, I understand, and damages in regard to breach of rights in a legal sense can be assessed upon certain principles. If it were possible to convince my hon. friend, I could easily convince him that these theoretical damages of which he speaks were never found within the purview of any legal considerations nor of any political one, either, up to date.

Two million dollars paid to Manitoba because they did not get the boundaries settled three years ago. Why did they not get their boundaries? It was their own fault. They never said they would take the boundaries until last spring when they took the very limits that the late government offered to them, Yet, the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. White), subsidizing the pathfinders, is going to give them $2,000,000 for nothing. What is going to happen, after they do get the

lands, to the 690 white people up there? The Manitoba government has never spent a five cent piece in actual money in looking after these 690 people or the territory in which they live since 1908, or at any time up to date. The Dominion government looked after that territory and had everything to do with it. The Indians were looked after by the Indian Department, and whatever police work was done was done by the mounted police. If Manitoba gets control of that territory the mounted police will go on looking after the territory at the expense of the Dominion of Canada. This additional bonus which they will receive we have not yet heard mentioned. The result is, that leaving out of consideration altogether the amount which is supposed to be their due for damages for a wrong that was never inflicted, this Dominion is giving to Manitoba a still further sum of $747.83 every year for every man, woman and child to be found in the added territory. Is it any wonder that my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley), wants to have a conference of the other provinces of the Dominion? When you get down to the real situation in reference to this matter you will find that the Dominion government hands over to this province $747.83 every year for every man, woman and child as a gift to assist in governing the people who are to be found in the added territory in order that Manitoba may be on an equality with Alberta and Saskatchewan. That is the reason that is given.

My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers), sang a dismal song that the late Premier would not give them what they wanted because they were Conservatives. He was smiling in his cheek when he made that statement in this House. It has become an old story how he and the Premier of the province of Manitoba have been making a football of this question for the last ten years. The Minister of the Interior knows very well that the Manitoba government were preaching that Laurier would not give them a fair deal. They did not want a fair deal. They were sparring for wind and for time, looking for a grievance, and it is on account of this old grievance of theirs that they were feeling so badly, but have succeeded in inducing the new Minister of Finance to give them this $2,000,000 as a present, and a solatium for their wounded feelings. Then my hon. friend was so sorrowful over the fact that this leader of the opposition. when he was Premier, would not give them the swamp lands just when they wanted them. But he said the Canadian Northern could get lands just when they wanted them in Saskatchewan. My hon. friend was worrying tremendously about the Canadian Northern railway. Everybody who knows anything about Manitoba politics knows that my hon. friend and the Canadian Northern have been cheek by jowl for the last ten years, standing and working together whether it was in regard to swamp lands or any other kind of lands. The Minister of the Interior was certainly drawing a long bow when he attempted to persuade this House that the claim of Manitoba in regard to this debt allowance and increased subsidies was approved by the conference. The contrary is the case as has been proved by my hon. friend from St. John. There is no evidence on the records to justify the statement of the Minister of the Interior. On the contrary, I want to reiterate to my hon. friend who was not at the conference at all, that the Premier and the Attorney General of the province who were there signed and supported the resolution which was presented to them under which they accepted the allowance that they have been receiving from that day down to the present time and never made any kind of a kick, never made any kind of objection as to these side claims. Look what Premier McBride did in regard to British Columbia. He presented his claims and advocated them very seriously. He could not get the representatives of the other provinces to agree with him and he said: I will not join you at all upon this question; you may go and see the Prime Minister if you like, but as far as I am concerned, I will leave the conference and do what I can to secure favourable action upon my demand. The colleagues of the Minister of the Interior, Mr. Roblin and Mr. Campbell, quietly and humbly sat down along with the other Premiers, and representatives of the other provinces and never said a word about these claims, except that they had presented them to the Premier. When these gentlemen would not agree with them that it was right that they should get these extra claims, they said: We are not going to go like Premier McBride, and kick over the traces, or do anything; we will take what we can get in the meantime, and as long as you do not agree with McBride we will go with you. They did so; there was no refusal on their part, as there was on the part of Mr. McBride. If the minister's colleagues, Messrs. Roblin and Campbell, had done what McBride had done in 1906, it would have been open to him to argue that they had a grievance that ought to be remedied, but he comes in and proposes to take the money of the various provinces because Laurier would not give them the boundaries. Since 1908 anybody who went to Manitoba would hear nothing discussed in provincial politics, but the declaration of members of the provincial government that this wicked man who had been leading the government of Canada would not

give them fair-play, and would not give them the boundaries. A great many people believed it, who did not know that there was incorporated in the records of this House, a resolution passed in 1908 giving them exactly what they get this year and what they would not take and what no one could possibly induce them to take. These gentlemen did not want to take that until they had the elections over in Manitoba last year. The complaint would have been done away with, if they had accepted these boundaries before the provincial elections were over. These gentlemen wanted a grievance. Mr. Richard McBride asserted, this claim for an extra allowance but, finding that his colleagues from the other provinces would not join with him, he would not have anything to do with them and went out and asserted he was right in this matter. These gentlemen did not do anything of the kind; they took the money went home, and now they have succeeded in inducing the government of this country to give them $2,000,000 for absolutely nothing. You say that this is not a finality that this does not close the books, that you are making a deal about lands and about territory, that you are taking from these people the swamp lands, that you are going to make a new arrangement at some time in the future and that when you make that new arrangement about the lands, you will hold a conference. We come to you and say: Do you think that it is a good time now to hold a conference because you are dealing with financial arrangements on a certain basis, with an old province of the Dominion, that joined with us three years ago, as a member of the conference that then took place, and where we were told what our course was going to be in the future and what we ought to receive—do you think that it is a fair proposition that you should hold a conference now before you adopt this new arrangement with this one province? That is the proposition of my hon. friend from St. John, it is a reasonable one, and I fail to see upon what ground it can be answered.

The circumstances of this case are such that my hon. friends opposite cannot answer their responsibility to the other provinces of the Dominion by saying they are going to level this up by the two prairie provinces. For the reasons I have given I support the resolution of my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley). The Minister of Marine and Fisheries rather suggested that my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) was not as enthusiastic about the matter of representation as he was at one time, but I can tell the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries that that idea is purely a figment of his imagination. The maritime provinces were not aroused on this question of representation until after 1901, and the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) was the first to raise the question. He initiated the legal proceedings which were taken to have the question considered before the Supreme Court and the Privy Council and I had the honour of being associated with him, representing the province of Nova Scotia in that argument No man could have presented a stronger case than the hon. member for St. John did before the Supreme Court of Canada, and I want to say that the decision upon that matter was based upon a strict legal interpretation and not upon the consideration of these constitutional rights which ought to have been taken into consideration in arriving at a decision upon such a question. The Supreme Court of Canada, when it has to deal with a question of constitutional rights such as that of representation, will not look at the historical documents which show the understanding that existed at the time of union, nor at the date which is open to every one and which discloses the intention of the original parties to the compact. The courts never looked at these facts, but decided the question from a technically legal standpoint. However, the right which is claimed now is one which can only be granted as the result of the consent of the various provinces of this Dominion. And, this would be an appropriate time to have this conference, a conference of value, a conference such as the Premier proposes to call with regard to the disposal of the land. Why not have that conference this year? Next year we will have redistribution and if parliament goes on redistributing without an amendment to the Act of the Imperial parliament to warrant their doing justice to the maritime provinces, the time will be too late and the right which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries says we should obtain, we cannot obtain. I come from the province of Nova Scotia, which is discriminated against as a result of this bargain. I come from a province which was one of the first partners of confederation, and has more right to consideration at the hands of this government than has that eldest of the prairie provinces, great as she is. And, I say that every year hereafter until justice is done us, we will be discriminated against, as compared with Manitoba, to the amount of $750,000 a year, I claim that the resolution moved by my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) demands the attention of the government, and I am surprised that the Prime Minister coming, as he does, from my own province, and knowing the conditions there, should absolutely submit himself to the dictation of the Minister of the Interior, who, in

this case has succeeded in getting him to do something which is unfair to the other provinces of the Dominion. If Manitoba is entitled to this concession, then let the other provinces of the Dominion be treated fairly at the same time. For my part I say: let Manitoba have every right to which she is entitled as a member of the confederacy, but do not let Manitoba have that which the government refuses to give to Nova Scotia, to New Brunswick, to Prince Edward Island and to the other provinces of the Dominion.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I understood the Prime Minister to say that as the amendment offered by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) was contentious, it would stand over until a future occasion. I have an amendment to move to section 4, and as no doubt that amendment will be contentious also, I want it to be understood that if this amendment is left over we are not to be precluded from moving further amendments.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the hon. gentleman's amendment?

Mr. GUTHRIE. When the present amendment is disposed of, I intend to move that subsection 2 of section 4 be stricken out, and the following substituted therefor:

The first half yearly payment under this section shall be made on the first day of July, 1912.

Mr. MONDOU. I also give notice that I shall move as an amendment:

That the following clause be inserted in Bill 115 as clause 8, immediately following clause 7.

Nothing in this Act shall in any way prejudice or affect the rights that may actually be enjoyed by the population of that part of the Northwest Territories now added to Manitoba.

Mr. ROGERS. I wish to say a few words by way of enlightenment to the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) who has undertaken to discuss a question that he apparently knows very little about. I am surprised at some of the statements the hon. gentleman has undertaken to make in this House, for I would expect that in undertaking to discuss an important question such as the one before us, he would have informed himself to some extent so as to be in a position to discuss it intelligently. In the first place, the hon. member (Mr. Macdonald) has asked: why did not Manitoba take her lands when they were offered to her three years ago. Well, I want to tell the hon. gentleman that we have never been offered the lands, neither three years ago, nor at any other time during the reign of the late Liberal government. Such a thing was never offered to us; we pleaded for that as representing Manitoba time and again, but we never could get that concession from the Liberal government.

Mr. MACDONALD. What about the resolution of 1908?

Mr. ROGERS. The resolution of 1908 did not promise or offer to the province of Manitoba one single solitary acre of land.

Mr. MACDONALD. You are confusing that with boundaries.

Mr. ROGERS. Then my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald) goes on and undertakes to tell the House that the territory of Keewatin to be added, has never cost the province of Manitoba a solitary dollar. Let me read for his information a few words from a speech delivered by his honoured leader in this House on May 9, 1905. Sir Wilfrid Laurier made the following statement:

No, there is no need for a legislature, because there is no population in Keewatin. Keewatin has been administered for thirty years by the province of Manitoba.

Mr. MACDONALD. Since 1905 who has administered it? The province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. ROGERS. The province of Manitoba was administering the district of Keewatin for thirty years, and an attempt was made by the government which my hon. friend supported in 1905 to take it away from us.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is it or is it not true that although it may have been administered by Manitoba, any expenses connected with the administration of Keewatin were borne by the Federal government?

Mr. ROGERS. Certain expenses were borne by the Dominion government. The Lieutenant Governor of the province of Manitoba received $1,000 a year for thirty years as the governor and administrator of the district of Keewatin, but every justice of the peace and magistrate in the province of Manitoba, who received his pay from that province, was a justice of the peace with full power and authority for the administration of law and order in the district of Keewatin for thirty years.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Did these justices of the peace receive any salary from the Dominion government?

Mr. ROGERS. Justices of the peace, police magistrates, and so on, always received salaries from the province of Manitoba.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Did they receive any extra salary for administering justice with respect to persons charged with crime in the Keewatin territory?

Mr. ROGERS. No doubt, in fixing their salaries, due consideration was given to the amount of work they had to do in ad-

ministering that great territory during that length of time. The hon. member for Pictou says we are apparently in great haste in endeavouring to settle this question, and that we should delay it further in order to have a conference. I do not think the facts will bear out the statement of the hon. member for Pictou that either I or any other member of this government, or the government as a whole, are evincing any great haste in the settlement of this question. It has been a very live issue in the province of Manitoba for ten long years. We have been appealing to the government of our predecessors during all that period, and we have not met with much success.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Has the Manitoba government pressed the federal government to give the lands?

Mr. ROGERS. We pressed the government of our predecessors to give us equality either with the provinces to the east or the provinces to the west. The real grievance of Manitoba rested upon that point. Manitoba claimed that her position was one of inequality with any other province in the Dominion, by reason of the fact that, before the province of Alberta and Saskatchewan were formed, she was the only province that was not in possession of her public domain and her national resources. She complained for many years, and received from this parliament, on various occasions during that period, a readjustment of her claims. When the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan were formed in 1905, the province of Manitoba made a special appeal to the gov ernment of the day to be placed in a posi tion of equality either with the provinces to the west or to the east. The older provinces of Canada had their lands and their mines and their minerals, and the provinces of the west then being created were being placed in a much more favourable position than the province of Manitoba. We were told by the right hon. gentleman who was leading the government at that time that he could not consider at all the question of granting us our lands. Manitoba then undertook to urge its claims on the ground that it was entitled to be placed in a position of equality with the sister provinces to the west. The province of Manitoba presented its claim at the conference, and had it supported by the conference, to be given the same terms and conditions as those given to the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta. The province of Manitoba has not asked this government up to the present time to give them their lands, because they felt that they had established their case at the conference to the satisfaction of every government in this Dominion, and were entitled to the same terms and conditions as the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. Now, the hon. member for St. John says that the Sessional Papers do not establish that Manitoba had made the claims which she did make before that conference. If the hon. gentleman will turn to page 3 in the Sessional Returns, he will find it stated that the return published there consists simply of extracts from what took place at that conference. Therefore the Sessional Papers show on the face of them that it is not a full report of that conference.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will my hon. friend allow me, because there is an issue between us? My hon. friend made the statement that the records show that the conference had approved of these special claims which the province of Manitoba was making. Now I have no recollection of it. I have searched the records, and I can find no trace of such a thing. Would my hon. friend be good enough to point out, where it appears that the conference approved of these things?

Mr. ROGERS. In answer to my hon. friend, let me say that I told the House yesterday that when Manitoba was invited to be present at that conference, its representatives replied they would only attend upon a certain understanding. They came here with that understanding, and when they arrived, Mr. Roblin presented his case to the conference and a sub-committee was appointed to consider that case, not as my hon. friend from Pictou, I think it was told us, that they were appointed to consider the case of the representatives from British Columbia. In order that I may make it clear to the House, I will read the statement appearing in the official record, as made at that time, by the right hon. gentleman who now leads the opposition, so that you will see that the case of Manitoba and of British Columbia were both dealt with in an entirely different form and in an entirely different way. When British Columbia came here the claim that she had in effect was this: That British Columbia would not be satisfied with the terms and conditions for which that conference was specifically called to deal with. That conference, as has been stated by the member for St. John, was called to carry out, or to approve, a resolution as passed by a conference held in the province of Quebec in the year 1902. That conference in 1902 laid down that the time had arrived when this government should give to the different provinces of Canada additional subsidies in regard to legislation and to the cost of government, as well as in regard to the changed conditions by the payment of 80 cents per head. The conference was called

to deal with these two specific points, and these two points alone. Manitoba at first refused to attend in case her position would be misunderstood for these points were the only two to be dealt with in that way. British Columbia refused to take part in that conference and Mr. McBride left the meeting because he could not get an additional increase under those two items. Those two items are to-day entirely satisfactory to the province of Manitoba. However, that was the point which Mr. McBride raised in so far as the province of British Columbia is concerned. Now, here is what Sir Wilfrid Laurier had to say in addressing the joint conference upon that matter:

I have given careful consideration to the memorial of British Columbia's government, and particularly to the request that a commission be appointed for the purpose of inquiring into the financial relations between the Dominion and the province. I have been unable to reach the conclusion that the appointment of such a commission would be the best way of dealing with a question of this kind. I fear that such a course would not lead to the harmonious settlement of the grants to provinces which all should desire to bring about. However, I regard the matter at present more as one for the opinion of the conference than for the judgment of the Dominion government. You have assembled for the purpose of considering the sums which should properly be paid by the Dominion to the provinces in the way of subsidies and allowance for the maintenance of government. The British Columbia proposal comes entirely within the chief purpose of this conference. If this conference, after hearing Mr. McBride's arguments in support of this contention, reach the conclusion that an arbitration should take place, through a commission, for the purpose of dealing with the claim of British Columbia, that would present the matter to the Dominion government in a new light, and while I am not prepared to express any final opinion, I can say at once that such a recommendation from the conference would have great weight with us, and we should feel bound to give it further consideration. While I give you this expression of my own views and of the views of my colleagues who are here with me, I shall, if you will permit me, offer a suggestion. I think there is a disposition on the part of the conference to recognize that the conditions in British Columbia, owing to the vastness of her territory, to its mountainous character, and the sparseness of her population, create exceptional difficulties which should be taken into consideration in the adjustment of the distribution of the grants in aid of provincial governments. I am myself disposed to admit that such is the case, I would strongly advise that Mr. McBride avail himself of the good disposition which is manifested in the conference and at once approach the question of that allowance, in addition to that already contemplated, should be made to meet British Columbia's difficulties. It is a question which after all can better be settled here than anywhere else. I feel assured that the conference will be willing to deal with the matter in a spirit of fairness to British Columbia. I propose therefore that we shall leave you to discuss the question frankly with one another and come to you again when probably you will have reached some satisfactory agreement.

Now that was where British Columbia came in in connection with the other provinces. Manitoba took no exception to the proposal as made by the conference held at Quebec in 1892, and when her representatives attended that conference at that time, they were careful then, as in 1906, to have a note made on the records of that date, that the case of Manitoba should receive special consideration, and at the foot of the report of that conference of 1902 you will find the note:

The following paragraph was added in the case of Manitoba:

It is, however, to be distinctly understood that in asking for this conference on the basis set forth, it shall in no way prejudice Manitoba's claims upon the Dominion in respect to her lands.

and so forth.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is the position which Manitoba has taken all along in respect to this matter, and her representatives attended the conference in 1906 with the distinct understanding that her claims against the Dominion were not to be prejudiced by the fact of their attendance there, and by Manitoba's acceptance of the terms in respect of the government and legislative allowance, as well as the allowance in connection with the 80 cents per head. I read to this House yesterday, and I am not going to detain hon. gentlemen by reading it again to-night, that when that conference took place, a subcommittee was appointed and appointed specifically to give consideration to this matter. On that occasion the hon. member for St. John, because I heard my colleagues talking about it at the time, was very good and very generous in supporting or giving consideration to that particular matter, and when the resolution embodying the arrangement agreed to by that conference—not only by the subcommittee, but by all members of the conference—Mr. Roblin who was presenting the matter moved this resolution, as reported in the Toronto 'Globe,' which published a full report of the official minutes of the meeting taking place at that time:

Moved by Mr. Roblin, seconded by Mr. Peters, that the report of the committee charged with the preparation of the resolutions embodying the views of the conference on the resolutions of 1902 be adopted, and it was unanimously adopted as follows:

Whereas the members of this conference are of the opinion that it is desirable in the interests of the people of Canada and essential to the development of the provinces

that an immediate provision be made for an increase of the subsidies granted by the Dominion to the several provinces and for the award to the provincial governments by Canada of an amount sufficient to meet the costs of the administration of criminal justice not exceeding twenty cents per head of the population; therefore it is unanimously resolved (1) that the subject matter of the resolutions adopted by the conference of the representatives of the several provinces held at Quebec in December, 1902, and which were shortly thereafter presented to the government of the Dominion and which were ratified by the legislature of the then existing provinces, except that of British Columbia, be now pressed upon the government of the Dominion for immediate and favourable action, under reserve of the right of any province to now submit—

Mr. PUGSLEY. To now submit.

Mr. ROGERS:

To now submit to such government, memoranda in writing concerning any claims it may have to larger sums than those set out in the said resolutions, or to additional consideration for recognition.

Mr. PUGSLEY. For recognition.

Mr. ROGERS. I want to tell my hon. friend from St. John, that Manitoba placed her claim in the hands of the Dominion government then and there, in writing. I want to tell him furthermore, that no other province in this Dominion from that day to this, as far as I know, has placed any claim in the hands of the government in writing in respect to the said matter.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The records show that immediately following the adoption of that resolution, British Columbia submitted her claim, and it was dealt with by the conference, including the representatives from Manitoba, and it was rejected, the conference passing a unanimous resolution which the representatives of Manitoba also assented to, declaring against arbitration but recommending that British Columbia receive a reasonable additional allowance for civil government of $100,000 a year for ten years.

Mr. ROGERS. My hon. friend does not appear to have understood what I mentioned a minute ago, that British Columbia's claim was a special one which simply dealt with the two specific items which the conference was called to consider—that of the subsidies for government and legislation, and the matter of 80 cents per head, as stated by the then Premier himself, whose remarks I quoted a few minutes ago. Outside of that no other province made any claim under the reservation as provided by these resolutions that they should make appeal to the government for additional consideration under the reserve so stated. Manitoba has been the only province that came under that particular clause from that day to this.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Have we heard now from my hon. friend all that he relies on as showing that the conference approved of the special claims of Manitoba or is there anything else that will tend to prove it?

Mr. ROGERS. I think I have told the hon. gentleman all that is necessary to inform him to-night. If to-morrow he wants more information I will, if possible, supply him with it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is not a word to show that the conference approved of it.

Mr. ROGERS. I told my hon. friend that our claim was presented at that conference and it was only after the conference gave it full and fair consideration that they were willing and did vote unanimously in order that this reservation should be placed in the resolution.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That does not approve of it.

Mr. ROGERS. That is a statement that should be plain enough in respect to the matter and should satisfy the hon. gentleman if he wants to be satisfied in regard to the position. My hon. friend has moved an amendment to the effect that we should submit this matter to a further conference. This course is adopted in pursuance of the same policy which has been pursued by the hon. gentlemen opposite for the past fourteen years. They have attempted to find one cause after another to stir up one province against another, in order that Manitoba might be prevented from occupying a position of equality with the other provinces of Canada.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Was the minister or any other member of the government of Manitoba aware of the terms of the address passed by the parliament of Canada in 1907 asking for certain imperial legislation to ratify the new provincial subsidies in which the terms were used that this settlement was to be final and conclusive? Did anybody oppose this legislation in the Imperial parliament on behalf of the government of Manitoba as it was opposed on behalf of British Columbia?

Mr. ROGERS. If my hon. friend will read the Act I think he will find it is there under subsection 7. That clause was put in order to cover the very resolution which I have been reading to this House which was passed unanimously at the request of Manitoba, and in order that Manitoba's claims should be protected and it is incorporated in the Act to which my hon. friend refers.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). That clearly refers to British Columbia.

Mr. ROGERS. So I think that Manitoba is not neglecting any part of her task in order that she may make clear her position so that she may receive justice at the hands of this House. We felt in 1905 that the Liberal government at Ottawa were putting every obstacle in our way they could, and so strongly did we feel that, that we made strong statements to the people of that province at that time in regard to the treatment we were receiving. I want to tell my hon. friend from Pictou that we were not willing or desirous to treat this matter from a political point of view, because when Manitoba came here to ask fair treatment in 1905, the first statement we made to the Premier was that a fair and just settlement of this question carried no political advantage to either party. That statement was published in the press of this country by an interview given by myself which the right hon. the leader of the opposition did me the honour to quote in parliament. We felt strongly and spoke strongly because we recognized then as to-day that the Liberal party were disposed, if they possibly could, in one form or other, to handicap and penalize the little province of Manitoba because that province would not send a Liberal majority to support them in the parliament of Canada or elsewhere. In the legislature on February 23, 1906, I said:

> Thank heaven, Mr. Speaker, the day is not far off when no public man in Canada, either through his own organ or by his actions, can continue to regard the good citizens of our little province simply as bastard members in the confederation of our great Dominion. We ask for no favours. We look for none. We expect none. We want none. We have pleaded for simple justice and fair play. This for the present has been denied us. We may have to wait a while but not long. It is true we may have to wait to see the present administration at Ottawa politically dead and politically damned. When that day arrives and a Conservative administration rises in their place, we can then depend as citizens of the province upon securing equal liberty, equal rights, and equal fair play in common with all other good citizens in all other provinces that now form the confederation of our Dominion of Canada.

That represented then, as I believe it represents to-day, the feeling that existed in Manitoba in regard to the fair treatment which we received at the hands of the Liberal government. My hon. friend from Pictou went on to deal with the finances of the different provinces, as did my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley), and they undertook to tell this House that Manitoba is getting too much, and should not receive an arrearage back to the year 1908. I would like to point out to my hon. friend, and I do not do this with any desire of making comparisons with our sister provinces, Alberta and Saskatchewan, to their detriment, the amount which the province of Manitoba has been contributing to the treasury of this Dominion during the last three years. The figures for the three provinces for the years 1909-10 and 1911 were as follows:

Manitoba paid..	$19,161,934 85
" received..	3,553,341 44
Paid more than received..	15,608,593 41
Alberta paid..	$5,243,808 70
" received	4,474,879 60
Paid more than received..	768,929 10
Saskatchewan received..	4,593,695 85
Paid by Saskatchewan	2,999,645 61
Received more than paid ..	$1,594,050 24

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would the amounts paid into the treasury be customs duties?

Mr. ROGERS. Customs and excise.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is not the great city of Winnipeg the wholesale distributing point of the whole of the west?

Mr. ROGERS. Toronto is too.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would it be fair to take the figures of the great city of Montreal and attribute them to the province of Quebec?

Mr. ROGERS. Now, I ask you if Manitoba, from that point of view if from no other, has not a good case to present to this House to have her position rectified, and to be placed on a footing of equality with the other provinces. That is all Manitoba has ever asked, that is all they are asking by this Bill. The hon. gentleman says that we should have a conference to consider the question of representation in the maritime provinces.

Mr. NESBITT. Those figures that the hon. gentleman has presented of money paid into the various provinces, are they based on the customs?

Mr. ROGERS. Based on customs and excise. I want to say that I sympathize with the hon. member for St. John and the other members from the maritime provinces in the claim they make in regard to representation. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has dealt fully with the conference that was held here in 1910. I had the pleasure of attending that conference, and the question which the hon. gentleman refers to was given careful consideration. The great majority of the members of that conference considered that it would be in the interest of this Dominion if most careful consideration were given to the representa-

tions then made. I think that one or two gentlemen present at that conference were not disposed to give sympathetic consideration to the proposals made by the maritime provinces. However, my feelings in regard to the matter have not changed, and I am sure that I represent the feelings of the people of western Canada. I am satisfied they are willing at all times to join any conference, and to give the most liberal interpretation to any propositions that may be made by representatives from the maritime provinces with a view to secure a remedy for the grievance of which they complain. I presume another conference will be held before very long, and when this question comes up, I am satisfied that the representatives from western Canada will be prepared to give a sympathetic and generous support to the claims of the maritime provinces. With regard to the amendment of the hon. member for St. John, I think the object is to delay as long as possible a settlement of this vexed question relating to the province of Manitoba. But I can assure him that no matter how many amendments he may move, we will be able to carry through this House the Bill which is now before us, and in so doing we will be rectifying an injustice from which Manitoba has been suffering for a long period.

Mr. PUGSLEY. By this amendment I trust the committee will realize that we do not ask for any delay that would be prejudicial to Manitoba. The first payment of the subsidy could only be made next July. Now, in the amendment we name the exact figures suggested by the Minister of Finance. All that we propose to attain by this amendment is that the Governor in Council shall have authority to pay to the province of Manitoba an amount not exceeding the figures which are named here. But before doing that a conference of the Premiers of the different provinces should be called to consider this matter, and also to consider what it would be equitable and just to allow in respect of the debt account to the other provinces of Canada by reason of this increase in the debt allowance to Manitoba. There need be no delay. We do not limit the Governor in Council at all, all we ask is that before deciding this matter, before disturbing the financial position of Manitoba, which necessarily does an injustice to the other provinces until they are likewise considered, we ask that a conference of the Premiers of the provinces should take place with the Federal government, to consider this matter very fully. Now, the Minister of the Interior gave me several surprises. I am surprised that he does not consent to the reasonable and fair proposition I have made. It looks as if he wished to rush this thing through and disturb the financial relations between the different provinces. He thinks if he gets this Bill once on the statute-book, then, when the conference takes place, he will be just that much ahead in the game. I think this is a pretty tough business on the other provinces of Canada, and I hope my hon. friend will not persist in a course so unreasonable and so unfair as he now threatens to take.

Mr. MONK. I will make a proposition to the committee. I understand that the clause under consideration is not to be disposed of this evening, as it is a contentious clause, nor will the amendment be disposed of this evening. I propose that the committee go through the other clauses of the Bill to which there is no objection, and then we will rise. In that way we will make some progress at this sitting.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There will be some discussion upon the clause relating to swamp lands, but as to the unimportant clauses it would not take five minutes to put them through. But we shall run against a snag almost immediately when we strike the swamp lands. There are a good many on this side of the House who think that is the most indefensible thing in the world, to take away from this province these swamp lands and then hold out the idea that in a year or two we are going to give them all back again.

Mr. MONK. I have no idea of arguing the objection that my hon. friend takes, I was merely endeavouring to ascertain, in order that we should make some progress, what clauses are objectionable. These we can reserve, pass the others, report progress, and rise if we are not going to dispose of the Bill finally this evening.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If we disposed of the contentious clauses the non-contentious clauses would not take five minutes, so that there would be nothing gained.

Mr. ROGERS. Let us take five minutes to the non-contentious clauses.

Mr. PUGSLEY. From the costume of many hon. members I conclude that there must be some pleasant function going on here and, therefore, I think we had better rise.

Mr. MONK. If we are going to make no progress I think it would be better to rise, I would move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 7, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

TIMBER SLIDE—CHATS FALLS.

*Mr. SHARPE (North Ontario):

1. On what date was the deed of the timber slide on Chats Falls given to D. O'Connor by the late government?
2. What was the purchase price?
3. Has the present government received any representations from the city of Ottawa or the Hydro-Electric Commission, urging the cancellation of the said deed?
4. Has the government decided to cancel the deed or taken any steps to cancel it?

Mr. MONK:

1. 2nd October, 1911.
2. $1,471.
3. Yes.
4. The question is under consideration.

DISMISSALS.

Mr. FORTIER:

1. Have Captain Léon Laroche, commanding officer of one of the boats doing quarantine service at Grosse Isle, P.Q., and Désiré Laroche employed at the same quarantine station as policeman, been dismissed? If so, for what reason?
2. Who brought complaints against them?
3. Will the department or the Minister of Agriculture grant them an inquiry?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. The engagement of Captain Leon Laroche at the Grosse Isle Quarantine Station terminates on the 14th of April, 1912.
The engagement of Désiré Laroche at the Grosse Isle Quarantine Station terminated on the 30th November, 1911.
It is not proposed to engage either for the coming season.
2 and 3, answered by No. 1.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Has Joseph Clouthier of St. Adolphe de Dudswell been dismissed as postmaster?
2. If so, who requested his dismissal?
3. Has an inquiry been made?
4. What is the name of the inquiring commissioner?
5. If an inquiry has been held, was it in French?
6. Has the department or the minister received petitions asking for the continuance of Mr. Clouthier as postmaster?
7. If so, how many signed the said petition or petitions?
8. Have any been received asking for his dismissal?
9. If so, by how many and where were they from?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.
2. It was requested on the recommendation of Mr. John Hayes.
3. Yes.
4. Dr. W. L. Shurtleff, K. C.
5. The report shows that some of the witnesses spoke in French and others in English.
6. Yes.
7. 107 persons.
8. Yes.
9. Thirty persons, residents of St. Adolphe de Dudswell.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Has Mr. Joseph Lapointe been appointed overseer of the wharf works on Lake Aylmer at Garthby?
2. If so, who recommended him for this position?
3. How long has he held the said position?
4. Who replaced him for the completion of the works on the wharf at Garthby?
5. By whom was he recommended?
6. Has he the necessary qualifications?
7. Who asked for the dismissal of Mr. Joseph Lapointe, the former overseer?

Mr. MONK:

1. Yes.
2. Mr. Tobin, M. P.
3. From 8th to 27th September, 1911, when work was ordered to be suspended.
4. Mr. Telesphore Pichette.
5. Dr. Hayes.
6. General instructions are issued to all engineers that the services of an inspector are not to be retained unless he is qualified.
7. Answered by question No. 3.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT WEEDON, QUEBEC.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Is it the intention of the Minister of Public Works to proceed at once with the construction of a public building at Weedon, Quebec?
2. Are the plans ready for said building?
3. Have tenders been called for?
4. Has a site been secured, as recommended by the Municipal Council of Weedon?

Mr. MONK:

1. The subject is receiving earnest consideration.
2. No.
3. No.
4. No.

PELAGIC SEALING.

Rt. Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister). I would like to say to my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who asked a question yesterday about the

treaty in reference to pelagic sealing, that I have this further information which I think it is only right that my right hon. friend should have. The Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs informs me that the ratifications in the matter of the pelagic sealing treaty of the 7th July, 1911, were deposited in the United States Department of State on the 12th December, 1911. This procedure is equivalent to an exchange of ratifications. It was thought more convenient for the four powers to deposit their ratifications in the Department of State rather than go through the somewhat complicated procedure of exchanging ratifications with each other.

BIOLOGICAL BOARD OF CANADA.

Bill (No. 118) to create the Biological Board of Canada—Mr. Hazen—read the second time and the House went into committee thereon.

On section 3,

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Will the members of this board receive any compensation ?

Mr. HAZEN. Section 8 of the Bill provides that no member of the board shall receive emolument for his services beyond actual and reasonable travelling expenses in connection with the work of the board.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Is it the intention to appoint special officers of the department, in addition to the representatives of the universities ?

Mr. HAZEN. The minister will appoint two members of the board. Prof. Prince has been a member of the board in the past and it is likely he will be again appointed. The universities mentioned in the Bill: Dalhousie, Laval, McGill, New Brunswick, Queen's and Toronto, carry on biological work. There is provision made in the Bill that when any other university engages in the work of biological research a representative from it may be added to the board.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Will the two members of the board appointed by the minister, devote all their time to this biological work ?

Mr. HAZEN. By no means; there is no necessity for that. The work of Prof. Prince in the department is in line with the biological work he will do in connection with this board. The other member of the board appointed by the minister will be an official of the department whose business it is to make a study of fishery conditions.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I do not wish to make any definite criticism of the constitution of the board, but in my judgment the minister would obtain better results if some members of the board devoted their whole time to this biological work. Prof. Prince has not been able to devote his whole time to this work in the past, and I have always considered it a mistake that he should have been assigned to work other than that for which he was originally appointed into the service. There is great field for biological work in connection with our fisheries, and Prof. Prince might with advantage to the country, devote his time exclusively to that work. I do not, of course, object to representatives of the universities being appointed, but still they can only be an auxiliary force and can hardly be considered practical working members of this board. I trust the minister will see that in future Prof. Prince shall devote his entire time to this particular work, and probably it would be well to associate one or two permanent officers with him.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The minister must not forget the practical side of the work of this board, and I may say that up to this date the board has not done very much practical work for our fisheries. Recently, Professor Prince gave evidence before the Fisheries Committee and he explained that owing to the fact that the gentlemen who composed the board were not salaried, the department was not in a position to give them instructions to do any special work, which I regard as a very important feature of this whole matter. There are many practical questions which arise in connection with the fisheries, and which a board of this kind ought to be able to solve. The scientific side of the question is all right and I have no criticism to offer on the work which the university professors are doing, but most of it is I suppose in connection with their professional duties in their colleges, which of course it is right the department should aid them in. There are a great many questions in dispute among practical fishermen which this board could do a good deal to throw light upon. A few days ago the question of steam trawling was under discussion in the House, and the minister appeared to think that it was not destructive to our fisheries, while I, like many others who live on the sea-coast, take an entirely different view. If we were able to refer such a question to the board and have them make actual investigation as is done in Great Britain where they employ vessels of their own in that service, it would be of great benefit to our fisheries. Then, as to the propagation of lobsters; the Fisheries Department has placed a great many millions of young lobsters in the sea year after year, and there is a variety of opinion amongst fishermen as to whether they ever mature. I do not think it would be very difficult for scientists to discover exactly what pro-

gress these lobsters make after they are put in the water. I urge on the minister the necessity of appointing a first-class practical man on this board who will get a salary and devote his whole time to the work.

Mr. HAZEN. As to the desirability of some members of this commission giving their entire time to the duties devolving upon them, I may point out that there are biological stations in different parts of Canada where during the season observations are taken from day to day in regard to matters that are of interest to this biological board.

Observers are placed at these stations for the purpose of making accurate records of the observations so taken. The results of those observations are furnished to the members of this board, and from these, and such observations as they may make themselves, conclusions are arrived at which may be valuable. These observations are, of course, made under the direction of this board, which at the present time is vested with greater powers of management than it had before. While the officials appointed under the board are to be paid, the board itself acts in an advisory capacity, and is charged with the management of these stations and the carrying on of this work. If the results of the work carried on by the Biological Board are found to be beneficial, it will have to be carried on upon a permanent scale; and, if so, it will become more expensive, and a larger sum of money will be required to carry it on than the modest sum voted by parliament in the past. The work will probably be one of growth and development. I think the suggestions made by my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), who takes a very active and intelligent interest in all fishery matters, are well worthy of consideration. I shall have great pleasure in directing the attention of the Biological Board to the suggestion of my hon. friend that more practical work should be done under its direction. There are in the department to-day officials whose duty it is to consider these fishery questions from a practical standpoint. My experience has been that it is difficult to get fishery experts to agree, and it is very seldom that they agree on technical questions. I suppose there is room for a divergence of opinion, because after the fish leaves the shores and gets into deep water, very little is known of its habits. My hon. friend, in referring to steam trawling, rather inferred that I considered that it was not destructive. If my remarks conveyed that impression, it is contrary to what I intended them to convey. I think that steam trawling is undoubtedly destructive in its effects, from the fact that many more fish are destroyed by that method than by other methods. My hon. friend also referred to the work done by the lobster hatcheries, and raised the question whether the conditions under which the lobsters were being hatched and cared for while very young are such as will enable them to live and increase the lobster industry of the country. I know that there is a great difference of opinion on this subject. There are some who believe that the young lobsters are not sufficiently protected under the present system, and that another system should be adopted. Others take the opposite view. This is a subject which we are trying to work out with the view of arriving at the correct solution. I will take up the suggestion of my hon. friend with the chairman of the Biological Board, and see if it will not be possible, besides giving attention to the scientific aspect of the question, to give attention also to the practical side.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Unless there are certain officers in the department who can devote their entire time to biological work, there is very little use in creating a biological board. This work has been very much neglected in the past. But I rise for the purpose of suggesting to the hon. minister that instead of a biological board there should be a fisheries board, consisting of officers of his own department and certain other persons living in the different provinces and interested in fisheries. I fear that such of his officers as are supposed to devote their time to the fisheries are so fully occupied with matters of a general character that they can hardly be expected to do good work along special lines. I think it would be a very good departure if the department were to organize a fisheries board, with the biological board as a branch of that board, the two working together. I know that the suggestion has frequently been made, in the province of Nova Scotia at least, and probably it has been conevyed to the minister since he came into office. I have often heard the suggestion made myself, and I have always looked on it with considerable favour. I think the departmental officers would receive a great deal of assistance by working together with appointees from the various provinces interested, and I would like the minister to take this into consideration berore the next session of parliament.

Mr. HAZEN. The suggestion which my hon. friend makes is, in my judgment, well worthy of serious consideration. I do not think the suggestion is a new one. I think it has been made in this House before, when the estimates of the Fisheries Department have been under consideration. Fisheries boards, I understand, exist in

other countries. There is one, I believe, in England, and one in Scotland, and these boards have been instrumental in doing a great deal for the conservation of the fishery interests in those countries. There is force in what my hon. friend says about the fisheries officials of the department having their time taken up with general matters and not being able to give as much time as should be given to problems of importance in connection with the fishing wealth of Canada.

I have found in the Marine Department that the Lighthouse Board is a most useful body, and one which not only relieves the minister of responsibility—perhaps I should not put that forward as a reason, because the minister is bound to take the responsibility—but which furnishes advice concerning the aids to navigation, the lighthouses, and the protection of our coasts, that is of very great value, and which it would be difficult to deal with in any other way. I may say—and I am saying it without a thorough study of the subject—that it certainly seemed to me that a board constituted along the same lines for the purpose of advising on questions affecting the fisheries, fisheries protection, the fishery patrol service, close seasons and open seasons, and the implements and means employed in the catching of fish, might be of very great use and assistance to the minister in charge of the department and to the country as well. I have been giving some thought to the matter—I cannot say that I have arrived at a conclusion, I have not the knowledge at present sufficient to enable me to do so—but it is my intention to give very careful consideration to the matter between this session and the next session of parliament.

Section agreed to.

On section 8—salaries to members,

Mr. SINCLAIR. Is it not intended that there shall be two paid members of this board?

Mr. HAZEN. No, not paid as members of the board. There will be two members who receive salaries as officials of the Fisheries Department, but they will not be paid any extra salary for their services as members of this board.

Bill reported, read a third time, and passed.

YUKON JUDGES.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to authorize the payment to each of two judges of the Territorial Court of the Yukon Territory of an annuity equal to the salary of the office now held by him; such annuity to commence upon the resignation of such judge.

Mr. HAZEN.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice). The purpose of the Bill which is to be based on this resolution, is to remedy a condition of affairs now existing in the Yukon, under which the country is called upon to pay salaries to judges for services which have become unnecessary. The present territorial court consists of three judges. At the time it was constituted, and those judges were named, there was ample work for them to do. But by reason of the changed conditions in that country, the position now is that there is in reality not more than enough work for one judge. But notwithstanding that fact, under their appointment, the three judges are entitled to draw their salaries and also their living allowances. The salaries of the judges are $5,000 each per annum. They are further entitled to a living allowance of $5,000, making a total payment to each of them of $10,000 a year. Two of these gentlemen are willing to resign their positions provided they be allowed a pension an annuity, equal to the amount of their salary, not including living allowance.

The effect of this is that the country is saved $10,000 a year and it is for the purpose of effecting that saving that the Bill to be based upon these resolutions will be proposed. The Bill provides that payments to two of the three judges of the Yukon Territorial Court may be continued equal to their present salaries, this annuity to begin upon their retirement and to continue thereafter. The Bill further provides that, in the event of the present condition changing and need arising for the services of either or both of these judges, they may be re-appointed, but should they, on being reappointed, decline to accept the reappointment, and to return to the Yukon and perform their duties, then this pension shall cease. There are other provisions in the Bill made necessary by this reduction of the number of judges from three to one, including the provision that appeals from the Territorial Court shall be to the Court of Appeal for British Columbia. And though it is not now contained in the Bill, the intention is to propose by amendment a provision for the appointment of a deputy-judge in case of illness, absence, or other unforeseen cause, preventing the one judge from performing his duties.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The provisions of the Bill, as explained by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), seem to be absolutely reasonable. The only question to be discussed is whether there is justification for the withdrawing of two judges from the bench. From the information I have, I think there is cause for that; but it would have been satisfactory to the House—and perhaps it can be done before my hon. friend goes on with the second reading of the Bill—to have statis-

tics comparing the condition of business at the time of the appointment of these judges with that at the present time. Representations were made to the late government in the direction now proposed, and we had the matter under consideration, at the time we went out of office, but had not reached a conclusion. The provision that the judges may be called back to resume their duties, should the conditions again arise which prevailed at the time of their employment, seems perfectly reasonable and commendable. Would the Minister of Justice give the names of the two judges who are to be retired?

Mr. DOHERTY. Mr. Justice Dugas and Mr. Justice Craig. Mr. Justice Macaulay will remain. As to information showing the necessity, or at least the desirability, of withdrawing these judges, I shall be in a position to give that in detail before I ask the House to pass the Bill. In the meantime, I may say that all the judges of the Territorial Court concur in the view embodied in this measure. Furthermore, I have certificates from the clerk of the court that there is in reality not sufficient work for one judge.

Mr. LEMIEUX. To take the concrete case, what was the salary of Mr. Justice Dugas as judge?

Mr. DOHERTY. His salary was $5,000 with an additional living allowance of $5,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. And now he will retire with a pension of——?

Mr. DOHERTY. Five thousand. We save the living allowance.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Has not the population decreased considerably in Dawson?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, very much. I may say that there are three judges in the territory and only four lawyers. That proportion, of itself, I think, will show that there is not the need for three judges.

Mr. TURRIFF. Why should not these judges be asked to take up work in some other part of the Dominion? Why make a discrimination in favour of judges as compared with other officials? If you find you have officials in the Yukon or anywhere else, and have not work for them to do there, you do not superannuate them on full salary—you bring them to some other part of the Dominion where there is work for them to do. Why not give these judges appointments in Ontario, Quebec, British Columbia, or some other place in which judges have to be appointed? It seems to me the proposal is a piece of extravagance not justified in any way by the conditions of the case. These judges have not been a very long time on the bench and have not earned that pension by their term of service. It would seem to an ordinary layman, applying common sense to the case, that if there is not work in the Yukon and if the salaries of these judges are to be continued, then the judges ought to be given work elsewhere, and so save the appointment of two new judges. This is another such example of extravagance as we had a little while ago. I see by a question asked on the 5th of February that the deputy Minister of Justice has just been paid a sum of nearly $10,000—to be exact, $9,809.24—for work done for the government, this being over and above his salary of $7,000 and his expenses.

Mr. SHARPE (North Ontario). Your party paid that money.

Mr. TURRIFF. I will attend to that in a minute. And in addition to this, the Deputy Minister of Justice is allowed to plead cases before the Privy Council by which he can earn large fees. My hon. friends on the other side say that our party paid that money. I beg to say that our party did nothing of the kind. That matter came before the late government time and again, recommended, I acknowledge, by the then Minister of Justice, and by several others ministers of justice of that government, but in no case was the recommendation agreed to by the government—it was turned down in every case. It remained to this government to pay over this large sum for work done for the government by this official who was already drawing a salary of $7,000 a year, and who was allowed to plead cases before the Privy Council and so earn large fees besides. I see that in the answer to the question, the Minister of Justice said that this claim had been recommended by his predecessor, Sir Allen Aylesworth. But he did not mention the fact that the government had refused to pay this account, and that the order in council for the payment was passed only after this government came into power. This case that we have now before us is another examples of the same thing. Two judges for whom there is no work where they happen to be located, are retired on full salary instead of being transferred to some place where their work is required.

Mr. DOHERTY. The hon. member (Mr. Turriff) perhaps does not quite understand the matter. These two judges were appointed to the position they occupy, and appointed to those positions for life. So that this government has no power to order them to go to work somewhere else, and if they chose to say: We do not desire to retire, they might stay on in the Yukon and draw their pay and their living allowance. They are perfectly within their right, they have been appointed to this

particular position for life, and unless they choose to retire, the government has no power, under the law, to retire them.

Mr. TURRIFF. When they do retire could not my hon. friend appoint them to the present vacancies in Ontario?

Mr. DOHERTY. In the first place I am not aware whether these gentlemen are members of the bar of that province as they would have to be for appointment to the bench of that province. Furthermore we might appoint them, but we could not make them accept the appointment.

With regard to the other extravagance that has been laid at the door of the administration in paying to the Deputy Minister of Justice a bill which he presented for services rendered previous to 1910, I might say that that account was rendered under the administration of the late government and was for services rendered under an express agreement with succeeding Ministers of Justice in that administration and certified to by them. They further certified that in obtaining those services from the Deputy Minister of Justice at the rate at which he was paid the government had effected large savings as compared with the cost of retaining the services of outside counsel. I investigated the account and it appeared to me that the certificates of Sir Allen Aylesworth, Sir Charles Fitzpatrick and the Hon. David Mills were fully justified. Had I been asked for a petition of right on such an account I would not have hesitated to grant it. The country had contracted a debt and we had to pay it. Of course all of this is entirely apart from the question whether it is or is not desirable that a gentleman occupying the position of deputy minister should perform services for which he would receive payment apart from his salary. All of these services were rendered before the passing of the Act of 1910 which absolutely prohibited any civil servant receiving payment in any form for services rendered to the government outside of his salary and unless I assumed that my last two or three predecessors in office had absolutely misstated the facts in reference to these services their payment became a debt of this country.

Mr. NESBITT. In case of the appointment of a deputy judge would the minister use the services of one of these superannuated judges?

Mr. DOHERTY. If one of them remained in the Yukon and chose to accept the position of deputy judge that might be done, but without the living allowance I doubt if they would remain in the Yukon.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. With regard to the payment to Mr. Newcombe, my recollection is that my hon. friend is somewhat in error as to his facts. It is quite true that Sir Oliver Mowat, the first Minister of Justice under the late administration, certified an account to be paid to Mr. Newcombe, but that was an account for services which had been rendered under the previous administration, and of course the following Ministers of Justice certified to accounts for services rendered since we came into office, but the basis of the claim of Mr. Newcombe was an alleged agreement that when he took office under the previous administration he had stipulated that he would be allowed to practice and to perform such services as he did afterwards. I do not wish to put in controversy the work done by Mr. Newcombe who is a very good lawyer, an efficient Deputy Minister and a gentleman whose word must be taken, but it was, to say the least of it, an extraordinary piece of business that an agreement of that kind should be made by the minister of the day without there being any record of it. Moreover, I do not think that such an agreement could have been binding or legal and as to this I would appeal to the judgment of Mr. Newcombe himself. I would have preferred that my hon. friend had done as we did and left Mr. Newcombe to his recourse in law, an appeal to the Exchequer Court.

My hon. friend has chosen to do what the late government would not do. I think there was no cause whatever to make such a payment to Mr. Newcombe. The reason why we did not accept this agreement was the reason which was afterwards embodied in the statute, that no member of the civil service should receive any remuneration beyond his salary. If that was not the law in 1892, or 1893, when Mr. Newcombe was appointed, it was the spirit of the law, and, for these reasons, I think my hon. friend would be better advised if he left Mr. Newcombe to his recourse in the Court of Exchequer.

Mr. DOHERTY. I am not in a position to say whether the agreement went back to the administration that preceded that of my right hon. friend, but this I am in a position to say, that the succeeding Ministers of Justice, under the administration of my right hon. friend, carried on that system with full knowledge that that was the system under which the work was being done, and that, as I said before, if not all of them, certainly several of them, certified it to be a desirable arrangement and one under which the country was saving money. As to what the law was before the introduction of the statute, I suppose it is permitted to lawyers to differ, but I, myself, would have no doubt that, under the circumstances, Mr. Newcombe had a claim against the government and in support of that, it might be pointed out that, upon a question precisely of the taxation

of costs in a case of this kind, the Supreme Court decided that there was a claim for a fee on the part of counsel, notwithstanding the fact that the work was done by a gentleman receiving a salary. I had the judgment before me, when the matter was dealt with, but I am not prepared to give all the details at the present moment.

Mr. PROULX. As there are two new high court judges to be appointed for Ontario, I would suggest to the Minister of Justice to appoint Mr. Justice Craig to the high court. I am sure he would accept that, because there is a difference of $3,000 in his salary which he would get. He was a good lawyer in Ontario before he was appointed to the bench in the Yukon and even if his qualifications were not sufficient for the high court bench, the minister could appoint him to the county court bench.

Mr. DOHERTY. I shall be pleased to give my very best consideration to the suggestion which my hon. friend has made.

Mr. TURRIFF. The Minister of Justice points out that these judges are appointed for life. I understand that the living allowance of $5,000 that they have been receiving in the past, is not a life matter. That was granted at the time because living in the Yukon was very expensive. I am quite satisfied that if my hon. friend wants these gentlemen, who are capable men and who are still young men, to take hold of other work, all he has to do is to drop off the living allowance and they will be pleased, I am sure, to take up work in other parts of the Dominion. With reference to the defence that the Minister of Justice makes for paying these large sums to the deputy Minister of Justice, surely it must have appeared to him that, if this account had been hanging fire for so many years, although it had been recommended by three or four Ministers of Justice, there must have been some good reason why it was not paid. What does the deputy minister get his salary for, if it is not to do the work of the department? It seems a very strange proceeding. Why should one deputy minister, who is paid an extra salary anyway, be allowed to charge for work done for his own department? Would you allow any other deputy minister to charge for the work that he does in his department, outside of his own salary? The Minister of Justice must have known that the late government had refused to pay that account. He must have known that there was some good ground for not paying that account. Here we have an official getting $7,000 a year and all his expenses when he travels over to the old country in connection with the work of the department and it is a remarkable thing that he should be allowed to draw big fees and in addition be paid his expenses while he is over there pleading cases for private parties. It seems to me to be a very strange thing that just as soon as this government come in they pay this amount that the late government refused to pay. However, the Minister of Justice must take the responsibility for that payment, but it will be pretty difficult to justify it to a great many people in the country, who do not earn anything like $7,000 a year, to whom $7,000 a year and all expenses seems a pretty good salary, equal to the salary of the Minister of Justice and of all his colleagues except the Prime Minister of Canada. In addition, Mr. Newcome is allowed to work for private individuals, to do a private practice and on top of that the government pays an account that the late government refused to pay.

Mr. THOMPSON (Yukon). Just before the resolution is adopted, I would like to offer an explanation as to the cause which gave rise to the necessity for this measure. When the Yukon was first settled in 1896, after the discovery of the Klondike, there were no laws governing placer mining in that country. Placer mining as an industry did not obtain to any considerable extent in Canada up to that time. There were some placer mines, but they were in provinces which had laws previous to the time that these provinces had entered confederation, such as British Columbia. That necessitated the making of laws governing the placer mining industry in the Yukon Territory, and for several years after the discovery of gold in 1896 the industry was governed altogether, not by laws, but by orders in council. There was a very great inrush of people to the goldfields, a great many claims were staked, boundaries overlapped and as a result a very great deal of litigation arose. The courts, in the first few years of the existence of the territory as a territory, were overworked. Subsequently all these regulations were gathered together, assorted and passed upon by the people of the territory, finally brought to parliament and passed through parliaparliament as the Yukon Placer Act, thus placing the chief industry of the Yukon on a more solid, permanent and better basis. As a result of that Act a great deal of the cause of the litigation of earlier years was removed. The consequence was that, although we had practically the same population, we had less litigation because our laws were in a better condition. The appeal was formerly from the Yukon court to the court in British Columbia, but after the court of the territory was established with three judges, appeals lay in Dawson city itself. The fortunes of a mining country like the

Yukon may fluctuate and at the present moment I regret to say that we have not as many people in the Yukon as we had when that court was established. That, however, is not a criterion as to the future of the territory, as we hope, and we have every reason to believe, that before many years, we shall have as many people and perhaps more than we have had and that the fortunes of the Yukon will be improved. Many new finds have been made and other prospects are looming up, all of which lead to the hope, based upon the history of mining in past years, that we will have a population in the Yukon requiring this full court. There is in this Bill a clause which provides for the recall of these judges. By passing this measure the country saves $10,000 per year, and if we find that we have to reconstitute this court we may recall these two judges who are to be retired.

Resolution reported, read the second time, and agreed to.

Mr. DOHERTY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 123) to amend the Yukon Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.—CUSTOMS OUTSIDE SERVICE.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Customs) moved second reading of Bill (No. 116) to amend the Civil Service Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. REID. This is a copy of a Bill introduced last session by the Hon. Mr. Paterson, my predecessor in office, and which was not passed owing to the dissolution. The Bill proposes to increase the salaries of some of the officers in the outside customs service such, as the collectors of ports and chief clerks. We introduce a class called senior chief clerks with a salary ranging from $2,200 to $2,800, and who will be employed only in the large cities like Montreal, Toronto and Winnipeg. The present system is to have a chief clerk for each department at these ports, but the business is so increasing that it has been found necessary to have a senior official over these clerks who must be a man of experience in the service and be the very best officer we can find in the port. The surveyors now get from $1,200 to $2,400 a year, and the Bill proposes to make the maximum $2,800. The assistant surveyors now get from $800 to $1,200, and in future they will get from $1,200 to $1,600. We provide for new officials called Dominion appraisers, who will receive a salary ranging from $2,200 to $2,600. At present we have an appraiser for each department, but we want a man at each large port who will see that the appraisers do their work properly and are qualified for the position. The Dominion appraiser will act as inspector of the other appraisers. Then we are introducing a new class called senior clerks whose salaries will range from $1,200 to $1,600. Under the present law these clerks cannot get a salary over $1,200, although they may have served for many years and be really deserving of better pay. If a senior clerk has reached the maximum of his salary and he is worthy of promotion, the Bill contemplates that he shall get a maximum salary of $1,600.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. CARVELL. Can the minister tell me on what principle the salaries of customs collectors are based? I notice that they run from $300 to $4,500 and I have never been able to understand how a man can faithfully perform his duties and maintain himself and his family on the minimum salary of $300. Is the salary based on the amount of business done at the port or upon the number of clerks and outports under the collector, or is there any principle at all in connection with it?

Mr. REID (Grenville). As I understand, the system that has been in existence for many years has been based on the revenue of the port. The hon. member says that he can hardly understand a collector of customs receiving a salary of only $300; but suppose a port has to be opened at a small place where very little business is done besides the clearing of a few vessels. Yet there must be a collector, and his salary must be based on the work he has to do.

Mr. CARVELL. The minister uses the word 'collector' here. Does that include a sub-collector? For example, at Woodstock there is a collector of customs for all the northern portion of New Brunswick, and there are under him 8 or 9 sub-collectors, some of whom are compelled to spend all their time in the duties of their office, and are entitled to as much as a collector. That would not be the case if their salaries were based on revenue.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The salary of a sub-collector is based on the revenue collected at his outport, in the same way as the salary of a collector.

Mr. CARVELL. A sub-collector would come under the heading of collectors in the schedule?

Mr. REID (Grenville). Practically the same.

Mr. EMMERSON. As I understand, a sub-collector is one who is required to report to a collector near by. For instance, the city of Moncton has a collector, and there are sub-collectors at Shediac, Hillsborough, in Albert county and Dorchester, who are subject to the jurisdiction and the control of the collector at Moncton. At the outports where these sub-collectors are placed the revenues as a rule are not large, though the export business is somewhat large and there may be a great deal of shipping. For instance, at Hillsborough, in Albert county, there is an immense amount of shipping of plaster and other raw material, which is quarried and shipped to the United States and other countries. The imports at that port are comparatively small, and yet the sub-collector there is required to be in his office at all times during office hours, and his salary is certainly not commensurate with the time he has to devote to his official duties. The same is true of Baie Verte and Cape Tormentine, and other ports which are sub-ports of Sackville. In years past, when I felt called upon to interview the predecessor of my hon. friend in office, his uniform reply was that, regardless of the duties a man had to perform or the time he had to devote to those duties, the amount of revenue collected was the governing principle in fixing his salary. Now, I would strongly urge my hon. friend to make a reform in this matter. Take the collector at the port of Moncton, which has a population of 14,000 or 15,000. Under his jurisdiction are sub-collectors at Hillsborough, Cocaigne, Shediac, and Dorchester. He is responsible in a large measure for the oversight of these several sub-offices. It does seem to me that $1,400 or $1,500 is a paltry salary to give to a man holding such a responsible position. At the port of Sackville the salary is, I think, $800 or $900. Yet these officers are required to be in attendance at their offices during office hours, and oftentimes outside of office hours, in order to clear vessels so as to enable them to take advantage of the tide. If the hon. minister will inquire into the matter, I think he will realize that these officials have been in the past underpaid, and that a remedy should be applied. I hold that the criterion of a man's salary should not be the revenue of his office. Some of the most important ports in the province of New Brunswick, and also in the province of Nova Scotia, are ports where no great amount of importing is done, and where the officials are engaged in attending to export business. In these days the large importations into this country are made at the great centres, such as Montreal, Halifax, Quebec and other shipping ports. But the smaller ports are a necessity in the interests of navigation, and in the interests of trade and commerce. Officials are necessary, their time must be devoted to the duties of their offices, and they should be paid on a scale larger than has heretofore prevailed.

I would urge upon the attention of my hon. friend this feature of the question of salaries. I do not observe that under this Bill any particular provision is made for officials of that class, but I think there should be. It seems that these provisions are intended to apply to the larger ports of Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, St. John and Halifax. But the smaller ports of the country should also receive attention. Take the one to which my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) referred, the important port of Woodstock, being on the border of the United States the officials there are necessarily continuously applying themselves to their duties. The same can be said of Moncton, which is a centre, Charlottetown and other similar points. The officials at these places are not provided for by this Bill, if I read it aright, and it seems to me that the collectors and sub-collectors, particularly the latter, should be recognized. I believe it to have been the policy of the department in later years to combine a number of ports together under the control of one official who is known as the collector, the other officials being designated sub-collectors. And these collectors and sub-collectors certainly have important duties. I invite my hon. friend's favourable consideration to the point raised.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. member is right about the extra work at the port when an outport is being attached to it. But the outport is really independent in a way. All that is done there is to send the cash and a copy of the entries to the port.

Mr. EMMERSON. That involves responsibility.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Certainly it does. Of course at the port the collector has more assistants in order to do that work. I agree with my hon. friend that the salaries are small, but it is hard to get any reasonable system by which you can regulate it. The hon. member mentioned a place called Cocaigne.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is in the county of Kent.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The sub-collector there only gets $300. That amount looks very small indeed, and any person can quite understand that a man could not live on $300; he should have more. That is how it appears on the face of it. But in such a small place as that, where there

is really no business done, the officer generally has some other employment and his stipend from the customs is really extra. For example the officer may be a merchant.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is not permitted.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Yes. When the salary is less than $800 he is able to do other work outside.

Mr. EMMERSON. He is not permitted to deal in merchandise.

Mr. REID (Grenville). He may not be allowed to deal in merchandise, he is probably engaged in insurance or something of that kind. But take the case of Cocaigne, which the hon. gentleman has just mentioned, where the officer only gets $300. The man only made five entries and took in $2.19, and there was only one vessel arrived at the port during the year. You can quite understand with that amount of business it is hard to increase the salary of the officer.

Mr. EMMERSON. Refer to Hillsborough and see the number of vessels that arrived there.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Very well, take Hillsborough and compare it with the other place. At Hillsborough the subcollector gets $700 a year. The total collections at that port were $1,184.30, so the subcollector got one-half of that amount. He made 168 entries, or about one every other day.

Mr. EMMERSON. What about the clearances?

Mr. REID (Grenville). Fifty seagoing vessels arrived and 49 departed. Practically the same vessels went out that came in. Of coasting vessels, 35 arrived and 39 departed. So the hon. member can see that the business there is small.

Mr. EMMERSON. Still it is important.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I admit it is very important. Now the difficulty—

Mr. EMMERSON. That man certainly could not attend to any other business. He is compelled to keep his office open at all times, I know that personally.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I admit that, but at the same time, he might do some other business if he had his office open. There is no reason why he could not do so, and it is allowed in small places where the business is unimportant. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that these salaries are small; no person realises it more than I do. During the short time I have been in the office, I have had very many complaints about the small salaries. In cases of this kind, it is left to the minister to grant an increase in each case, in so far as he feels that the circumstances justify it. Last year my predecessor gave increases to 1,752 men—that was the number, if my memory serves me right. Now the hon. gentleman can see that even if you only grant an increase of $100 a year, it would mean a total of $175,000. The practice has been for the minister to place an amount of $200,000 in the estimates for the purpose of increasing salaries and opening new offices. I claim that amount is too small. Every time you open a new outport, it seems on an average an additional outlay of $1,000 a year. Some of the outports may yield a large revenue in which case, a subcollector is appointed. Probably at a salary of $1,000, if there is a lot of work to do, and the other disbursements for rent and so on, would bring the total up to $1,200 or $1,400. You may appoint another man at $500 or $600, so that when you average these expenditures up, it means about $1,000 for an outport. There are very many places throughout the Dominion applying for new outports, and think they are entitled to them; and along the new territory which is being opened up, it is absolutely necessary to open a lot of new outports. That takes a large portion of this appropriation. Personally, I feel that there are very many officials who should have larger increases than I am able to give them, and so far as I am concerned I shall grant to every man in the service, the very largest amount that I can possibly give him, from the lowest official up to the highest, out of the appropriation that is being voted at this session. The case of the collector at Moncton, will be considered with the rest. Personally, I would be very pleased to give him the very best consideration I can, under the circumstances. Under these increases a man gets a raise of $50 to $100, and he finds it hard to realise that where the appropriation has to be divided among a couple of thousand officials, the amount is very small that would be available for each man. I know officers that are applying for increases that should have $200 or $300 a year more, and I would be glad to give it to them if I could. They claim the cost of living has gone up and that they should have a substantial increase when they have a family to support. On the small stipend such as the hon. member has mentioned, it is undoubtedly hard to live. Yet the money that was voted last year is exhausted, and when we come down with the amount the same as last year, it is hard to give the increases that have been expected. I can only say, I will do the best I can to give every deserving officer in the service, the best increase I can, under the circumstances.

Mr. EMMERSON. I appreciate the spirit in which my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid, Grenville) approaches the consideration of the question. I ask him to bear in mind, as justification of the

course I take, that our revenues have immensely expanded and that trade, commerce and navigation have had a like expansion. All this means the opening of new ports. It is necessary for the protection of the revenue, for the very fact that there is a port of entry in a certain district has the same effect as the placing of a policeman on a beat, such an officer may not have much to do, but the fact of his being there has a deterrent effect upon evildoers. Therefore, it seems to me that the justification for the course that my hon. friend, I know, would like to follow and which, I believe, he will follow as far as circumstances permit, is to be found in the conditions prevailing in Canada to-day.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am glad that the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) has brought this matter up, for I believe there is a great deal in it. I would draw attention to another feature of the case, to which, I think, he has not referred. I have in mind a place in Ontario where there is a very large amount of imports for a town of its size. In this town of 2,000 population the imports would probably amount to $800,000 or $900,000 a year. Possibly two-thirds, I might even say three-quarters, of those imports would be of free goods. But all these goods, free or dutiable, have to be passed by the customs officer, and he must be in attendance. If the salary of the officer is fixed according to the revenue, there would be a certain unfairness to the officer, for he must be in attendance during business hours to make these entries even when the result does not show in the revenue receipts. I think some other plan might be adopted to equalize these salaries. I hope the minister will take the matter into consideration, and I am sure the hon. gentleman desires to do justice to all concerned.

Mr. LEMIEUX. How many offices are involved, and how many new officers would be appointed, and what is the total annual charge?

Mr. REID (Grenville). The total estimated increase is $10,000; and the officers to which these increases will apply are 13 inspectors, 7 surveyors, 13 appraisers and 30 clerks.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Are all these in the outside service?

Mr. REID (Grenville). Yes.

Mr. GUTHRIE. In section 2, 'other classes' are mentioned. What is the distinction between 'higher classes' and 'other classes'?

Mr. REID (Grenville). If the hon. member will refer to schedule D of the Bill, he will see the word 'higher classes,' then 'technical officers' and 'other classes.'

Mr. GUTHRIE. The Bill would apply to places like Guelph, Berlin and Stratford?

Mr. REID (Grenville). Yes.

Mr. GUTHRIE. And I understand that this is practically the scale of remuneration proposed in the Bill that was introduced by the former Minister of Customs, Mr. Paterson. I think the Bill is in the right direction. We have places in Ontario where quite large amounts are returned to the treasury and a very heavy responsibility attaches to the collector and his staff; and the salaries now paid, I believe, are entirely inadequate. I was just going to rise when my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) took the floor, and mention what he suggested, that the revenue collected is not always a fair guide in fixing the salary. I know offices in my portion of the province of Ontario where fully half the imports are on the free list. The work to be performed by the collector is just as great in regard to free imports as in regard to dutiable imports. The responsibility is not so great, of course, because the actual cash is not handled. In Guelph, a city of about 17,000 population, the collections run to about $225,000. The collector there, I believe, receives $1,800 a year. He has been there many years, having been appointed in 1894 or 1895. He is a first-class business man and gives personal and constant attention to his office. The salary paid seems to me ridiculously small for the work done. I have, time and time again, taken up this matter with the former minister, with a view to having his salary placed at a minimum of $2,000. I trust that under the provisions of this Bill the minister will see his way to grant an increase not only in the Guelph office but in all offices in western Ontario similarly situated. As to the principle upon which the minister is to proceed, would it not be possible to devise a scheme by which the inspector would report from time to time? He must visit the offices periodically and make a thorough examination, and I think he would be the proper man to report.

Mr. CARVELL. I quite approve of this Bill and I concur in the remarks that have been made as to the great difficulty any minister must have in a department of this kind in satisfying and at the same time doing justice to a horde of officials. I think the minister is in error when he says that a collector has no greater responsibility on account of having a number of officers under him. A collector, especially along the boundary line, as in the county I have

the honour to represent, must be constantly on the alert to guard against the very frequent cases of petty smuggling. I know the collector in Woodstock makes frequent trips all over the district extending 100 to 200 miles, to discuss these matters with the sub-collectors. His duties are very different from those of a collector who sits at a port to register the clearing of vessels. I doubt if the minister is correctly informed, when he says that the word collector would cover sub-collectors. In the Customs Act the word 'collector' is defined thus:

"Collector" means the collector of the customs at the port or place intended, or any person lawfully deputed, appointed or authorized to do the duty of collector thereat.

I do not think that would cover a sub-collector fifty miles away from the port, and I fear that the minister may not be able to consider the claims and the rights of sub-collectors under this, and there are five times as many sub-collectors as collectors. This would apply also to tide waiters and preventive officers. Take a preventive officer living at the border. There again you have an entirely different class of duties from those of a man stationed 100 miles away. The man on the border is on the go from Monday morning until Saturday night in order to prevent smuggling and, shrewd and earnest as they may be, they cannot prevent it altogether. Merchants complain that these officers are not doing their duty, that their neighbours are smuggling goods constantly and that nothing is done. I know men who devote their whole energy to travelling up and down the country to prevent smuggling who receive the paltry sum of $600 a year. The duty of the preventive officer is to prevent the bringing in of goods, and if his salary is made to depend on the volume of collections it is not a fair basis. Nor is it fair that a clerk who has to devote all his time to office-work should not have his salary increased merely because the collections at his port have not increased. I hope the minister will be able to give us some rule or basis on which these salaries will be increased from time to time under this Bill.

Mr. EMMERSON. I mentioned the port of Moncton simply because I am familiar with the conditions there, but my remarks would apply to every port and all officials similarly situated. The importations of raw cotton at Moncton are direct and no duty is paid. Large quantities of hard pine timber and anthracite coal are imported in that section of country and the free goods imported certainly exceed in value those upon which duty is paid. The larger dutiable imports are made at the larger centres of the Dominion.

Mr. CARVELL.

Mr. ROBB. Possibly there is no member of the House better qualified to judge the value of the outside service in connection with the customs service than the Minister of Customs. He has lived close to the border, where there is always considerable importation going on, and to-day it is reassuring to have the minister tell us that so far as he is concerned justice will be done to every officer in the department. That is somewhat different from the story we hear from his friends in the country. There we hear that promotion will come from the broadaxe. I want to do the minister the justice of saying that in the county I have the honour to represent so far the axe has not moved and I hope it will not be used in that county; there is no justification for it.

Two of the oldest, and as good officers as there are in the service, are Conservatives, appointed by the political friends of the Minister of Justice. One of these officers was appointed by Sir John Rose, and the other was twice the Conservative candidate in the county. I do not think that the customs officers in the country have had the same consideration as officers in the large centres. Looking over the list of collectors in Quebec for the year 1908, I find that at Abercorn the officer is receiving a salary of $900 a year. He was appointed in 1877. At Athelstan, Huntingdon county, where the collector has under him four or five men, and where at times the business is so great that they send out relief officers from the cities, the collector was in receipt of a salary, in 1908, of $800. I submit that this salary is not sufficient for a man in an office of that character. In the town of Hemmingford, the oldest officer in the service in Quebec, a man who was appointed in 1868, is only getting a salary of $750. I hope the minister will carry out his promise and give greater consideration to the officers in the country districts. As my hon. friend from Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) has pointed out, these officers are continually on duty, and they are at considerable expense. They have to keep horses, they, at times, have to drive at night, and they are the most deserving officers in the service. At the large ports where goods come in ships, a man is compelled to make his entries, but at these frontier ports the officer must continually be on the watch, and if there is any class of officer in the public service who is deserving of consideration it is the country customs house collector.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I would like to ask the Minister of Customs to give some information regarding the dismissal of Mr. Lyman C. Smith, of Oshawa, Ont. I do not know anything about the matter or the circumstances relating to the case, but I had the curiosity the other day to read the

papers which the minister had placed on the table, and it seemed to me to be rather an extraordinary case. This man appears to have been dismissed because he expressed himself as being in favour of a pure election. I think it is a case that the minister ought to give some information about to the House.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Answering the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) first in reference to sub-collectors, I understand that the officers of the department have been appointed sub-collectors under the section he has read. Of course, they are appointed by order in council similarly to the collectors, and for that reason we feel that the sub-collectors should really be treated on the same basis as collectors in so far as their salaries are concerned. As far as my hon. friend from Wellington (Mr Guthrie) is concerned, I would say that this does apply to Guelph and places like that. This will enable clerks who have been in an office like that of Guelph for many years, who probably have families, who have done their work well and are deserving of promotion, but who cannot at present go higher than $1,200, to be increased up to as high as $1,600. With reference to what my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) has said, I agree with him that in places where the business of a port or outport is such that there is a great deal of work on account of the free importation of goods, such work ought to be taken into consideration. Of course, it is taken into consideration, and no doubt has been in the past in fixing the salaries of the officers at those different places.

It has been the custom in the past for the minister to give an increase when he thinks it deserved. There is no doubt about it that I must take the advice of the inspectors and the commissioner who have knowledge of the conditions at the different ports, who know the officers and the service they are giving, and act with them in coming to a conclusion as to what the increases should be. I shall certainly try to do justice to every officer in the Customs Department. With reference to the question asked by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) as to the dismissal of an official in South Ontario, I may say that in the first place this collector had never been appointed by order in council. He was simply acting as collector. If I remember aright, my predecessor sent this order in council over and it was returned to him so that this man was never permanently appointed. However, be that as it may, this official acknowledged in a letter that he wrote to myself that he had made remarks that were certainly offensive to the candidate who was running. I took it for granted from the letter he wrote himself that he really admitted that he had made remarks that were offensive. My hon. friend knows that if a member of parliament makes a charge that an official has been offensive it has been the rule laid down by both sides that we are justified in dismissing that official. That is the rule that I acted upon. Where we have the member's own recommendation I consider that the proper course is to act upon it. In the case of this gentleman in the town of Oshawa, I think it was, the member who demanded his dismissal. With reference to other dismissals throughout the country, my hon. friend from Carleton mentioned that even in his county he expected they would all be dismissed.

Mr. CARVELL. I said if they kept on at the present rate.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I do not know what the hon. member meant by that, but I think he must be aware that if there have been any dismissals in his county, I have not sanctioned them without having a full investigation and with out a report from the commissioner confirming the charges of partisanship.

Mr. CARVELL. I do not know about that. I take the minister's word for it, and I will presume that he has had a report.

Mr. REID (Grenville). That has been the policy that I have been following throughout. I have been holding investigations and there have been no dismissals with the exception of two or three——

Mr. SINCLAIR. Did the minister have any investigation in this case to which I have called his attention?

Mr. REID (Grenville). No, because a member of the House asked for his dismissal on account of active partisanship. That rule has never been questioned by either side of the House. The member representing the constituency claimed that this man was an active partisan and I acted on his statement.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The dismissal appears to have been based upon a letter written by this Mr. Lyman Smith. There are three letters in the correspondence, one to the Prime Minister, one to the Minister of Customs, and the third to Mr. Smith, member for that constituency. I have been unable to find anything in Mr. Lyman Smith's letter to justify his dismissal, I will read it:

Ottawa, November 21, 1911.

Hon. Dr. J. D. Reid, M.P.,
Minister of Customs,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—I have received the following from Mr. Lyman Smith, collector of customs, Ottawa, viz.:—

'Oshawa, Nov. 15, 1911.

'William Smith, Esq., M.P.,
'House of Commons,
'Ottawa, Ont.

'Dear Sir,—The 'Indicator' to-day reports that at a meeting in Oshawa at which you were present, Dr. Raiser said I should be removed from office as an offensive partisan. I have thought best to give you a plain statement of facts:

'(1) I was not appointed because of political services.

'(2) I never contributed a cent for any election.

'(3) I never even sat on any political platform in my life.

'(4) I never spoke at any meeting.

'(5) I never was in a party committee room in my life, nor attended any such meeting.

'(6) I never canvassed for votes, nor spoke to any man with any intention of influencing his vote.

'(7) I attended four political meetings—two on each side. I took no part in any demonstration. I never even cheered for any candidate or speaker.

'(8) As the election was the one subject of conversation, I conversed with perhaps a dozen whom I chanced to meet, and expressed my views of the question at issue.

'(9) I hold certain views in regard to the conduct of elections and expressed these views to private parties and only in private conversation. I did not hesitate to express them, but it was with no intention of influencing votes. I spoke to both friends and opponents.

'(10) I do not believe in canvassing for votes. I do not believe in a party fund. The bare expenses of hiring halls, printing, and such absolute needs, should be met, and I think, by the State, for all legitimate expenses are for the good of the country or should be. I do not think voters should be carried to the poll, except old and feeble folk, and the expense of this should be borne by the state. I do not believe in parades or demonstrations. I never took part in one. I think there should be open and fair discussion. Public meetings should be held to inform the people of the questions at issue, then the voters should go quietly to the polls of their own accord and exercise their franchise without fear or favour.

'(11) The head and front of my offending seems to be that I stated to John McCulloch that I considered the right of the franchise so sacred that I would never vote for any man, no matter who he was, or what party, or what the issue, who had proved to have been concerned in the giving of money for bribes. I stated that I had on a few occasions unknowingly voted for such, but I would never so vote if I knew it. If pure men did not offer themselves I would not vote at all. I further stated that in my opinion a man that had done this should not have a vote himself, or be permitted to hold any office. This view was stated in general terms, and I have often made the same statement when an election was pending. Remember, please, that all this was said in private conversation only.

'I know that customs officers are supposed to take no part in politics; but I judged we lived not in Russia but in Canada, where a man could express his views privately to his friends.

'I have done nothing that I wish to deny or conceal. I never considered you anything but a friend, and was persuaded you entertained like feelings towards me. Therefore, there could be no personal animus in this matter. It was merely a statement of my principles.

'I am, dear sir,
'Yours truly,
(Sgd.) LYMAN C. SMITH.

Mr. Smith was appointed to the customs of Oshawa about a year ago, and in many ways was very active during the election which closed on September 21. I think the above letter would be all that was necessary to cause his removal, which I would recommend to be done as soon as possible.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) WILLIAM SMITH.

The answer of the Minister to Mr. Lyman Smith's letter, was as follows:

Ottawa, 6th Dec., 1911.

Lyman C. Smith, Esq., B.A.,
Acting collector of Customs,
Oshawa, Ont.

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 2nd inst., respecting a charge of partisanship against you, and have carefully noted your representations in the matter.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) J. D. REID,
Minister of Customs.

The Prime Minister appears to have turned the letter addressed to him which is almost an exact copy of the letter to Wm. Smith, M.P., over to the Minister of Customs, and the next one is a letter from Mr. John McDougald, the Commissioner of Customs, to Mr. Lyman Smits, as follows:

Ottawa, 27th Dec., 1911.

Lyman C. Smith, Esq.,
Acting Commissioner of Customs,
Oshawa, Ont.

Sir,—In my letter of 30th December, 1910, authorizing your employment as acting collector of customs at Oshawa, Ont., it was stipulated that this employment may be discontinued at any time at the discretion of the Minister of Customs.

I am now directed to inform you, by order of the Minister of Customs, that, on account of political partisanship, your employment as acting collector of customs will be discontinued and shall terminate on the 30th December, 1911, at the close of which day you will deliver the books and other customs property in your charge to the Inspector of Customs who hands you this letter.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) JOHN McDOUGALD,
Commissioner of Customs.

Now, there is nothing whatever in that letter of Mr. Lyman Smith which seems to justify his dismissal. I do not know the circumstances more than what appears in the correspondence, but this man was certainly not a partisan. According to his own story he is an extraordinary man; he does not seem to have taken the usual interest that men everywhere take in public affairs, and he appears to be under the impression himself that he was dismissed because he made the statement that he did not approve of bribery at elections. Surely that would not be a good reason for dismissing this official, and that is the reason which appears to have been acted upon in this case after having read the correspondence, I ask the minister to give an explanation.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I did not know that this matter was coming up this afternoon, and I am not prepared to go into it, but now that the letters have been read, I may say that the letter of this man, as read, certainly justified his dismissal, and I acted accordingly.

Mr. GUTHRIE. What portion of that letter justified his dismissal?

Mr. REID (Grenville). The whole letter. The man himself admits that he was practically canvassing.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Oh no.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Well, it amounts to that; he says he went around expressing his opinion to private individuals.

Mr. SINCLAIR. And the opinions he expressed is an opinion that is shared in by everybody in this country, namely that we should have pure elections.

Mr. REID (Grenville). He attended meetings and expressed his opinion, and certainly took part in the elections. If the hon. gentleman wishes to bring the question up on the estimates I will be prepared to deal with it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Minister of Customs has, with, shall I say painful frankness—it is hard to know how to express it—admitted that upon that letter he dismissed this man. It is a letter of high moral tone, a letter, the contents of which, no man could possibly object to. Because that man to one elector expressed the opinion that——

Mr. BORDEN. I have no objection to the hon. member discussing this matter at the proper time, but I do not think it is in order to do so on this Bill.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend is a little late in rising to the point of order, as the Minister of Customs has chosen to discuss the dismissal and has stated the grounds on which he dismissed this man. I submit that it is entirely relevant to the Bill to discuss the tenure of these offices, the grounds on which they can be dispensed with, and the rights and privileges of these collectors. I am inclined to think that my right hon. friend is endeavouring to confine the discussion to too narrow limits.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the point of order is well taken. I do not see any relevancy to section 1 in the discussion of the dismissal of an officer.

Mr. TOBIN. I would like to ask the Minister of Customs what decision he has arrived at with regard to Mr. James Pender, the subcollector at Windsor Mills. An investigation was held some time ago by Dr. Shurtliff, of Coaticook, who was the organizer of the Conservative party in the eastern townships; but so far, Mr. Pender has not heard what decision the minister has come to or whether he is to be dismissed or not.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I have not the papers here, and do not know what the situation is. I did not know anything of that kind would come up.

Mr. CARVELL. Does the minister intend the officers provided for in 39a and 39b, that is, senior chief clerks and senior clerks, to come under the inside or the outside service? Section 39 of the Civil Service Act refers only to officials of the outside service.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The side-note on the Bill says it is for the promotion of a chief clerk in the outside service, and that is what is intended.

Mr. CARVELL. The marginal reference is not an enacting part of the Bill.

Mr. BORDEN. I think my hon. friend's suggestion is a proper one, and that we had better insert the words 'in such service' in line 10, after the word 'clerk' and in line 16 after the word 'clerk.' It will then be well understood that this applies to the outside service.

Section amended accordingly.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I read in the papers this morning that the hon. Mr. Lougheed, the leader of the government in the Senate, stated yesterday that it was the intention of the government shortly to put the outside service in the inside service. Did he speak authoritatively?

Mr. BORDEN. I have not seen the observation, which my hon. friend attributed to Mr. Lougheed; but I do not imagine that it went beyond what has already been stated on more than one occasion in this House, that it is the intention and desire of the government to extend the provisions of the Civil Service Amendment Act of 1908

to the outside service as far as may be practicable, and as rapidly as may be practicable. But of course it must be understood that before we do that, there would have to be inquiry and consideration and investigation in every department. It cannot be done in a moment or without consideration; but we have already said that that is the policy and intention of the present administration; and indeed I think the late administration had something of that kind in contemplation during the last few years.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I approve of the principle of increasing the salaries of the officers mentioned in this Bill. This Bill refers particularly to collectors and inspectors and makes provision for the payment to them of such salaries as will be adequate and sufficient to keep them in a reasonable way. By so doing I believe you will attract better men into the civil service of the country. But there is a class of government officials throughout the country whose needs I submit, are just as great as the needs of the inspectors, collectors and inspectors of customs throughout the country, and even greater, I refer to the ordinary customs officials, for instance in the office of Regina, or in the customs offices in similar cities and towns in western Canada, and I believe the same argument will apply to towns in eastern Canada although perhaps not to so great an extent. The cost of living in western Canada, as well as in eastern Canada, has increased tremendously. I know instances of customs officials resident in Canada to-day who are not getting sufficient allowance to actually subsist upon. I submit that is not a fair position to put any government official in. The revenue of this country is vastly in excess of the current expenditure at the present time, and I think that part of that surplus might very well be expended by the government in making a general increase to the civil service, if not in the actual salary at least in the living allowance. The living allowance granted in the west to many of these officials is certainly not adequate. My own experience in connection with government offices in western Canada has been that the only man who can be got to enter a government position, outside of the better class of offices, is a man who is temporarily out of employment, and who says: I will go into the position for two or three months in the hope of getting something better outside and then I will leave the service. If you want ability in the government service throughout the whole of Canada, if you wish to secure efficient and capable men who will devote their lives to the service of the government, you must pay them salaries adequate to their positions and equal to the salaries they can obtain in similar employment elsewhere I think at the present time we are not paying sufficient salaries to the ordinary clerks throughout the country. Take for instance in my own part of the country, the wages paid in every calling in life, from the ordinary labourer up, have increased during the past three or four years, and increased adequately with the cost of living in the west. The only calling in which the remuneration has not been increased has been in the civil service of Canada. I recognize, of course, that the class of men to whom I am calling the attention of the House do not come under the provisions of this Bill. At the same time I would ask the Minister of Customs to direct his attention to the ordinary customs officials throughout the country, and if possible give them adequate salaries to live upon. In the city of Regina it would take half the salary obtained by the average customs clerk to pay the rent of an ordinary house, and that is not a fair position to put these officials in.

Mr. BORDEN. I realize that there is a great deal of force in what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin, Regina) has said, not only in regard to the customs service but with regard to other government departments. He will appreciate the fact, however, that there has not yet been opportunity to take that matter up in a very comprehensive way. I think something has been done in the Post Office and Customs Departments, and I can only ask my hon. friend to take what we are doing now in respect to these customs officers as an earnest of what we may look forward to doing in placing the public service of the country upon an effective basis. I appreciate entirely the truth of the hon. gentleman's remarks that you cannot have an efficient and stable public service, unless you give to the men who are employed by the government a reasonable salary, having regard to the positions in which they are placed. I am afraid, however, that we shall not be able during the present session to take the matter up in the comprehensive way which my hon. friend suggests, but I can assure him that we appreciate the force of his remarks, and that we will hope at some subsequent session to bring in a measure which I trust will be along the lines which he has pointed out to-day.

Mr. CARVELL. I did not exactly catch the explanation of the Minister of Customs when he was referring to the amount of increased expenditure, which these augmentations of salary would involve. Did I understand him to say that the increase would amount to $10,000 as regards the whole of Canada? I sincerely trust that all the customs officials of Canada will be brought under this Bill. Some doubt has been expressed as to whether it applies

to sub-collectors, but I am inclined to think that these officials will come under the provisions of the measure. I hope the amount of increase will be more than $10,000; if not it will surely be very inadequate. I want to tell my hon. friend that when the late government were in power the members on this side pleaded with them to increase the salaries of customs officials, perhaps not as publicly as to-day. but we did it just the same, and we urged that that increase should apply to the whole service.

Mr. HENDERSON. It is not the first occasion on which I have heard the hon. member for Moosejaw refer to subjects somewhat akin to this. I only rise to express my surprise that that hon. gentleman, as well as the hon. member from Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) have not in the past complained of these very same matters. They have been sitting here for some years without criticising these small salaries to government officers, and it is only when a change of administration takes place they suddenly come to the conclusion that something is radically wrong. I do not think it is fair for these hon. gentlemen to cast reflections upon the government now in power, when they have been supporting in the past the very thing which they now condemn.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). Did the hon. gentleman refer to me when he spoke of the hon. gentleman from Moosejaw?

Mr. HENDERSON. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I mean the hon. member from Regina. I was thinking of the larger town when I spoke.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I may say to the hon. gentleman that on many occations—on several occasions at least—in this House during the past three or four years, I did advocate a general increase in salary in the outside service. If the hon. gentleman would take the trouble to look at 'Hansard' he will find that is the case. I am not attempting at the present time to cast any aspersions on the present government. I do not think I put the matter at all in that way.

Mr. BORDEN. Hear, hear.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I do not see why the hon. gentleman should introduce the matter of politics into the question at the present time, because I did not discuss the matter at all in that spirit.

Mr. HENDERSON. I simply rose to express my surprise that nothing had been done in this matter previously, or that these hon. gentlemen had not succeeded in getting the government that they supported so faithfully to do what they now ask should be done.

Mr. CARVELL. The hon. gentleman is not aware of all that was done.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I wish to correct the impression that nothing was done by the previous government because my recollection is to the contrary. The minister will remember that a few years ago an increase was given by his predecessor to the customs officials. It was not a large increase, but it was pretty general, I think, and it was supported by the gentlemen who sat behind the government of that day. There were many of us, however, who thought that the increase was rather small.

Mr. HENDERSON. Not enough.

Mr. SINCLAIR. That is a different thing, as to whether it was sufficient or not.

Section agreed to.

On the motion for the adoption of the preamble.

Mr. McKENZIE. (North Cape Breton). I would like to know clearly from the minister if he is fixing the amount of $300, which appears in this schedule, as the minimum salary. Does it mean that any person engaged in the customs service as collector or subcollector is to receive a minimum of $300 a year?

Mr. REID (Grenville). No, we are paying even less than $300. I am not making any change in this, but I am simply continuing the terms of the old Act.

Mr. CARVELL. I thought it was $300 to $4,000.

Mr. REID (Grenville). No, I think that the year before last an amendment of the Civil Service Act made it $300 to $4,500. But even less than $300 is paid.

Mr. McKENZIE. That is why I asked. I am aware of some officials receiving less than $300, and I was in hopes that the intention was to fix $300 as a minimum.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I am only carrying out the same policy as my predecessors, so far as salaries are concerned, until I can look into the situation. I have had no time to do that yet.

Mr. McKENZIE. It seems to me that if a man is appointed at all he should receive not less than $300. I have listened with great attention to the discussion and concur, so far as my own part of the country is concerned, in what has been said. We have in Cape Breton three very important ports, Glace Bay, Sydney, and North Sydney. I do not know whether this Bill will affect officials at those centres or not. But there are very large transactions in these ports. There is the export

of coal, iron and steel, and large imports of iron ore from Newfoundland and other places, as well as the general business, so that the duties devolving upon these officers are very important, and their work is very heavy. I hope the attention given to the officers in such places does not necessarily depend on what is said by representatives here, but I wish to mention these important ports of my county.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, Prince Edward Island). There are ports in which the revenues are very small. The representatives of inland places seem to think that there is no need for a collector where there is an extremely small revenue. But I suppose it is not the intention of the minister to close the small offices.

Mr. REID (Grenville). No, that is not my intention.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, Prince Edward Island). Those offices are very important for the prevention of smuggling, assistance to shipping, and otherwise.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Of course.

Bill as amended reported.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT—POST OFFICES.

House went into committee on the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to amend the Civil Service Act by providing that assistant postmasters in post offices in which the postage collections exceed $1,000,000 may be paid a minimum salary of $2,800, with annual increases of $100 up to a maximum salary of $3,500, and that, if the Governor in Council so determines, such provision may be made applicable to assistant postmasters appointed prior to the first day of April, 1912.—Mr. Pelletier.

Hon. L. P. PELLETIER (Postmaster General). This resolution will be applicable only to the assistant postmasters of Montreal and Toronto. As the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) knows, they are two first-class officers. They are given salaries running from $2,800 to $3,500. The Toronto post office is the one in which there is the largest revenue of the whole country, and Montreal comes next. The revenue of the Montreal post office is going up by leaps and bounds, as also is that of Toronto. We think these officers are deserving of the recognition here given. And this is the sole object of the resolution.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If the resolution has for its object only to increase the salaries of these two deserving officials, I very heartily concur in it. Speaking more especially for Montreal post office—with the work of which I am more familiar, though during my career as Postmaster General I visited the Toronto office a number of times—I can assure the House that Mr. Gaboury is the 'deus ex machina' there. He has accomplished great reforms in the office. And besides, I am aware that he has received very good offers from different financial institutions, banks especially, but these he has refused because he is a faithful servant of His Majesty. He could have had a much better salary if he had accepted any of these offers. Such men ought to be encouraged. The gentleman in Toronto who occupies a similar position is also a most valuable officer. The post office in Montreal has, under ordinary circumstances, more work than any other office. I do not refer only to the letter delivery in the city, but also to the work connected with the European mail which is concentrated in the Montreal office, both for the incoming steamers as they reach Rimouski and for the steamers leaving Rimouski and Quebec for Europe.

The work is tremendous, there is an immense number of bags and baskets, and the sorting of the European mail generally is of great importance. Mr. Gaboury has reorganized that service to perfection and I am glad to say that under his régime in Montreal we have had fewer thefts in the post office and in the postal service generally than ever before. In fact he has the full confidence of the board of trade, and generally speaking, of the business community of Montreal. I am very glad that the Postmaster General should have thought of raising the salaries of the assistant postmasters of Montreal and Toronto. They well deserve it.

Mr. PELLETIER. I cannot afford to do any more.

Resolutions reported, read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. PELLETIER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 124) to amend the Civil Service Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

EXTENSION OF BOUNDARIES—MANITOBA.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 115) to provide for the extension of the boundaries of the province of Manitoba.—Mr. Borden.

On section 4, financial provisions.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall section 4 be adopted?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The question is on the amendment. If any hon. gentleman desires to hear what the amendment is, I might repeat it; but it simply is that the Governor in Council may give interest upon the proposed debt allowance to the identical amount named within the Bill, but that before the amount shall be so fixed there shall be a conference of the Premiers of the different provinces called by the federal government to consider the matter and also to consider the question with respect to any increase in the debt allowance which would be just and equitable to make to the other provinces of Canada in connection with the increase in the debt allowance which the government propose granting to Manitoba. I desire to repeat what I said last evening, that this amendment seems to be so reasonable, so well calculated to do justice to the other provinces, that I am surprised it is not readily accepted. It will cause no delay. It has been stated by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) I think, that there is a conference of the Premiers of the province to be held early in the summer. This payment, unless it is to be dated back, in the ordinary course, would not commence until the 1st of July. It does not mean therefore, practically any delay, and I am sure that after this conference had been held and the views of the different provinces ascertained the Governor in Council would be in a position to come to a conclusion that would be very much more apt to be satisfactory to the provinces and would be much more apt to be fair and just to the provinces, than this proposition now before the committee.

Mr. TURGEON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be permitted to say a few words of appreciation of the statements made and the sentiments expressed by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) when he moved his amendment yesterday. This amendment does not interfere with the operation of the Bill. It is only requesting that the grant made, or offered to the province of Manitoba in connection with this extension of territory be delayed for a while until the suggested conference shall have been held. We are not asking you to take away anything from the amount allotted by the government; we are only asking that further consideration of the general question may be given by such a conference. There has been a tendency during this debate to allege that Liberal speakers who have presented objections to this proposition now before the committee have displayed a spirit of reluctance to allow the people of Manitoba the full enjoyment of what they are entitled to. I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, and every member of this House, as I can assure the whole country, that no man in the maritime provinces regrets the prosperity of Manitoba or any other prairie province. No man has more admiration for the people of Manitoba, whose activity, intellectual as well as physical, seems to be stimulated and enlivened by the invigorating atmosphere which pervades the country in which they have made their homes. The people of the maritime provinces have generously contributed to the purchase of these western territories for the common welfare of the Dominion and it is gratifying to us to see that our children have gone forth from Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island to assist in the development of that great west, have reflected credit upon their native provinces, and that those of them who have been elected to represent their fellowmen, young or old, are to be found in the first rank among the members of this parliament. Certainly I wish to insist upon this point that, whatever position may be taken or whatever suggestion may be made, it is always in the spirit of the greatest liberality of the east towards the west. No greater builders of this nation have been in this parliament than the great men from New Brunswick or the illustrious Howe, who foresaw sixty years ago in that great western country what we have realized to-day and whose hopes in regard to that rich heritage have been fulfilled to a greater degree than even he could possibly have expected they would be.

A suggestion has been made by my hon. friend from St. John that this Bill should stand until we have a conference of the Premiers of the provinces to consider the rights of the other provinces in connection with this increase in subsidy—it is nothing else—given to Manitoba. I have always been a generous admirer of the constitution. It is our admiration of the constitution which has made the people of New Brunswick as good Canadians as they have been. We have suffered, in so far as the Catholic minority is concerned, from the terms of confederation, but our sufferings perhaps have only rendered dearer to us that constitution which we cherish today knowing that it will ever stand for the rights which have been acquired in every part of the Dominion. This Bill today is merely a usurpation of the rights given at the last provincial conference to the different provinces. There had been an agitation going on for years amongst the provinces to secure an increase in the subsidies in order to enable the provincial governments to better administer the affairs and develop the resources under their control. We all know that with the increased revenue of this government the provinces have increased expenditure, and, therefore, it was nothing but natural that

the amount of money fixed by the Fathers of Confederation should be insufficient to meet the present day needs of the provinces. A conference was called by the then leader of the government, the right hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), to meet in 1906, and the provinces were allotted a certain amount each according to the unanimous resolution which was passed. As I stated a few days ago, I regret that this amount was not made larger, because I feel that the time will soon come when the provinces will have to come again and ask for a further increase of these subsidies which at present are not sufficient to enable them to administer their many departments according to the needs of the time. I would have expected that this government, when enlarging the territory of Manitoba, and giving an increased subsidy to that province, would again have called a conference of the provinces to consider this question of the increase of subsidies together with many other questions in connection with the development of Canada. We have, as I said a moment ago, contributed very spontaneously and generously to any assistance that the west may have required in the past.

We are willing to-day or at any time to contribute for further railways, or for the construction of the Georgian Bay canal, for the great benefit of Ontario and the west. We shall tax ourselves with pleasure whenever any government may be disposed to impose on Canada any expenditure for our national development, which will contribute to the welfare of the people of the west as well as of the people of the east. Meanwhile right is right, and while we are willing always to be generous, we have at the same time to consider our own future.

A great deal has been said by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior about the province of Manitoba looking like a postage stamp on the map of the Dominion. New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island together are perhaps a still smaller postage stamp on the map of the Dominion. In the meantime, we are not less hopeful of the future; but it may be that such considerations will develop in the minds of the people of the maritime provinces a desire to state as forcibly as possible their position. We have contributed to the purchase of the territories which are now to be allotted to the largest and perhaps the wealthiest provinces of this Dominion. Those territories may become very valuable. If we are to believe half of what we are told in the reports on the resources of northern Ontario and of Ungava, the provinces of Ontario and Quebec will soon get the benefit of territories as wealthy as any portion of the Dominion. I believe that the people of the maritime provinces have not only a right to a fraction of the money which we paid as our contribution for the acquisition of those territories, but a right to share in some way or other in the benefits which will be derived from the development of those territories. Very recently the Premier of Quebec stated that the district of Ungava had immense lumber resources, water-powers and minerals. Therefore, we of the maritime provinces, with our postage stamp provinces, unable to expand, surrounded as we are by the sea and by other provinces, have a right to a portion of those benefits which will accrue to the province of Ontario, and Quebec from the development of those immense resources which are the pride of the country to-day. I believe that the present occasion should be taken advantage of to bring together the Premiers of the various provinces, with the right hon. the leader of the government, who represents at this moment the province of Nova Scotia, and the eloquent Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to whom I listened with pleasure last night, to see what can be done, to-day and not to-morrow, on behalf of the maritime provinces and the other provinces of this Dominion. I always listen with pleasure to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries even when he comes to my constituency to speak against me——

An hon. MEMBER. Without success.

Mr. TURGEON. Yes, without success. I admire his way of putting the case, and I believe he is convinced that the time has come for a conference of the Premiers of the provinces to settle many of the questions to which he has referred, such as the decreasing representation of the maritime provinces in this parliament from census to census. On this question my views have not always been similar to those expressed by the hon. minister and by the hon. member for St. John city (Mr. Pugsley). As I have said, I am a jealous admirer of the constitution, and at the risk even of losing something, I prefer to hold to the fundamental principles of the constitution. Meanwhile, just because at this moment there are divergent opinions as to what step should be taken by the maritime provinces on the question of representation, I say that it is imperative upon the Premiers of the various provinces to come together in order to see what can be done in that regard. I have held during my whole lifetime that it is better for us to stand by the terms of the constitution than to expose ourselves to the danger of tinkering with it. But a conference of the provincial Premiers is the only tribunal before which such a question could be placed to advantage, whatever their de-

cision might be; and if perchance they could not come to an agreement by which the representation of the maritime provinces should remain in statu quo, or be placed in the position in which it was at the time of confederation, the Premiers of the maritime provinces and the ministers representing those provinces in this government should insist on some financial return in order to place our local governments in a better position to develop their own resources, and thus keep our population at home and bring more population which would enable us to maintain and increase our representation. I have always held the view that just because we have not been in a position to develop our resources as they should be developed, we have not been able to keep the population that has been going away from year to year, until according to the last census the province of New Brunswick shows an increase of only 20,000—increase solely due to the French population.

I regret to see that in the southern counties of New Brunswick the English speaking people have year after year since confederation been drifting towards the New England States, and all on account of that want of development of our agricultural resources which would have kept the children of New Brunswick on their native soil. I support the amendment of my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley), because I feel the time has come for us to make a fresh start with greater vitality than has actuated us in the past; the time has come for better terms for the provinces and for improving the financial relations with the Dominion of the provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. I have many a time advocated in this House greater transportation facilities for the maritime provinces, and I have advocated the construction of a tunnel between Prince Edward Island and the mainland so as to place the population of that fertile island on the same footing as the people of the rest of the Dominion, thus giving greater opportunities to the young men of Prince Edward Island to stay at home on their fertile soil which is capable of sustaining a population of 300,000, and which now, I regret to say, has a population of only 93,000. I congratulate the Minister of Railways on promising to establish a car-ferry service between the mainland and the island, but I still believe that the construction of a tunnel, even though we should have to make large sacrifices, would be far more advantageous to the people of the island, and would not in the course of years be any greater burden on our resources. Though I am sure the Minister of Railways will keep his promise with regard to the car-ferry service, I hope to see the day when that tunnel will be constructed. Then again, the question of the representation of the maritime provinces in this parliament must be dealt with, and when we consider that these provinces are decreasing in influence decade after decade in this parliament, it is a matter which must be regretted by every member of this House. Then again, I believe that Newfoundland should be brought into the Canadian union. It may be that the leading statesmen of Newfoundland will not to-day entertain the idea of uniting with the people of Canada, but there was a time when the stand taken by Newfoundland towards the Dominion was very different, and there may grow up in time to come a feeling in that ancient colony for union with our confederacy. We must not forget that at confederation Newfoundland offered her vast natural resources in agriculture, in lumber, in minerals and in fisheries, to the Dominion, and that unfortunately this offer was not accepted on the terms proposed. Then again in 1895, when the government of Newfoundland came to Ottawa and again offered the resources of their colony to the Dominion, for the sake of a paltry half-million dollars they were permitted to go back without their offer being accepted, and again another fatal mistake was made by us. Let us not forget that Canada can never become a great nation, unless there is included within the confederation the ancient colony of Newfoundland which occupies such a splendid strategic position at the entrance to the Gulf of St. Lawrence. I trust this government will make every reasonable effort to induce Newfoundland to cast in her lot with us. Perhaps there is an opportunity now that we are inaugurating a naval service for asking Newfoundland to join with us. The Minister of the Naval Service has told us recently that the navy such as we have it to-day will remain, and that until he can confer with the admiralty during the vacation the vessels would be used in the fishery protection service. I trust that after the hon. gentleman does confer with the British authorities, he will return to Canada and be able to announce a naval policy in the interests of the Dominion and of the empire.

But I take advantage of this opportunity to say also that before the hon. gentleman goes to Great Britain, before he confers with the British Admiralty in order to effect a change in the naval system of the late government, which was adopted after a consultation with the British Admiralty and on their advice a year or two ago—although I have no objection to further consultation with and further advice from, the naval authorities in London—would it not be proper for him to listen to my suggestion this even-

ing? Then when he goes to London he will be able to say that he is acting after a conference with the representatives of Newfoundland, the representatives of that great British colony—perhaps the most British colony under the Union Jack where no doubt as to loyalty can be said to exist. For I am sure if he has to establish any naval service at all which would be valuable to Canada and to the empire on the Atlantic coast, the same would also be serviceable to the island of Newfoundland, and would save that colony the large amount of money which she has to pay for the protection of her coasts. The concurrence of Newfoundland would be a most valuable factor. There is no doubt that the union of Newfoundland with Canada is about to come. It is her ultimate destiny, and while the movement for confederation is not a popular one at present in that island, still I have faith that if Canada persists in the policy of conciliation towards Newfoundland that desirable result will yet be accomplished. It behoves Canada, however, to make the first step towards union. The occasion is opportune on the creation of a navy, or the creation of a system, the details of which are not known to us, but which must be made efficient in the interests of Canada and Newfoundland, as well as of the British Empire as a whole. At such a time would it not be well to unite with Newfoundland and take advantage of the fine strategic position of that island lying as it does at the very gateway of the northern part of the continent. I have already said that I have always been a zealous admirer of the constitution. I heard with pleasure the leader of the government speak last night of the harmonious feeling which exists in the province of Nova Scotia, where there are no statutory separate school systems, but where every child in the province enjoys the system of education there on a footing of equality. Let me say that I commend this spirit of harmony which prevails in Nova Scotia, and which also prevails in the province of New Brunswick. In the latter province we at one time thought we enjoyed a separate school system which was statutory, so strong was our faith in the legality of that school system at that time. The leader of the government will admit that the harmony which may prevail in any one or two provinces in regard to school matters does not curtail a constitutional right with respect to schools possessed by any section of people in other provinces. Therefore, it is not merely on the fact that a spirit of harmony exists in the maritime provinces that we should build up our hopes for the future. It is well known that the fathers of confederation had intended to give the maritime provinces separate schools the same as in Ontario and Quebec, but we did not get them. The words 'by law' having been introduced into the Act of Confederation, with respect to the school system, it was found that our schools, although they were advantageous did not give us the rights we thought we possessed. Those rights, it seems, were enjoyed by practice but not by law. The troubles of the past in New Brunswick in regard to the school question are well known. I have taken an active part in public life myself and participated in these troubles; and it is on that account, as I said a while ago, that I have learned to admire the constitution. We found ourselves by the decision of the Privy Council confirming the judgment of the supreme court of New Brunswick, in this position: We did not have separate schools by law, and the privileges we had been enjoying were only given to us by practice. If you consider the settlement which was made in regard to the province of Manitoba, you will see how very carefully that great statesman Sir John A. Macdonald acted at that time. By reason of his experience of the situation in New Brunswick he was careful in framing the constitution for Manitoba to insert into the constitution the words 'by law or by practice,' hoping therefore to avoid in the case of the minority in Manitoba the troubles which had arisen in the province of New Brunswick. Again contrary to the interpretation of the law it was once more found that in that western territory, including the province of Manitoba, there did not legally exist separate schools, and therefore it was left to the local legislature of the new province to enact whatever statute it might see fit in regard to education. But it is well known that a system of separate schools, which was agreeable to the majority as well as to the minority, was introduced by an Act of the legislature itself in 1871, and the educational grant was divided according to population, one half going to the Catholic minority and the other half to the Protestant majority. I have always heard the school question in the province of Manitoba spoken of as the trouble of 1896, but that trouble really developed in 1890, when the legislature passed an Act which annulled the preceding law, and therefore cancelled the enjoyment by the minority of the privileges which they had exercised up to that time with regard to the separate schools.

It was in 1890 that the trouble began. And in my opinion, and in the opinion of those who have been consistent in this line the government of Canada at that time should have refused the Royal assent to this measure of the Manitoba legisla-

ture and, instead of making that law operative, should have sent it back to the legislature of Manitoba. Then, had the province of Manitoba taken the thing up and gone from court to court, the Act of 1871 would have been in force and the separate schools would have remained. After five or six years of agitation, the Remedial Bill was brought in. But the Bill was not in compliance with the order of the Privy Council. The appeal which was made and which ultimately reached the Privy Council was based on the ground that the Manitoba legislature had refused to provide money for the support of separate schools in that province. The judgment of the Supreme Court was to the effect that money should be provided for the schools of the minority according to the law of the province previous to 1890. That Act was not ultra vires, but it was defective in the sense that it did not give the money necessary for the separate schools, and without such moneys it was impossible to maintain those schools. In the province of New Brunswick during the period of agitation to which I have referred, while we were awaiting the decision of the Privy Council, the minority endeavoured to keep our schools notwithstanding. But after a few months, everybody saw that it would be impossible for the minority to keep their schools on an equality with the public schools which enjoyed grants of public money. And the same thing would have happened in the province of Manitoba. When I say that the Remedial Bill was not in compliance with the order of the Privy Council perhaps I may be allowed to read a few words of that judgment—page 127:

> The schools before 1890 received their proportionate share of the money contributed for school purposes out of the general taxation of the province, and the money raised for these purposes by local assessments was, so far as it fell upon Catholics, applied only towards the support of Catholic schools.
>
> What is the position of the Roman Catholic minority under the Act of 1890. Schools of their own denomination, conducted according to their views, will receive no aid from the State. They must depend entirely for their support upon the contribution of the Roman Catholic community, while the taxes out of which the States aid is granted to the schools provided for by the Statute fall alike on Catholic and Protestant. Moreover, while the Catholic inhabitants remain liable to local assessments for school purposes, the proceeds of that assessment are no longer destined to any extent for the support of Catholic schools, but afford the means of maintaining schools which they regard as more suitable for the education of Catholic children than if they were distinctly Protestant in their character.

This is the basis upon which the judgment of the Privy Council suggested that the government of Canada should provide a Remedial Bill. And what did this Bill provide as it was laid before the House? The first provision was to strike off the appropriation of money for the assistance of schools that the government offered to give the Catholic minority of Manitoba. This Remedial Bill was opposed by the leader of the opposition of that time, the hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who leads this opposition to-day. It has been said all over the country that the Remedial Bill should have been accepted by the chief of the opposition, and that in refusing to accept it he had failed to do his duty towards the Catholic people of Manitoba. A great agitation, of which I need not speak further, has been made against him in Quebec and elsewhere. Speaking as a member of the Catholic minority, and as one of the French people, though not of the province of Quebec, I say it was great statesmanship on the part of the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to refuse the Bill that was offered. And my reason for saying so is that this Bill did not contain the means necessary for the support of the separate schools. I was a candidate in 1896, and explained my position to the Catholic minority in New Brunswick and to the French Acadians of the county from which I come. I took my stand chiefly upon the very fact that the schools offered by the Remedial Bill were not in a position to be maintained, and for that reason the Remedial Bill of 1896 was not worth the paper it was written on. We had had the experience years before in New Brunswick that schools could not be supported without a share of public money. If the Remedial Bill had been accepted, and if an attempt had been made to put it into operation in Manitoba, it would have been a great misfortune for the Catholics in that province. For it would have been impossible to maintain their schools upon it, and word would have gone abroad that the Catholic people were not the kind of people to maintain their schools. Is it necessary for me to show the correctness of what I state? I do not believe it is necessary for me to weary the House with reading the provisions of the Bill. But let me say that the Hon. Mr. Dickey in presenting that measure in the House in 1896, declared that the portion which referred to the public money would be eliminated and that that matter would be left in the future, to the good-will of the province. And this notwithstanding the fact that it was on the ground that the province of Manitoba had refused to assist in any way, the schools of the minority

that the agitation for a Remedial Bill had arisen. We know from speeches delivered in 1896 by members of the then government, between the dissolution of parliament and the elections in June, that they would not give a cent of the public money towards the support of these separate schools, that the supporters of such schools would have to keep them in an efficient state or they would be closed. Therefore, the more this question is considered by any Canadian, no matter from what province he may come, the more thankful he must feel towards Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the settlement which he brought about. It has been said on many occasions that when the history of Canada comes to be written, a black mark will be placed against the name of Laurier because he did not accept that Remedial Bill and thus deprived the Catholic minority in Manitoba of their rights and justice. I believe that when our history is really written, when impartiality has succeeded to sentiment, it will be proven to the country at large to Canada, and to the British Empire, that there has been no greater act of statesmanship in the history of Canada than the position taken on that question by Sir Wilfrid Laurier . In view of all these considerations, in view of the agitation which may occur in future, owing to grievances of any part of the population, even although those grievances may not be, and I hope will not be always religious, now while we are forming these new provinces, while we are allotting to them immense territories, with immense possibilities for the future, we should decidedly accept the amendment of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) in order that time may be given for further consideration.

There is one other reason which I wish to give. In to-day's papers I see it stated that the addition of the district of Ungava to the province of Quebec, would not affect the unit of population for the future, that the population of Quebec as at present constituted, would be the pivot of our representation, but if correctly reported, Premier Gouin to-day or yesterday stated in the legislature of Quebec that the district of Ungava would be given in the future additional representatives beyond the 65 representatives of the province of Quebec, as it is to-day. I hope he has been misrepresented, but still while there are such rumours I feel that we would be only the more prudent and should insist on adopting the amendment of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) in order to give both the government and the members representing the maritime provinces, time to come to some understanding, bearing in mind the possibility of the entrance into the Confederation of Newfoundland, which after all, might be the best strength that could be given to the maritime provinces, owing to the harmony of feeling between the people and the similarity in resources.

Mr. MOLLOY. Coming as I do from the province of Manitoba and voting as I do against this Bill I think it only fair to my constituents and to this House that I should explain the reason for my course. This question last came before the House in the closing session of the last parliament on an amendment to the motion for Supply moved by the then member for Winnipeg (Mr. Haggart). As that was a vote of want of confidence in the government, I voted against the amendment of the then member for Winnipeg and for doing so I received a certain amount of abuse, I was called a traitor to the province of Manitoba. I was not a traitor to the province of Manitoba. I love Manitoba better than any other province in the confederacy of Canada. I was not born in that province but I was taken there many years ago and my length of residence in Manitoba is greater than that of any other member of this House coming from that province, and anything I may be able to do to assist towards the advancement of Manitoba I would very gladly do.

The boundary question first came into prominence in Manitoba politics in 1905. In that year there was a by-election in the constituency of Mountain owing to the resignation of Mr. Greenway who had been elected to the House of Commons. In that by-election the Conservative candidate was elected by means which could not be defended by everybody. The boundary was made the main issue by the Roblin government. To show its effect in the constituency of Mountain I may say that the gentleman who was elected at the by-election in 1905, against the same Liberal candidate who opposed him in the general election of 1907 the Liberal candidate received the largest majority of any man elected to the legislature in that year. It was again the issue in 1907. I was a candidate in the election of 1907. The Premier of Manitoba said it was a paramount issue. He made many speeches including one notable speech at Carman, on the day of his nomination. He said it was the only issue. With that those of us who were opposed to the Roblin government at that time did not agree.

It was fought out largely on that issue. Mr. Roblin told the people of Manitoba that he would stand by his claim on behalf of his government and that he would not accept anything short of it. He told the people of Manitoba that if any other man than my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) had been at the head of affairs in this country Manitoba would have been justly dealt with. I did not believe that then and I do not believe it now. I have felt con-

vinced, ever since this session opened, that two things would happen; in the first place, that Manitoba would not receive such fair treatment from this government as it would have received from the government of my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition, and second, that the minority in the province of Manitoba would, to use an expression, get tomahawked at the hands of this government. There were some things that were upheld and advocated by Mr. Roblin in the province of Manitoba during the election of 1907. I say that he misled the people of Manitoba with regard to this settlement that he has made. Among other things Mr. Roblin, speaking of the boundary and speaking of the treatment which he was receiving from the then government, said:

I stated at the conference, and I repeat here tonight, that neither Ontario on the one hand nor Saskatchewan on the other have any right either by law or in equity to adjudicate or arbitrate as to what portion of the territory to the north and east Manitoba should have. I say in law, and in making this statement I understand that at once a constitutional question is raised, and I am prepared if Sir Wilfrid Laurier dares undertake to take from us that portion of Keewatin lying north of Albany river, and which was included in the Act of 1881, and which has not yet been repealed—I say, if Sir Wilfried Laurier undertakes to deal with that I shall resist it with all the power and all the influence that a united people with a just cause can exercise and command.

A very lofty sentiment.

I will go to the foot of the Throne where justice is always secured and there I believe—I know—that we will get what is ours; we will get what Sir Wilfrid has invited Ontario to claim and which she is ashamed of herself, and thus get at least a portion of the territory he would propose to give to another province.

As a matter of fact, he has not received that territory, and he has not only not received that territory, but he had accepted a great deal less. He has accepted less than that which was offered by the members of the former government in 1908. Speaking at the same meeting he said further on:

We are asking for a territory that Ontario never asked for; no public man in Ontario ever thought of asking for it, because constitutionally they had barred their claim to this particular territory. Sir Wilfrid, however, cunning and designing in his methods of operation to thwart the will of Manitoba invited this province which has no right or interest there to make a claim and they have done so (applause). Now, you say, why cannot you succeed as Sir Oliver Mowat has done? We can and will, if the people of Manitoba stand behind me.

Well, the people of Manitoba supported the Roblin government in 1907, there were thirteen oppositionists elected. In the general election of 1911, there were thirteen oppositionists elected; so that the people of Manitoba evidently were behind the Premier of that province, and still he has accepted much less than he told the people he would accept. He also said on that same day, speaking with reference to the claims that the province of Saskatchewan was making:

Why do I mention Saskatchewan? I will give you a reason. It is one that will carry conviction to the hearts and consciences of every true Manitoban in this province. When we met in conference at Ottawa as I have said, after I had stated my case and after Mr. Whitney had made his pretensions of a claim, knowing he had nothing he could make any argument on, because there was no argument to be made.

That is what Mr. Roblin said in 1907. However, times have changed. The then Minister of Public Works in the Manitoba government is now in Ottawa, and a member of the present government. He is a strong and influential man—there is no question about that— but he sits beside a man who is also strong and influential, a member of the same Cabinet, and that gentleman is from the province of Ontario. After all the trouble they raised about the boundaries as laid down by the Laurier government in 1908, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) a member of the government of Ontario, made a claim on behalf of that province, and in order to satisfy the wishes of Ontario it was considered necessary by the government to accede to the demands of that hon. gentleman. What is the situation to-day? Here is the old province of Manitoba, here is a portion of the added territory, the northerly portion of which is divided by the Churchill river, and in comes the province of Ontario in the form of a strip five miles wide running from one side of the province of Manitoba to the Nelson river. I wonder what the Premier of Ontario would have said if the government of Manitoba, whether Liberal or Conservative, with the endorsation and assistance of the government of Canada that was in power prior to the 21st of September, had asked the government of Ontario to concede a strip of territory five miles in width running easterly from the Manitoba boundary through the province of Ontario. I wonder what Mr. Whitney would have said, and when Mr. Whitney says 'no' he is given credit for meaning just exactly what he says. But our representatives in the Cabinet, and there are two from Manitoba, have consented to a bargain which is nothing but a jumble on the very face of it. Not only have they given Ontario a roadbed through the province of Manitoba for no reason whatso-

ever, but along with that they have given Ontario some other things as well. In the Ontario legislature the other day members of the opposition found fault with the little that Ontario had received from the bargain that is about to be made. Mr. Hearst in reply said regarding the strip of territory that is given to Ontario from the Manitoba boundary to the Nelson river:

The Minister of Lands, Forests and Mines, proceeded to point out the advantages Ontario would receive under this arrangement to secure access to Port Nelson. The five-mile strip of the river gave a ten-mile frontage on the south shore and the best shore.

Ten of the best miles on the river will be Ontario's said Mr. Hearst. 'Ten miles frontage on that harbour means that Ontario will own the townsite there if ever it becomes a real harbour.

That statement was received with applause, and no wonder. What I particularly want to point out is that the government of the province of Manitoba would not accept any settlement offered by the Laurier government for the simple reason that it would not pay them politically to do so. They made a football of the Manitoba boundary during the Manitoba campaign on two occasions. They find now that they are about at the end of their tether, and they are willing to act in defiance of the speech made by the now Secretary of State, (Mr. Roche), in 1908, and sitting in the gallery at that time before I had become a member of this House, I heard that hon. gentleman claim just as Mr. Roblin had done, that under the decision of the Privy Council in 1884, Manitoba was entitled to every foot of that territory known as Keewatin north of the Albany river.

Now, they come back and after all, they accept less from this government than they were willing to accept from the Laurier government on any consideration. Of course, they had no intention of accepting any terms offered by the Liberal government, because they thought it was good policy—and I regret to say that the result shows it was—to hamper the Liberal government in every way and to prevent a settlement so far as they could. However, these things all come to an end, and the Roblin government cannot work that game much longer. What the Roblin government will do for a policy, now that they are going to get rid of the boundary question, I really do not know. I am sure they will not appeal to the country on their telephone policy, or on their Manitoba elevator policy, or on the Manitoba land deals on the part of the Roblin government, or on their administration of justice in Manitoba. Well, perhaps they may go to the people on their God-fearing and saintly record as a government for the last twelve or thirteen years. As to the financial terms offered to Manitoba by this Bill, I contend that the province will not be as well off, when the swamp lands are given back to the Dominion, as it was before. The province of Manitoba receives under this legislation, an increase on debt account amounting to $202,637 a year; on land account amounting to $313,270; and the interest on the bulk sum given to the province will amount to $119,013. Along with the boundaries offered by the Laurier government, they were offered by that government a yearly grant of $200,000, and the items I have mentioned above under this present proposal, amount to about $634,000 a year. The $200,000 which would have gone with the boundaries, (plus the strip that Ontario has received), would amount in toto to about $434,000 a year more in cash than was offered by the Liberal government. Now, the statement made by the Hon. Hugh Armstrong, Provincial Treasurer, in Winnipeg last year, will give an idea of what the government of Manitoba valued the swamp lands at. The statement of Mr. Armstrong was made on the 22nd of February, 1910, and is reported in the Winnipeg 'Telegram,' of the 23rd of February, 1910. Accounting for the assets of the province, he made this statement:

Provincial lands, 1,425,712 acres; valued at $3 an acre, and amounting to $4,277,136; swanp lands to be turned over by Dominion government 4,000,000 acres.

It has since been estimated to be more, but we will accept the statement of Mr. Armstrong. At $3 per acre, that would amount to $12,000,000 and plus the one million odd acres sold, it would mean a cash value of $16,000,000 which capitalized at 5 per cent., would amount to $800,000 a year. That would be the condition if they had retained control of the swamp lands. Now, as against that, they receive a cash subsidy of $434,000 a year better than the Laurier government offered. But they give back to the Dominion the swamp lands of the province, which would mean, if capitalized at 5 per cent, $800,000 a year. But, the argument is made that Manitoba will get back the swamp lands. Well, perhaps she will and perhaps she will not. The people of Manitoba have no guarantee that the swamp lands will ever be returned and those who believe that they will not have just as much right for their belief as those who believe to the contrary. My own opinion is that the swamp lands will probably be retained by the Dominion and be administered by the Department of the Interior. Therefore, I say that the financial arrangements as proposed in this Bill are not in the interests of Manitoba. If the swamp lands had remained in the province of course the other terms offered here would be very much to her advant-

age. It was but a short time ago that gentlemen opposite were advocating: 'what we have we'll hold.' Let me ask why did not the province of Manitoba retain her swamp lands when she had them? It is my belief that it would be far easier to retain possession of these lands than to ever get them back again. There were over 8,000,000 acres of swamp lands, and at a valuation of $4 an acre they would amount to $32,000,000. According to the statement of the Provincial Treasurer of Manitoba, the lands which were sold were sold at an average price of $5.48 per acre, amounting in all, for the year to $515,298. Last year the statement of the sale of lands alone, outside of subsidies received from other quarters, is as follows:

First payment on land sold..	$ 43,383
Deferred payments..	289,728
Timber dues, &c..	16,167
Interest on deferred payments.	166,319

In eight years the province of Manitoba had received from the interest on deferred payments alone, $923,692 and a great part of these were swamp lands. The most damaging feature in connection with the swamp lands is this: the swamp lands will now become the property of the Dominion, and as a consequence the drainage will not be done which otherwise would. I call the attention of the Minister of the Interior to the fact that on the fourth of March, 1910, he moved a resolution to the effect that in the opinion of the government of Manitoba it was in the interest of the province that the Dominion should at once turn over to the province the swamp lands so that they could be made into drainage districts. In that way the lands would be drained and they would find more ready sale, and the lands of the settlers adjoining would receive the benefit from the drainage which would have been done. I think that was a very sensible way to go about it, because when the lands were turned over to the province then not only the swamp lands themselves but the other provincial lands and the lands of the settlers would come under one drainage district and everybody would be benefited. In support of the policy then advocated by the provincial government with respect to swamp lands, I quote no less an authority than the Winnipeg 'Telegram' which is the official organ of the Roblin government in Manitoba. On April 5, 1911, the Winnipeg 'Telegram' said in a plainly inspired article:

> Under the settlement of the boundary question proposed by Mr. Oliver, 8,000,000 acres of swamp land would likely be transferred to the province. The importance of this assurance contained in Mr. Oliver's communication can hardly be overestimated for it presents the Dominion government's proposal in an altogether different light. The recent communication from the Dominion government, setting forth the terms under which it would agree to the enlargement of Manitoba's boundaries made no reference to this immense acreage of swamp land which it is proposed to donate to Manitoba, and, the concession of 8,000,000 acres of swamp land is infinitely more important than the cash compensation offered for the surrender of the public domain in the added territory.

It was of infinitely more value than the cash offer of $434,000 better than was offered by the previous government. I may say that the swamp lands were estimated by the late Mr. Young to be 8,232,831 acres at $3 an acre, which, capitalized at 5 per cent, would give an income of $1,234,964. I admit that it would naturally cost the government of Manitoba something to drain that land, and something to put it on the market, but little compared with the value received for it.

We have been told time and again that with the advent to power of the Conservative government the prairie provinces would be given their natural resources. Hon. gentlemen opposite say, we have not had time. There is reason and justice in that statement; but I believe that many moons will pass before the natural resources of the prairie provinces are handed over to them by this government, if it is ever done.

Another question which I want to deal with is the school question, or the rights of the minority of the province of Manitoba and in the territory which is to be added to the province of Manitoba. I listened with great attention to the statements made by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), who is known as a lawyer of high standing in this country, in which statement he tried to justify the action of this government in ignoring those rights. I believe, and I do not care how many authorities are brought forward, that the minority in the province of Manitoba are and have been suffering from a grievance for the last twenty years, and they are determined, and justly so, if it lies in their power, that this shall come to an end. I cast my first vote on the 15th of January, 1896, though I was a Liberal then, as I am a Liberal now, and I voted for the present Conservative member for the county of Emmerson. My second vote I cast on the 23rd of June, 1896, and I cast it for the gentleman who is now Senator Larivière from the province of Manitoba. I have been consistent on this question, and I propose to stand out for the rights of those who are suffering from a grievance, and at some time this government or some other government will have to reckon with those people and with their co-religionists throughout this entire coun-

try. I say they have been unfairly treated for political reasons and political reasons only. Just as the Roblin government made a football of the boundary question for political reasons, so the Liberal government of Manitoba in 1890 made a football of the school question for their own political purposes.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Will the hon. gentleman move an amendment to force the province of Manitoba to recognize the rights of the minority of which he is speaking?

Mr. MOLLOY. Will the hon. gentleman vote for it if I move it?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I have voted already for the Bill as it stands.

Mr. MOLLOY. I say I have been consistent on this question. It originated as a result of the Act of 1890 abolishing separate schools in the province of Manitoba which the Liberal government then in power in that province put in force because they believed that the majority of the people in the province, being other than Roman Catholic, would support them, and they did so. Then the Tupper government, at the very last moment, tried to pass the remedial order, thinking that the people of this country would support them, but they refused to do so. As far as I am concerned, I have voted for the Conservative party on this question because I believed they were right, and I will vote for them again if they give relief to the Roman Catholic minority in the province of Manitoba, and particularly in the territory where they are entitled to that relief.

The statement of the Minister of Public Works rather nonplussed me for the time being, when he said that the district of Keewatin did not come under the Act of 1875. I believe that it does come under that Act, for the following reasons:

The district of Keewatin was created as a separate entity by Chap. 21 of the Statutes of Canada, 1876, and by section 9, thereof it was provided that:

All laws in force in the said district as part of the Northwest Territories, at the time of the coming into force of this Act, and not hereby repealed, shall, so far as they are consistent with the 'The British North America Act, 1867,' with the terms and conditions of the admission of Rupert's Land and the Northwest Territories into the Union, approved of by the Queen, under the one hundred and forty-sixth section thereof, and with any Act of the parliament of Canada relating to the Northwest Territories then in force, and with this Act, remain in force in the said district until repealed or altered by the parliament of Canada, or by the Governor in Council, or the Lieutenant Governor and his Council, under this Act, as shall also any order of the Governor in Council made under any Act mentioned in the second section of this Act, until repealed, or altered, as it may be, under this Act.

It was also provided that the Governor in Council at any time by a proclamation, should have the right to re-annex the same to the Northwest Territories and when so done, this particular territory should be subject to the same government and laws as that part of the territories to which it was to be re-annexed. This is provided for in the latter portion of section 1, which is as follows:

Provided always that the Governor in Council may, by proclamation published in the 'Canada Gazette,' at any time when it may appear to the public advantage so to do, detach any portion of the said district from the same, and re-annex it to that part of the Northwest Territories not included in the said district; and the portion so detached shall then be subject to the same government and laws as that part of the said territories to which it is re-annexed.

Therefore, at this date clearly the provisions of section 10 of the Educational Act of 1875 were applicable to Keewatin as well as to any or all the other portions of the Northwest Territories. Things remained in this condition until the creation of the new provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, when a new Act was passed regarding the Northwest Territories, known as chapter 27 of the Statutes of 1905, which, while assented to on the 20th of July, 1905 by section 15 of the Act. did not come into force until the last day of September, 1905, and by section 3 of this Act, the Northwest Territories were defined as follows:

The Northwest Territories shall hereafter comprise the territories formerly known as Rupert's Land and the Northwestern Territory, except such portions thereof as form the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, the district of Keewatin and the Yukon Territory, together with all British territories and possessions in North America and all islands adjacent to any such territories or possessions except the colony of Newfoundland and its dependencies.

It will be seen that Keewatin was not included as a portion of the Northwest Territories, but for the time being remained a separate district, but by an order in council passed on the 24th day of July, 1905 under the provisions of section 1 of the statutes of 1876, hereinbefore quoted, it was re-annexed to and became a portion of the Northwest Territories, to take effect on, from and after the first day of September, 1905, which order in council is as follows:—

By proclamation dated 24th July, 1905, under the provisions of the Act, chapter fifty-three of the Revised Statutes of Canada, commonly known as the Keewatin Act, the

whole district of Keewatin was annexed to that part of the Northwest Territories not included in the said district, on, from and after the first day of September in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and five.

It will therefore be seen that on the 1st day of September, Keewatin became a portion of the Northwest Territories.

Mr. AIKINS. Under the Keewatin statute, I think it was of 1876, provision was made that a portion of Keewatin might be detached and added to the territories. What portion of Keewatin was detached and added to the territories by the proclamation?

Mr. MOLLOY. The whole of it came back.

Mr. AIKINS. The whole of it was attached to the Northwest Territories? Under what authority was the whole of it detached?

Mr. MOLLOY. I cannot follow the hon. gentleman. It will therefore be seen that under the provisions of the Act of 1876, by a provision which in no way is contrary to the provisions of the Northwest Territories Act of 1905, because both the Act and the order in council were to take effect on the same dates, this condition of affairs was recognized and ratified when the statutes were revised in 1906, as will be found by chapter 62, section 2, subsection (a), which is as follows:—

'Territories' means the Northwest Territories which comprise the territories formerly known as Rupert's land and the Northwestern Territory, except such portions thereof as form the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta and the Yukon Territory, together with all British territories and possessions in North America and all islands adjacent thereto, not included within any province, except the colony of Newfoundland and its dependencies.

Therefore, without any question, whatever rights were granted the minority by section 10 of the Act of 1875 went to Keewatin when it was separated from the rest of the territories in 1876, and remained an inherent right of the people down to the first day of September, 1905, when it was again re-annexed and became a portion of the Northwest Territories, and all of these rights whatever they may be, must necessarily exist at present.

That is to say the district of Keewatin comes under the Act of 1875 and section 10 of that Act guarantees to the minority, Protestants or Roman Catholics, the right to establish separate schools, and only to be taxed for the maintenance of such schools whether they be Catholic or Protestant. It is only fair and just that it should be so. With the constitutional aspect of the question, I am not going to deal, because I am not a lawyer, but I know the stand of the Roman Catholics in the province of Manitoba on the question, particularly in the city of Winnipeg, and it is their purpose and intention as representing the entire Catholic population, to lay before this government shortly their claims to right and justice in this matter, and I think it would be just as well for the government, knowing, as they must know that intention, to show a little less haste in trying to put this Bill through parliament. I might also say that I have here the Northwest 'Review,' which is the organ of the English speaking Catholics of Manitoba, and in its last issue on March 2, speaking of this question, it goes on to say as follows:

We will not now discuss the constitutional powers of the province of Manitoba in educational matters, but what we do know is that the new territory which is to be added to the province of Manitoba has constitutional rights which neither the government at Ottawa nor that of Manitoba can ignore with impunity. To leave the settlement of our school troubles to the province of Manitoba is sheer nonsense.

The hon. Postmaster General lays considerable stress upon the fact that they will address Mr. Roblin in this matter. But the Catholics of Manitoba have made up their minds that they expect relief, and they do not expect to get that relief from any other source than from this government, they certainly do not expect it from the government of Manitoba:

The treatment that has been meted out to us in the last 22 years at the hands of this or that political party in Manitoba is guarantee enough that the future holds very little for us. When one party is willing to enact legislation to restore our Catholic schools, invariably the other party refuses to fall in line, and the efforts and good will of the first are thereby paralysed.

I say it is in the interest of peace and harmony in this country that this question should be settled, as was the opinion of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce in the great speech he delivered in this House in March, 1896, when, in closing, he said:

Let us do justice to a weak and patient minority.

As pointed out by the paper from which I have quoted, which represents English speaking Catholics in the west, this question has been a matter of agitation for 22 years, and it is about time in the opinion of the Catholics of Manitoba that they should get relief from some quarter. There is another feature which should be explained and it is this: The Catholics of the northwest have been led to believe that they would obtain relief from the

federal government in Ottawa whenever a change of government took place. Ninety per cent of the Roman Catholics in that province, and I think I am well within the mark in making that statement, have on this ground voted in support of the Conservative party.

An hon. MEMBER. Whom do you represent?

Mr. MOLLOY. I represent the other ten per cent. The Conservative party in Manitoba in the provincial, as well as in the federal elections, have received the almost undivided support of the Roman Catholic electorate. There are gentlemen who sat in the last parliament, as well as in the previous one, who would not have had the honour of sitting here had it not been for the vote of the Roman Catholic electors. In order to establish that a large percentage of the Roman Catholic electors have been voting for the Conservative party in the interest of separate schools I will quote from 'Les Cloches de St. Boniface,' the official organ of His Grace Archbishop Langevin. The statement in question appears in the Winnipeg 'Free Press' of September 4, 1911, and reproduces the views of 'Les Cloches.' Let me say before reading the quotation that the Roblin government have succeeded during the last eight or ten years in attracting to itself the undivided support not only of the Roman Catholic electorate but of that particular body known as the Loyal Orange Society, and in that way have continued to hold power.

FROM ST. BONIFACE SOUNDS THE TOCSIN.

Every Catholic of French Tongue bound to support Conservative Candidate.

The current issue of 'Les Cloches de St. Boniface' which bears on every issue the archiepiscopal coat of arms and the announcement that it is the official organ of the archdiocese, has the following in the current issue under the heading: "The Election in the County of Provencher":—

Mr. J. A. F. Bleau, mayor of the city of St. Boniface, seeks the votes of the electors of the county of Provencher in the federal election of September 21. We do not hesitate to declare that every Catholic of French tongue, anxious for our school rights, is in honour bound to support his candidate.

Commenting upon the result of the general election of October 26, 1908, 'Les Cloches' made the following remarks, and they have lost nothing of their aptness and their justice:—

'The result of this election has been a majority of about 50 for the Liberal government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

'The county of Provencher has elected a Liberal and an Irish Catholic.

'The French-Canadians who did not vote for the Hon. Mr. Larivière have forgotten the pact made upon the organization of the electoral divisions here which assured to the French-Canadians the election of one of their own race. They have forgotten, also, that it was the Liberal government which in 1890 abolished the official use of the French language. Catholics who voted for Mr. Larivière forgot that it was the Liberal Greenway government which took from us our schools in 1890, that it was Sir Wilfrid Laurier, head of the Liberal party at Ottawa, who opposed, in 1896, the Remedial Bill, establishing the principles of separate schools and presented to the House by the Grand Orange Master, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, that it was the same Sir Wilfrid Laurier who in 1905 did not have the courage to concede all our school-rights, especially the right of the confessional school, guaranteed by the constitution, in Saskatchewan and Alberta, that the so-called final Laurier-Greenway settlement of 1896 gives us none of our former school-rights from the Catholic standpoint, although it gives us a portion of our rights to the French language, placing us, however—us, the first occupants of this country—on the same footing as all other settlers speaking a language other than English. These are incontestable facts, which one may try to weaken or explain, but which remain absolutely true and which many know without appearing to be at all disturbed.

'There is no doubt that in the present contest the county of Provencher will be able to recover itself and to regain the position lost in 1908. This county belongs by right to the French-Canadians and to the French Métis, who form the majority and who must inwardly desire to be represented by one of their own race and not by a man who is a stranger to their nationality, and to their language. May the regard for superior interests and for patriotism win the day over the blind party spirit, and may all the French-speaking electors in the county of Provencher contribute by their votes to assure themselves a Catholic and French-Speaking member.'

I am sure that will satisfy anybody as to the direction in which it was thought advisable that the Catholic vote should go in the province of Manitoba, and especially in the constituency of Provencher. Now, we shall see whether they will receive more from the gentlemen who are in power here, and from those who have been kept in power in Manitoba for the last ten or twelve years by this same vote. This is not a political question—or should not be. I am going to support the man and the measure which will give to the minority in Manitoba that to which they are entitled—and they are asking nothing more—as guaranteed them by the constitution. And if it has come to this, that a religious body, in order to receive justice, must be in the majority, there is something wrong with the existing state of things. In Manitoba the separate schools were taken away,—and let them say of those schools what they will; there was no need to abolish the separate school system in Manitoba; if that system was not

right, it could be reformed. And I say I will give my support only to that man and that measure, which will restore to the Catholics of Manitoba and the territory to be annexed to Manitoba, the rights which they formerly enjoyed. And beyond any question of doubt, the Catholics have a greater right to separate schools in this added territory even than in the old province of Manitoba. I hope the government will see their way clear to secure for these people the rights to which they are entitled as clearly as the Catholics of Ontario are entitled to the rights which nobody would deny them, as are also the Protestants of Quebec. I remember hearing the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) state in his first speech this session, that it was no disgrace to a man to have gone down with the good cause in 1896. If it was a good cause in 1896, it is a better cause to-day. On behalf of the Catholics of Manitoba being the only Catholic in parliament, from that province, I claim for them these rights to which they are entitled. And the day will come when their rights will be given to them, whether the government of that day be Conservative or Liberal. And we will thank nobody for it, because we are asking only for that to which we are entitled.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is neither my purpose nor my desire to take up the time of the House at great length. But this Bill is of such far reaching consequence, that I think it my duty as representing a constituency of eastern Canada to offer some observations with respect to it. While the title of the Bill is: 'An Act to provide for the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba,' the Bill is not confined either in its provisions or in its consequences, to one particular province. It is so far-reaching that it certainly affects every province in eastern Canada.

Shortly after Confederation, in 1868, as a land speculation if you will, the Dominion purchased what were known as the Hudson bay lands, a venture which was conceived to be in the interests of the provinces. It is now conceded on all hands that it was a wise speculation, not only in the interests of the original provinces, but in the interests of the great country that was purchased by the Canadian Confederation. And from that day down to the present, every province of the Dominion has been interested in our western heritage, as it has been called.

Every province in the Dominion has looked to that western country with pride, with a feeling of proprietary right, and not merely with respect to the good which was to come to the eastern provinces, but with respect to the good which was to come to the country carved out as our Northwest Territories. The original partners were Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec and Ontario and when British Columbia and Prince Edward Island came into the partnership they entered having equal rights with the original provinces, and were entitled to share with the original provinces all the benefits that might accrue, and they assumed their proportion of the responsibilities, which were placed upon the Confederation by the act of absorption of these western territories. It is not merely the question of the investment of the original purchase money, not merely the dollars and cents involved in the securing of the western country but from the moment of the purchase down to the present each of the eastern provinces has given of its best to the upbuilding of our great western territory, to the creation of a great west that would invite the millions from all lands. To the upbuilding of the western country the eastern provinces have contributed of their brain and their brawn, year after year we have poured into the west our young men, our very best, with a view not merely of upbuilding that country but of advancing the individual interests of those who thought it desirable to make their homes in the western land. In the face of great difficulties we have built up a confederacy which has attracted to us the eyes of Europe, the eyes of Great Britain, the eyes of the people to the south of us. Chief among the difficulties that presented themselves to those who were charged with the duty of creating the federation was the question of finances. Had not some assurance been given particularly to the people of the Maritime provinces that financial arrangements would be made sufficient to guarantee them from any direct taxation in order to carry on the government of their respective provinces, there would have been no confederacy. When Sir John Macdonald, the Hon. Geo. Brown and their associates went to Charlottown, at a time when the delegates of the several maritime provinces were meeting to consider the question of a maritime union and presented their proposition with respect to a larger and wider confederation, one of the very first questions asked of them by the men of the maritime provinces was: Upon what terms can such an arrangement be entered into with respect to the financial future of our provinces. At that time each province had entire control of its excise and customs duties and of all revenues, and they wished to know how they could receive compensation for surrendering these revenues and how they could carry on the affairs of their local administration. The second question was with respect to the binding of these provinces together. The provinces were then aliens and strangers to each other.

The men of the maritime provinces were more familiar with Massachusetts, Maine, New York and the New England States than they were with Quebec, Montreal or Ontario. There was no communication of any character whatever between the people of Canada and the people of the maritime provinces. Therefore, the very next question that was taken into consideration was as to the means of communication between Ontario and Quebec and the provinces by the sea. These two important questions were solved to the satisfaction of the people of the east, and they consented to become partners in the confederacy. But, the confederation was no sooner launched than it was found that there were financial difficulties, that the provisions which had been made were not adequate, that the calculations that had been entered upon were faulty and, practically speaking, it was found to be a necessity to have some other arrangement. I am sure that it is within the recollection of those who are familiar with Canadian political history that there was an agitation with respect to better terms with Nova Scotia. That great Nova Scotian, Joseph Howe, who had opposed the terms of confederation, who had fought valiantly against confederation, continued his agitation and continued it to the point where it was found necessary on the part of the Canadian government to make terms with him and to make terms with Nova Scotia, and in the making of terms with Nova Scotia it was recognized as well that there were other provinces to be dealt with. New Brunswick came to the front, and Nova Scotia had no sooner been settled with than New Brunswick put forward her claim and recognition was granted to that province. Later on, when British Columbia and Prince Edward Island came into the union, there had to be a special provision made in each case with respect to financial arrangements and special consideration given to these provinces. Otherwise they declined to be partners in the confederacy. These arrangements were made. At that time the men who were charged with the control of affairs had taken a wider conception of the future of this country, they had a vision with respect to the future possibilities of our great confederation, they were willing to make better terms, to give greater consideration, and they did give that greater consideration, and they did make better terms. We launched out with six provinces, the four original provinces, the extreme western province of British Columbia and that little province in the gulf, Prince Edward Island.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that did not settle the question. There have been from that time down to the present upheavals and rumblings with respect to each partner in the confederacy. From time to time this province would put forth its claim and some other province would put in a counter claim or take exception to the claims then presented. It was a question of agitation, it was a question of irritation, and the history of our confederation with respect to these terms is a proof of the axiom that nothing is settled until it is settled right. Although we have thought from time to time, when arrangements were made, that we had reached a finality, although we thought, after having made additional arrangements with Nova Scotia, with New Brunswick, with Prince Edward Island and with British Columbia, and finally with all the provinces, that we had reached a finally final settlement with respect to the terms of partnership, we find to-day that we have not, but that we are still as unsettled as we were before. Is there a member who has been in this House for the past twelve years who will not recall that session after session we have heard a voice, deep and loud, from the little province of Prince Edward Island with respect to the want of consideration that has been given to that province in connection with the carrying out of the terms of confederation, who will not be able to recall the complaints that have come up from that province in respect to the injury done to that partner in the confederation? It has been an annual offering, although it has been an offering that has not at all times received the response that it should have received. It has been a complaint that has left in the minds of every man, who feels himself at all responsible for the conditions of this country, a feeling of unrest. It has always been a disturbing feature in connection with our parliamentary conditions as well as with our political conditions in the confederation. As I have said, nothing is ever settled till it is settled right, and until this is settled right it will always be a cause of irritation, it will always be used for a purpose perhaps other than that of having the grievance remedied. Local parliaments and local governments must live, and they do as best they can. Political parties in the respective provinces are quick to seize upon any matter that will be a disturbing element so that they can secure for themselves that which you might consider as sectional, that which you might consider selfish, but that which the people themselves are taught to believe to be in their interest, and to be an act of justice to them. In the province of Prince Edward Island, election after election, appeals are made with respect to the condition of that province under confederation. Men may talk about the last election of September 21. It was my privilege to be

in the province of Prince Edward Island during that election, and I did not observe so much interest in the great overshadowing question with which we felt we had to deal and with which we thought we should deal, but I saw and observed great concern on the part of electors in the constituencies there with respect to the means of communication, the terms of confederation and an increase in representation. I observed more agitation and irritation with respect to these questions than I did with respect to the future of this Dominion in connection with its trade relations with the United States of America. That will be so. It has been asserted on the floor of this House that this question of better arrangements in respect to Manitoba has been made a football at election after election in that province. I do not doubt it. I am not going to in any way condemn the men who use it as they do. It is but human for them to do so, and it is but natural that they should.

The right hon. gentleman introduced this Bill, not with the assurance that it was a settlement of the difficulty, not with the assurance that it would, in any way, solve the problems which confronted him and his government with respect to Manitoba, or Alberta, or Saskatchewan, or any of the other provinces, but, he introduced it with the frank announcement that it was a tentative measure. He talked about the difficulties that had existed; he talked about the proposition that had been made by the Laurier government to the province of Manitoba with respect to its boundaries, and he felt that it was necessary that some action should be taken by him to afford a pretended solution of the difficulty. The statesmanlike course for the right hon. gentleman to have pursued, was to take a broader view of the whole situation, and to have dealt with the whole difficulty as it existed among all the provinces in the Dominion. You will notice that whenever the right hon. gentleman is asked with respect to the Intercolonial railway branch line question, or with respect to transportation in the maritime provinces, or with respect to his naval policy, and the other great questions which are agitating the public mind, his answer is always that these matters are under consideration. and that they will not be dealt with until his government can realize just what should be done to settle the whole matter. His is a government that is devoting itself to the consideration of questions and not to the solving of them; his is a government that is putting off until to-morrow what should be dealt with to-day; his is a government that, with respect to all those other questions, is postponing and deferring in the hope that the people may forget them and, had he pursued a like policy with respect to this question, had he taken the whole situation of the provinces of Canada into review and taken time to consider before dealing with the difficulties existing, he would be doing justice, not only to himself, and the government, which he so ably leads, and he would be doing a greater justice to the Dominion for the administration of whose affairs he is responsible. I hold Sir, that this Bill does not settle the question, and it does not settle it admittedly from his own standpoint. He holds out the hope that Saskatchewan and Alberta, will have something done for them in respect to their natural resources, and he says that the ownership of these resources shall be held in the Dominion for the time being. He even goes so far as to say that this very legislation does not settle the Manitoba boundary question, because he tells us that, so that Manitoba may no longer be a postage stamp on the map of Canada he will extend the boundaries for the present, and he also says that in a little while when it may be found more opportune, he will be able to take into consideration the settlement of the whole question with respect to the ownership of the lands and resourses and the boundaries of Manitoba and Alberta and Saskatchewan. As to the maritime provinces the hon. gentleman says: You are partners in the confederacy, you can have no part in the division of this western heritage, but we will perhaps do something for you later on. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has told us that there may perhaps be a meeting of the Premiers of the different provinces shortly, and then that this government would take into consideration the financial conditions of the eastern provinces and the question of the representation of these provinces in this parliament. The Minister of Marine has not been in this parliament for the past few years and presumably he is not familiar with what has transpired here with respect to the representation of the lower provinces. Does he think that he can in any way settle that question by a convention of the Premiers of this Dominion; can he hope to invite delegates from the respective provinces of this Dominion and get these delegates to agree upon a question which may involve the representation of their own provinces. If he has any such hope, I fear he will see it dashed to the ground. We know the terms of the British North America Act with respect to the representation of Quebec and we know that that is the governing feature of the representation of the other provinces. It was thought at confederation when New Brunswick and Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island entered the Dominion, that their representation would never be less but that it would most probably be increased as the Dominion grew and expanded. I say that this question is not settled because it is

not settled right, and it is not settled for the further reason that it leaves all these matters open to future adjustment. Instead of calling this 'An Act to provide for the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba.' I would call it 'An Act to create entanglements and embarrassments as respects our western heritage and to make confusion for all time to come in the matter of provincial subsidies.' That, in my judgment, is the proper appellation for the Bill now before the committee. It is calculated to create entanglement and embarrassment as respects our western country. You tentatively have arranged boundaries for Manitoba and you have carved out of it an area for Ontario, thus placing across the territory of Manitoba a bar sinister, and affording a pathway which is calculated to create disturbance, to cause confusion and to engender irritation between those two great provinces. You have provided in your Bill conditions for the creation of jealousies among the other provinces of the Dominion.

In the public prints of to-day we observe that the province of Saskatchewan has put in its claims. This is a question which, like Banquo's ghost, will never down, which will always be before the Canadian people. This government may not live very long to grapple with it; but succeeding governments will be confronted with the same difficulties. This matter is not settled, and cannot be settled, until it is grappled with, with a courage that has not been evinced by this government. With respect to the provincial subsidies, the original basis has been departed from, from time to time. In 1906, I think it was, the right hon. leader of the opposition, then the leader of the government of Canada, invited the representatives of the several provinces to take into consideration the question of subsidies. We know the history of that conference, and we realize the position that was taken by the Premier of British Columbia. That gentleman refused to be reconciled, refused even to consider the judgment of his colleagues in the conference, and went away; and that question has been in British Columbia, from that time down to the present, and I doubt not will be for years to come, a disturbing element, a matter upon which provincial elections will be run, and which may become an issue in any Dominion election that may be contested in that province, either a general or a by-election. To the detriment of other great questions, it will cause injury not only to the province, but to the Dominion at large. If our human ideals were attained, we would have great issues settled by the people of the several provinces upon their merits; but when you leave as matters of contention, issues that are local, you have those issues engrossing the minds of the electors to the exclusion of greater issues that affect the Dominion at large. Therefore, I say that in this regard this Bill will not only create confusion, but is a menace to the future of this Dominion, a menace to the good government of Canada, a menace to the parliament of Canada in its consideration of the great questions entrusted to it for solution. From that standpoint I condemn this Bill, and I say that it does not meet the difficulties, that it does not attempt to grapple with and solve the difficulties, that it is imperfect, incomplete, and as such deserves the condemnation, not only of this House, but of the people of Canada at large. Who wants simply to half settle a matter? There must be in the mind of every man here, I care not what his political faith may be, a desire to see all these difficulties, as between the federal government and the provincial governments respectively, settled and determined, so that they can be brushed from our pathway, and we can follow along the road of national government in the interest of the whole people, and without regard to any merely sectional prejudice or passion.

Another thing. This question, however settled, affects the future representation in this House of Commons, and as such does an injury to eastern Canada. As such it affects the little province of Prince Edward Island very materially. That province has contributed to the upbuilding of the western country, with its brain and its brawn, with young men and young women going from its shores every season. That little province is being depleted—shall I say impoverished? No, because it is so rich and fertile that it is almost impossible to impoverish the 'Garden of the Gulf.' But it is being injured, and its representation in this House is decreasing year by year until we can in vision see that it has reached almost the vanishing point. If we go on in the same ratio, the time will come when the constituency of Prince Edward Island will be joined to that of Westmorland, and we shall have an electoral district composed of the county of Westmorland in New Brunswick, with Prince Edward Island thrown in and sending one member to this House. The next distribution, I understand, will give Prince Edward Island three members, while it has four senators in the Senate of Canada. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen), spoke, I am sure with sincerity, and with a desire to accomplish the very best possible for the province which he so ably represents in this government. But my hon. friend has been too long in politics to be in any way caught by fair promises, and I am sure that he must realize that now is the time to have this whole problem solved. When

we are discussing the financial arrangements with Manitoba, when we are taking into consideration the enlargement of Ontario, when we are contemplating a solution of the difficulties in the prairie provinces, and when we have in mind the coming to Ottawa of the Premier of British Columbia with his claims, my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries must realize, if he realizes anything that now is the time to strike, while the iron is hot, that now is the time to demand for his province, and the other provinces by the sea, the consideration which they should have.

My hon. friend said that the case of Manitoba was urgent. What greater urgency could there be than in the case of the province of New Brunswick, or than in the case of the province of Nova Scotia? There it is assuredly a question of urgency, it is a question which I might almost say is essential to the future of these provinces by the sea. The Minister of Marine is aware that to-day the province of New Brunswick is awaking with respect to its future, that its people are alive to the conditions that confront them, that their environments have created an unrest that is in evidence to-day in that province. I have in my hand a badge to be worn by delegates from the whole of the province of New Brunswick to a convention that to-morrow is to be held in the city of Fredericton, a convention to take into consideration the conditions which prevail in that province with respect to the depletion of its population.

Mr. HAZEN. That is a very free translation of the objects of the convention.

Mr. EMMERSON. A true translation of the objects.

Mr. HAZEN. No, a free one.

Mr. EMMERSON. I will not go at length into the matter of the decline of the population of our province. There has been a trek of our young men, from the maritime provinces to the country to the south and also to the western provinces of Canada, and no more important convention could be held than the one I have referred to. I trust that the convention will be confronted with the questions which really appertain to the present condition. It is all very well to invite men to come to New Brunswick and to occupy the farms that are vacant. Why are they vacant, may I ask? It is a question which that convention must necessarily answer. And one that every man in the province of New Brunswick must answer. Why are our young men leaving, some to dwell under a foreign flag and others going to the great west to help in the building up of our western territory? Let my hon. friends stop and think on this point. Hon. gentlemen opposite have made a plea for the suppression of all partisanship in connection with this matter. I associate myself with them in that wish. I would have hoped that this matter could have been dealt with not as one of party exigencies and party expediency, but I feel that it is and the evidence to support that opinion has fallen from the lips of the Prime Minister, the Minister of the Interior and other gentlemen who have spoken in support of this Bill. Evidently this Bill is conceded to have been conceived as a tentative measure, to catch for a moment the ear of the people of Manitoba, because of political exigencies and expediencies. This is not a courageous, a complete and comprehensive solution of the difficulties which exist, and for years have existed between the federal authorities and the provincial authorities in their respective provinces. These difficulties have not come to a head, as the saying is in some of the provinces. It so happens that in British Columbia and in Manitoba for the past ten or more years there have been in charge of the governments of those provinces, administrations that were not in harmony with the federal administration at Ottawa, and it was in their interest to have a bone of contention and to have a grievance. There are some men whom we meet in the world who always have a grievance, and the last thing they wish in the world is to be free from that grievance. There are some governments with a love of grievances, which could not subsist without having one; and the governments of Manitoba and British Columbia lie under the suspicion at least that they have been thriving on the grievances which they themselves have created. The convention badge which I had in my hand a few minutes ago—and I am sorry that I shall not be able to attend at that convention—bears the motto 'Delegate to Convention to boost New Brunswick.' Well, although I cannot attend that convention I am here to-night to boost New Brunswick with respect to the difficulties under which that province labours, and under which it will labour to even a greater extent by the provisions of this Bill if it becomes law. Under the terms of the amendment of the hon. member for St. John there is a provision whereby the matter of the adjustment of the financial terms shall be subject to a conference to be held among the representatives of the several provinces of this Dominion. And who have a better right to be consulted than these provinces? I do not say that on all occasions in the past when an adjustment of the financial terms has been

made that there has been such a consultation, but I do say that where it has not been done it should have been done. That course was followed on the very last occasion of a readjustment of the subsidies, and there can be no question but that a similar course should be followed now.

I wish my hon. friends would carry the idea I have in mind.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. EMMERSON. I know that I cannot carry it without their help. And I have been pleading, I have been agonizing with them——

An hon. MEMBER. You had fifteen years to do it in.

Mr. EMMERSON. Ah, but my hon. friends opposite have come to judgment, and they are to remedy all the ills that have existed. I am not here to deal with the past—let the dead past bury its dead. But we are dealing with the living present and with the future.

An hon. MEMBER. You are making it go.

Mr. EMMERSON. But hon. gentlemen opposite are not making very much go. If they would consider this a little longer and deal with it in a more comprehensive way, greater justice would be done, not merely to the Dominion, but to every individual province.

No man will say, I care not how biased his judgment may be by political associations, that this has been settled right. For the answer to such a statement would be in the utterances of the right hon. the leader of the government (Mr. Borden) himself who has said that these matters will probably be dealt with a little later, perhaps at the next session. We find that the Highways Act, which was heralded in the speech from the Throne, is to be put foward as a tentative proposition, and the leader of the government tells us that probably during next session or in some succeeding session a more comprehensive Act will be introduced. It is admitted to be imperfect—they have not even got a principle upon which to base it. It is put in the form of a contribution of additional subsidy to the respective provinces; and then we have a little rider added whereby the Minister of Railways and Canals who, in some of his fitful moods may be in a position or may feel constrained to do so, may go out somewhere and build a small culvert or reconstruct a bridge. That is within his authority.

I say the subject of this Bill is left for future consideration, as other matters are left for future consideration. But the country would have been safer, and especially the east would have been in better condition, had this matter been dealt with so as to settle the whole question for at least a score of years. You may place this upon the statute-book; but it is not a settlement. You have heralded it thoughout the country as something that has been done; it is something that has not been more than half done. I would ask my hon. friend to drop this Bill and take hold of a matter that affects Eastern Canada to an extent that few realize, the question of the branch lines. This is a matter which has been formulated and agreed upon, which my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) himself determined even before he was charged with the responsibility of leading the government, believing it to be in the best interests of Eastern Canada and a wise addition to the transportation system which affects not merely Eastern Canada but the whole Dominion. Mr. Chairman, I have taxed your patience, I know, and the patience of my hon. friends opposite——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. EMMERSON—though I know they are too good natured to say so. But above all, I have so taxed my own strength that I think I will have mercy and say no more at present.

Mr. HAZEN. I do not rise for the purpose of making a speech. But my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) has referred with feelings of great pride to the fact that he has in his possession, a badge, such as those to be worn to-morrow by the delegates attending the immigration convention to be held in Fredericton. I also am the proud possessor of one of those badges, which I now hold in my hand. I interrupted my hon. friend to say that he was giving a very free translation of the inscription upon that badge. one would have thought in listening to my hon. friend, that the convention was to be held because the people of New Brunswick were bowed down with care and sorrow over the condition of affairs existing in the province, and that they felt it necessary to hold this convention because of what he calls the abandoned farms and the deserted homes throughout the province. That is not at all the reason. The convention is being held because there is a feeling of extreme optimism and of hope in the future in the breast of every one in the province of New Brunswick to-day. Let me read the language of the inscription upon this badge of which my hon. friend gave such a free translation:

Delegate to the immigration convention, Fredericton, March 8th. We are going to boost New Brunswick——

Not New Brunswick, the down-trodden, not New Brunswick the depressed, but—

We are going to boost New Brunswick, the busy east of Canada.

Let me call attention to some of the reasons given why the delegates ought to attend this congress. I have here a report of a meeting of the Board of Trade held in the city of St. John on Tuesday evening last, and reported in the St. John papers of yesterday morning. This is the report in the paper read on all occasions with great care by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) and to which he occasionally makes reference in this House:

T. H. Estabrooks then called attention to the immigration congress to be held at Fredericton. He said that owing to the more favourable attitude assumed by the federal government to the eastern provinces, and the interest shown by the provincial government in immigration, they should do all that was possible to boost the immigration movement, and send a large representation to the congress. He believed the St. John Board of Trade could take credit for doing much to promote the feeling of confidence and optimism that now prevailed, and it should continue to take an aggressive interest in the forward movement in the province.

It is not necessary for me to remind my hon. friend from Westmorland or any hon. gentleman who knows New Brunswick, that Mr. T. Estabrooks who made the statement referred to about the more favourable attitude of the federal government towards New Brunswick and of the attitude of the provincial government as regards immigration is not a member of the Conservative party, but is a leading citizen of St. John, and one of the most active and zealous leaders of the Liberal cause in that constituency.

Mr. McKENZIE. The importance of this question to Nova Scotia as well as to other provinces of the Dominion, compels me to take up a little time of the House in discussing the subject. In this cabinet Nova Scotia ought to be well represented, and I conclude is well represented.

But that representative evidently must fight for the rights of that province. A strong claim is made for New Brunswick, the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has said he is going to do great things for that province. The Minister of Railways not satisfied with taking what lies in front of his province, is stretching out through another province to Hudson bay. When I see these things being done by the present cabinet, when I see the hon. gentleman of the cabinet who represents Manitoba getting everything in sight for his province, when I know that there is a grievance approaching full maturity in British Columbia which is represented in the cabinet by a very capable representative, then, knowing that all of these representatives will insist on their pounds of flesh, I feel that the good representative of the province of Nova Scotia in the cabinet is in a position similar to that unfortunate person, who, on one occasion, going down from Jerusalem to Jericho fell among thieves. I feel that no matter how able that representative from Nova Scotia may be, strenuous assistance and support even from the opposition will be required to enable him to impress on his colleagues that there is such a place as Nova Scotia and that it has demands and needs of as great importance as those of the other sections of the Dominion.

We have heard severe criticism of Liberalism from hon. gentlemen from Manitoba, particularly from the Minister of the Interior. I shall not quote the not at all classic or choice language in which he last night made reference to the position of Manitoba in the confederacy. I shall not refer in his own words to the lamentable position in which he says that province has been ever since its creation nor shall I refer to his description of the lack of justice that has been meted out to that province by the Liberal party. But I must remind him that that province was not created by a Liberal government, but was created in 1870 by a Tory government and whatever constitution, whatever terms it received, were given by the late Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald and a Tory cabinet. Thus, if its territory or if its financial terms were not right, it was not the fault of any Liberal government or of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Manitoba was a province during the administration of the Tory party from 1870 to 1896 with the exception of four years from 1874 to 1878. What have these hon. gentlemen supporting the government to-day to say about the conduct of the Conservative party who for twenty-two years made no attempt to improve the position of Manitoba? We have heard a great deal about the Liberal party being responsible for the educational conditions in Manitoba, about the settlement of the school question made by the Liberal party not being satisfactory. If it was not satisfactory to the Conservative party in Manitoba when they came into power in 1899, why did they not remedy the conditions as it was entirely in their power to do? From that day to this they have done nothing by legislation to better conditions there. Whatever that settlement was, it was eminently satisfactory to the Roblin government and the Minister of the Interior, for they have left it severely alone.

I submit that in dealing with the vast heritage which has come to us we should treat it as the property of the whole of Canada. The method which is being adopted by the government bears a striking

similarity to the winding up of an estate step by step, giving each heir a share of the estate at a different time.

Mr. BURNHAM. Do you think the country is dead?

Mr. McKENZIE. I think this alarm clock must be wound in such a way that it will not be going off at unexpected moments. I would ask the Minister of Public Works to see that this clock is looked after in some better way.

I was saying, Sir, that my hon. friend, in his practice of his profession, and every hon. gentleman in this House who practices that profession of the law, knows that the settlement of estates can better be accomplished when the heirs or their representatives are all before the court at the same time. I submit that the land of the Northwest Territories is the common property of the people of this country. It was bought by the common administration of the country, and paid for by moneys coming out of the common treasury. The moneys that were expended in the development of the country were the common moneys of the people. The land and the money given to the Canadian Pacific railway for the development of that country, were land and money expended by the people of Canada as a whole for the development and welfare of the Northwest. We are all on an even footing. No partner of the concern has any advantage over the other. We are all on equal terms, and we have a right to an equal part of that territory. If it be true that while we were expending money and giving land for the advancement of that large corporation, for the benefit of ourselves as well as in the interest of the corporation, is it not likewise true that, if now, this land has become profitable and worth looking after, we have a right as partners, to come in and benefit by what is to be got from it. The moment Alberta and Saskatchewan received money in lieu of land, they began to participate in the profits of that land. It became a source of profit to them. We are putting through this House another Bill by which the province of Manitoba is to receive the rentals from this land. It will receive so much per acre for the land which comes within its lines. Alberta and Saskatchewan are receiving a rental from this land. Why should not Nova Scotia, Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island receive an equal compensation, or some compensation from the same property to which they have the same right? That is the ground largely upon which we come here and present our claim. Ontario is getting the land itself, Quebec is also getting land, and they are therefore, not in the same position as New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia. We cannot get the land itself, although we are not without a precedent for getting it. What has happened in the United States under similar circumstances is that certain sections of Louisiana were set apart for the eastern states and they sold the land to their own advantage. We are not looking for a condition of that kind, but we are looking for something that will be equivalent to it, something that will give the provinces by the sea some compensation for the interest in these territories and valuable properties. This is the most opportune time for the government to deal with this question. Never again will such an opportunity present itself. Saskatchewan has its part, Alberta has its part, and now Manitoba is getting its quota. Ontario, by a resolution which is on the order paper of this House, is getting its share, Quebec is to get its share and now is the opportune time to settle the question once and for all. We are told by no less a person than the Prime Minister that this is not an opportune time, that we must put it off a little longer, and that when Manitoba gets its share, and all the provinces except the maritime provinces get their share, something will be done. I submit to the Prime Minister that it will be more or less a matter of bargaining before he can reach a settlement and that the best time for bargaining is when he has something to offer to these provinces for a fair settlement with the maritime provinces. The mother country cannot be suspected of being less honourable in its dealings with the smaller sections of the empire than would be the province of Ontario, Quebec or Manitoba in dealing with the maritime provinces. And yet, when my right hon. friend who leads the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) made a change in the tariff by which preference was given to the mother country, we were told that he made a mistake, that he should never have given that concession without something in return, and that if he had stood by manfully and kept them from getting that preference until they gave us some preference in their markets, it would have been better for us. The situation here is exactly the same, the position is similar, the Premier of this country has to-day the whip-hand, he has control of these lands, they are the lands of Canada, the provinces want this consideration and it is for him to say as representing the maritime provinces as the trustee of the maritime provinces in this matter, as he is of every other part of the country: Before you can get these lands you must consent to certain concessions as far as the maritime provinces are concerned, you must consent to a readjustment of the representation in the House of Commons for one thing, and you must

agree to some money consideration to these provinces for the interest and right which they have in these vast territories. These are conditions which the Prime Minister will find it comparatively easy to settle to-day, but which he will find extremely difficult to settle if he goes to those provinces empty-handed without anything to offer in compensation for any concessions that he may ask them to make. It is proposed to enlarge the province of Quebec to a large extent, and I do not begrudge that province any territory which properly may be added to it. If that territory is what we believe it is going to be, it is a territory in which people will live, it is a territory which will become inhabited, it is a territory which will add largely to the population of the province, and if matters remain in statu quo it will increase the unit of representation enormously, and as the unit of representation increases in Quebec I need not point out to the Prime Minister that it makes the representation of the maritime provinces smaller and smaller until it comes to the vanishing point altogether. I do not know whether the addition of this territory to Quebec will affect the unit of representation in that way, but I think it would be better, if the territory is going to be taken in, that we should have a reconsideration of the terms of confederation in so far as representation is concerned, and fix a unit of representation at something higher than it is at the present time, in order that justice may be done to the maritime provinces. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) spoke last night about a resolution which was moved in this House in 1909. He will find in the discussion then that all of us practically from Nova Scotia spoke upon it. I spoke upon it myself, and I took the very same position then that I am taking to-day, although we did not have the same opportunity of presenting our case, as the question was not as fully before the House then as it is now. I submit that when Quebec is getting its lands is the time to revise the representation and to place a provision in the constitution whereby the maritime provinces will be in the same position as British Columbia.

It does not work unfairness to anybody and, therefore, I do not see why there should be any objection to putting similar safeguards in the arrangements with the maritime provinces. Why should we not at this opportune time settle everything once and for all? I submit to the Prime Minister with confidence that unless he is going to the imperial parliament for confirmatory legislation, he has no constitutional authority for the Bill now before the House. There is no constitutional precedent for this measure, unless it is the intention of the government to go to the imperial parliament to get an Act confirming it, as was done in 1871 when Manitoba was first created a province. I am confirmed in my belief in this matter, by the remarks of the Prime Minister himself, who, speaking on the constitutional aspect in respect to the Manitoba school, told the House that we had no constitutional authority to deal with the terms upon which Manitoba came into confederation. He told us that section 2 of the British North America Act of 1871 gave us power to create the province and to start it out on its housekeeping and to give it financial and educational terms, but he also told us that we had no authority whatever to afterwards alter the terms of that constitution. I submit that this Bill is a reconstruction of the constitution of Manitoba, and is, therefore, beyond our jurisdiction. The twenty-fourth section of the Manitoba Act says:

> Inasmuch as the province is not in debt, the said province shall be entitled to be paid and to receive from the government of Canada by half-yearly payments in advance, interest at the rate of five per cent per annum on the sum of $422,900.

Will any person in this House deny that that section is a part of the constitution of Manitoba? Then when you come to section 4 of this Bill, it commences:

> Inasmuch as the province was not in debt at the time it was established, &c., and you are practically to all intents and purposes repealing section 2 of the Manitoba Act and putting in its stead sections 4 and 5 of this Bill. I submit that before this bargain is confirmed we must go to the imperial parliament for confirmatory legislation, and as the fewer times we go there the better, I would suggest to the Prime Minister that all these changes, everything that is necessary to put the provinces on a proper footing, should be incorporated in the one Bill, that we may once for all settle with the provinces.

My contention is that even if the constitution of a province came only from this parliament, we could not afterwards change it, but how much more is that the case when we find that the charter of Manitoba is practically an imperial Act. At page 2927 of 'Hansard', 1905, appears an opinion given by Mr. Borden, now Prime Minister, upon the authority of this parliament to tinker with or change the constitution of a province once it is given. The right hon. gentleman then said:

> I do not know whether my hon. friend is quite of the same opinion to-day, with regard to the easy nature of the step, but I venture to say in all seriousness that the step which we are taking now is the most important and momentous step that has ever been taken

by this parliament in regard to our Northwestern Territory. We are doing to-day what this parliament cannot undo in the future, because the constitution which we now propose to give to the territories of the Northwest can only be adhered by the imperial parliament.

Further on he said:

I, to-day, am standing on the rock of the constitution, as I understand that constitution; that I simply desire that the domination of this parliament shall not in any way destroy or undermine that foundation upon which the provincial rights of this country rest.

The Prime Minister then took the ground that once a constitution was given to a province nothing could be done by this parliament that would interfere with it. I think that I can successfully contend before any authoritative body on constitutional law, that the Bill now before parliament has the effect of changing the constitution of the province of Manitoba and that we are attempting to legislate in this direction without any authority under our constitution.

I have been looking at the different Acts which compose the British North America Act, but I can find no authority to the contrary. If what I say is true, that hon. gentlemen opposite must go to the imperial parliament for authority for the revision of this agreement, I submit that we should only go when all the land questions are settled, and when every province has received what is its due under present conditions. We might have thought, from what we had heard during the last few years, that the moment the Premier obtained charge of the affairs of this country, he would give the lands to the different provinces in the west. But he has brought a gentleman to take charge of those lands in the person of the Minister of the Interior, who is a very different sort of man when he is in charge of them from what he was when he was merely a minister of the province of Manitoba. That hon. gentleman now realizes that to have the swinging of all the lands from Ontario to the Rocky mountains is quite a piece of patronage to have in his hands, and that to give those lands to the provinces of Saskatchewan and Ontario and Manitoba, which I understand is to have a Liberal government in a few months, would be to place in the hands of the various local governments a weapon that they could use against hon. gentlemen opposite. For that reason there is a change of front upon this question. It is entirely a question of whose ox is gored. When they could not use those lands themselves, they were ready to grant them to the provinces, but now that they have the swinging of the lands and the patronage connected with them, they wish to leave them as they are, and the old slogan of last summer, let well enough alone, is brought into play again. It is said that we cannot give the lands to Manitoba until it is put in the same position as Saskatchewan and Alberta. I cannot understand that reasoning. If it shall be a good and proper thing to give the lands to Manitoba ten years from to-day, why should it not be a good and proper thing now, particularly in view of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite during the ten or fifteen years that they were in opposition in this House? The policy of the government on that point reminds me of the doctor who was treating a patient with fever, and who prepared a large tub of ice-water. He was asked, 'What do you mean by putting a patient with fever in that cold water? He said, 'When I put him in that water, he will have convulsions, and I know how to treat convulsions.' In the same way this government want to put the province of Manitoba into a certain position before they give it its lands.

Now, I want to point out where the province of Nova Scotia stands in relation to this arrangement. The province of Nova Scotia and the province of Manitoba are closer together in the matter of population than any other two provinces in the confederation. This arrangement gives the province of Manitoba an arrearage, going back for four years, amounting to $2,380,372.09. Hon. gentlemen tell us that they are doing this under section 3 of the British North America Act of 1871. I say that that Act simply gives them authority to deal with conditions as they are when they pass the Act. That section does not give them any authority to go back one day. It is not retroactive, and they go back those four years without any authority whatever. According to the last census the province of Nova Scotia had a population of 492,338, and it receives from this Dominion $636,671.28, or $1.20 per head of population. The province of Manitoba has a smaller population, numbering about 450,000, on which it receives $2.96 per head, or more than double the amount, per head, paid to Nova Scotia. Under the terms of confederation the different provinces were supposed to get exactly the same amount per head. How does the Prime Minister, being the only representative of the province of Nova Scotia in this cabinet, propose to explain to his people that the good old province of Nova Scotia is to get along with $1.20 per capita of its population, to do all its work and meet all its obligations, whereas he is a consenting party to giving Manitoba $2.69 per capita to do the same kind of work? That is the bargain

which is being submitted to this House today, and which is supposed to be accepted by the people of Nova Scotia. We have 36,724 more people in the province of Nova Scotia than there are in the province of Manitoba, and yet the latter province gets $712,674.11 per year more than Nova Scotia does. I submit that this is an absolutely indefensible and unfair position for the Prime Minister to take in regard to the province he represents; and I presume it is the same with reference to every other province.

I figured it out as between Manitoba and the province to which I belong, because I am particularly accountable to the people of the province of Nova Scotia. I submit, therefore, that any legislation confirming this arrangement is not fair to the province of Nova Scotia or any of the maritime provinces, and it is not fair to any other province in Canada. Unless the Prime Minister intends to bring all the provinces up to a position of equality, to put them on the same footing, and give them all according to the population the same amount of money, he cannot expect to have peace, contentment, or harmony in the family of provinces over which he presides. One thing more, and I perhaps should not say very much about it. I want to point out to the Minister of Public Works and to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that this Manitoba school question seems to be a very important one, and that if they want to do anything with respect to the constitution in Manitoba on the subject of education they are beginning at the wrong end. They say that they have not the authority to touch the territories, and that they cannot give any new law to the territories, but they are creating boundaries for the provinces. Everything within those boundaries will constitute the one province. There will be no north, south, east or west about it, all that territory will be in the province of Manitoba. When Sir John A. Macdonald and his government drafted section 22 of the Manitoba Act, will anybody tell me that it was not his intention to give separate schools in that part of Manitoba. The section provides:

> In and for the province, the said legislature, may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject and according to the following provisions:
>
> Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to Denominational schools which any class of persons have by law or practice in the province at the Union.

It was the intention of the government of that day to give separate schools to the people of Manitoba. It was the belief of the people who went into Manitoba that under that law they had that right. When that section came to be interpreted by the Lords of the Privy Council they said: There is no doubt about it, that was the intention of that legislation, but the drafters of the Act did not use apt language to fully carry out what they set out to do. Now the Prime Minister, the Minister of Public Works, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and every other lawyer in the cabinet, and every man that is in the cabinet or is supporting it, cannot escape the responsibility by saying that there is nothing in the Territories Act to enable them to change the law. All they have to do now when if they are giving a new charter, or a new constitution, to Manitoba and I challenge anybody on the other side to say to the contrary—that if they are giving a new constitution to Manitoba changing its financial terms, and changing its boundaries, what is the matter, if they are true to their principles, with changing that section to give what it was intended to give from the start. That is the condition, Sir, and there is no use in hon. gentlemen trying to escape by any back door, or by saying there is nothing in the Territories Act which gives them the right to do this. If the government had the right to change the financial terms, they have the right to change other features. They cannot escape their responsibility and they may as well confess that they do not want to do it. That is the position and that is where I want to leave it. Now I submit that all these things should be put right, and that the province should get what belongs to it. If these matters are not righted now there will be an appeal to Cæsar, there will be an appeal to the people. If we cannot get our rights here, we will get them at the ballot-box, and this government will be hurled from power and will have plenty of time to lament not taking the action which they could have taken in this matter.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). The Bill before the House is, in my judgment, one of the most important measures that has ever been introduced in parliament since confederation. As has been pointed out by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, it is in effect, an attempt at recasting the terms of confederation. It goes to the very essence of our constitution. It deals with matters that pertain to all the provinces, and with especially matters of very vital importance to each and every one namely, the extent of its territory and the financial arrangements under which it came into confederation, and form part and parcel of that grand scheme. I shall say nothing as to the rights of the people in the addition which is being made under this Bill to the province of Manitoba. I want to deal more particularly with this special point: I represent a constituency which, from what I

have heard within the last few days, regarding the effect of the late census on the question of representation, will stand a good chance of being wiped out. I am quite convinced, after listening to the eloquent speech of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries yesterday, that it was not the intention of the fathers of confederation that any of the maritime provinces should lose the representation which they had at that time. I have the honour to speak for a constituency that was represented about the time of the union and afterwards by men who took a prominent part in the confederation scheme and afterwards in the securing of better terms. I refer to one of the bright and shining lights of confedration one who took a prominent part in the confederation deliberations, William A. Henry, subsequently, Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, who at that time, represented the county to which I have the honour to belong. I refer likewise, to the late judge Hugh Macdonald, who also represented the county of Antigonish, and who after confederation went to England to secure better terms for his native province. I am quite sure that if these men could have anticipated that the county of Antigonish would be put into the position it is likely to be, by reason of the legislation which is now before the House, and legislation which will be brought down with respect to the extension of the boundaries of Quebec—not directly due to that legislation, but indirectly due to it—I am quite sure that if they could have foreseen that the constitution would be construed in the way that it is likely to be construed, they would have taken care that more apt language was used in connection with the clauses dealing with the question of representation, than was used. It has been pointed out by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries who backed up the members from this side of the house that the provinces by the sea, are likely to be placed in a very humiliating position by reason of the great growth that is going on in the western part of the country, due in a large measure to the drain that has been made upon the eastern provinces. They are likely to have their representation still further reduced. I have listened with a great deal of pleasure and satisfaction to that hon. gentleman's statement when he said that we should approach this question without any party spirit. On this question, he said, all those from the maritime provinces, should be united. I agree that it is a most serious question, and I invite hon. gentlemen opposite, and especially those from the maritime provinces, to show that they appreciate the gravity of the situation by urging upon the government to afford some protection to that section of Canada before this measure goes through. Now is the time, I submit to do that, when the province of Manitoba is asking for an extension of her boundaries and for a change in the terms and conditions under which it entered confederation, and under which it existed in that confederation for a period of 40 years.

The province of Quebec, as explained by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, is to have almost an empire added to it. And the papers tell us that the province of Saskatchewan is asking for further consideration and for redress of grievances which it alleges will exist if this measure goes through. Does anybody doubt for a moment that, if we give this large territory to Manitoba and make the proposed subventions to that province, the other provinces will be discontented? Though I have listened to this debate carefully I have not heard a solitary, substantial reason advanced in support of these concessions to Manitoba, except that Manitoba is a young, energetic, active province that was well worthy of the advantages proposed to be given, and deserving to be as well treated as Alberta and Saskatchewan. There was no constitutional ground for the favours to be granted—only a comparison with Alberta and Saskatchewan. We are asked to depart from the terms of confederation on which Manitoba came in and under which she has existed since, and this is to be done on the plea that it is necessary in order to place Manitoba on an equal footing with Alberta and Saskatchewan—not because there are constitutional grounds for the change. But what about the other provinces of the Dominion? What about New Brunswick? What about Prince Edward Island? Have not these provinces equal rights with Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba? And if you are going to make an increased grant to Manitoba simply because a certain grant was made to Alberta and Saskatchewan and not because there is a legal constitutional ground for it, why not deal in the same way with the maritime provinces and British Columbia?

This is the time when the people of the maritime provinces should urge their grievance. That there is a grievance, no one can deny who has listened to the calm and earnest speech of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) and to the speeches of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) and the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) and the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson). Anybody who listened to these speeches, whether in sympathy with the maritime provinces or not, if he applies reason, judgment and fair-play to the question must come to the conclusion that the people of the maritime provinces have a just and valid claim, that they have a

grievance that should be redressed. I refer to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the speech he delivered to show that in my judgment we should look at this question not from the party point of view. We should not seek to make party capital out of it.

It was pointed out by the hon. member for Westmorland that the intention of the fathers of confederation was that the maritime provinces should continue to have the representation that they had on entering confederation. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries emphasized that. But the whole difficulty is that the intention was not expressed; what was intended to be said was not said, or that which was said was different from that which was intended. But that is not by any means unprecedented. The hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) referred to the Manitoba school case and to the decision of the Privy Council, showing conclusively from the language of the members of that court that there was no doubt as to what was intended so far as Manitoba was concerned, which was separate schools, but the difficulty was that apt language was not used, and they had to consider the language used and give their decision accordingly. It was pointed out by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and others that the idea of the fathers of confederation was that the representation of the maritime provinces should bear a certain proportion to that of the rest of Canada. But what was meant by Canada? The maritime provinces contended that it meant the original four provinces. But the courts held that it meant the Dominion of Canada as it then was, including the added provinces. And we suffer in consequence, and we must accept the constitution as it is. But we appeal to this government to take steps to secure for the maritime provinces that which it was originally intended they should have. I say it is time that we should press our claims, now when other provinces are coming and asking that justice be done. When the half of Canada is asking for changes, seeking favours and concessions—justice if you like—from this parliament, that is the time when we should be more likely to get the ear of this parliament and of the other provinces for our own demand. The Prime Minister intimated yesterday that something would be done for the maritime provinces. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries also gave us some comfort in that regard. But the statements of the Prime Minister were rather vague and indefinite and, while in form reassuring and comforting, were far from satisfactory. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who was rather more assuming so far as the rights of the maritime provinces are concerned, asked us not to throw any obstacle in the way of this measure, not to press our claim just now, but to take the chance of the goodwill and generosity of the other provinces at a later date. I concur in what the hon. member from Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) said, that the time when others are seeking for redress of grievances, the time when the other party is seeking a favour from you, is the proper time to do business. The words of the Prime Minister were somewhat comforting and the words of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries perhaps were well conceived. Yet I think the words of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) and the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) were far from comforting. The Prime Minister tells us that later on the provinces by the sea would be taken into his council and he would see what could be done for them. But he did not promise definitely that anything would be done. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries went further and said he hoped the day was not far distant when these grievances would be settled and thus justice done.

The Postmaster General and the Minister of Public Works rather ridiculed the claim that we made. The latter was somewhat sarcastic when discussing our claims. The argument of the maritime provinces is that this large territory which is to be added to the province of Manitoba is not the patrimony of Manitoba but the equal property of all the rest of Canada. It was purchased by the four original provinces, costing $1,500,000, but since then there has been expended on it a vast sum of money for surveys, policing and development, the construction of the Canadian Pacific railway, the Canadian Northern railway, the Grand Trunk Pacific and other railways, and it is surely right for the other provinces to say that we must jealously guard our own interests with respect to that country. The Minister of Public Works grew sarcastic and ridiculed this claim. He said:

> When we heard the hon. member speak of the necessity, in the disposal of these great territories, of consulting provinces far removed from the regions which we are discussing, and talking of compensation being given to these provinces, one would suppose we were assisting a land deal. Well, that is not the spirit in which the founders of confederation proceeded; that is not the spirit which presided over the negotiations when they acquired Rupert's Land and the territories of the northwest. There was no payment there for real estate; it was under an order in council of the imperial government that most of these lands were handed over to us, and, while it is true, that in 1868, compensation was paid to extinguish the rights—other than trading and commercial rights of the Hudson's Bay Company, the idea at the bottom of it was that these territories would afterwards

be distributed among the provinces in order to complete a symmetrical plan under which this territory would become provincially organized for the fuller and more completed development of the confederacy than in an embryo state. It is not a matter of adjusting accounts among the provinces; it is not a matter to be taken up in a book-keeping spirit; but it is a matter which should be regarded in the light alone of the fruition of the scheme of confederation. It seems to me, therefore, that the criticism we have heard to-day about the financial terms granted and about consulting the other provinces and about an accord between Manitoba and Ontario, as to a right of way for a purely provincial railway into the hinterland and towards Hudson bay; it seems to me that the constitutional points raised in these questions did not evince on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite that large and liberal-minded view which we should take of an event of this kind.

It may be that the Minister of Public Works and the Postmaster General, who spoke on similar lines, think that this is a matter of no great importance or concern to us, and that we should look at it in a big, broad, liberal-minded way. That is not the way the people of the maritime provinces look at it, Conservatives as well as Liberals. They feel that all the provinces must have a fair proportionate share of this land in order to carry on their administration. As the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) pointed out, when Louisiana was purchased by the United States, a large tract of the land was reserved and afterwards dealt out to the various states of the Union. The states received large grants for the support of colleges devoted to agriculture and the mechanical arts. This was done under the Morel College Land Act which was approved on July 2, 1862. We in the maritime provinces are far removed from that western country, but we have a right to participate, and some scheme could be worked out similar to the Morel Act. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries have urged that the further consideration of the rights of the maritime provinces should be deferred until this matter is disposed of. I venture to say that if that is done then later on, when the maritime provinces ask to have their case dealt with, they will be told that they should have presented their claim in 1912, when there was a readjustment of the boundaries of Quebec, Ontario and Manitoba, and of the indemnity paid to Manitoba. I submit that the time for us to present our case is now, and that there is nothing unreasonable in asking the government to let this matter stand over until a conference of the various Premiers may be held on the question of fair and equitable readjustment of the subsidies. The principle of the extension of the Manitoba boundary has already been recognized by the seconding of the Bill. The people of Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec will not suffer from the postponement, and I submit that if this measure goes through it will practically for ever bar the maritime provinces from coming in and securing a redress of grievances. It is now or never with us.

If that be the case, I think it is only fair that the further consideration of this matter should stand over until this question of what our rights in the maritime provinces, both as to representation and provincial subsidies has been determined. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries pointed out that we would likely have our grievances redressed a little later on. The language of the Minister of Marine was somewhat assuring, but the language of the Prime Minister was rather less assuring, while the language of the Minister of Public Works and of the Postmaster General, in referring to the claims of the maritime provinces, was positively disheartening. How far did the Prime Minister go in this connection? He said:

> And I would like to repeat what I have already said in speaking upon the resolutions in that regard, that when we do come to consider that proposal I think it will be just and necessary to give some consideration to the maritime provinces whose boundaries cannot be enlarged by reason of their natural situation, to call them into our councils and give them a just voice as to the terms upon which these lands shall be handed over, and especially with regard to what compensation, if any, should be given to the three maritime provinces by reason of the transfer of these lands to the governments of Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan.

It will be observed that the Prime Minister was very careful not to commit himself to the statement that the maritime provinces reasonably could expect to participate in these lands at a later day. He said that they would consider what compensation, if any, might be granted, and he said that they would be called to the councils of the government, but nothing further than that. That surely cannot be satisfactory to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who come from the maritime provinces. They may have some further assurance that we know nothing of. If they have I can understand the position that they will take but, if they have not any assurance further than these words in the speech of the right hon. Prime Minister, speaking in the debate, they are recreant to their duty to the maritime provinces if they do not take a firmer and more positive stand on this occasion. This is the time for us to act and to act unitedly if we hope to accomplish anything. The hon. Minister of the Interior emphasized

the fact last night that the people of Manitoba have had a long standing grievance, that they had been complaining in season and out of season ever since they had entered confederation, and in order to placate them it was necessary to come down with some such measure as this. He emphasized the fact that they had complained, that they had remonstrated with this government time and time again ever since confederation. They succeeded, or they are about to succeed. Therefore, I say it is up to the people of the maritime provinces, who have been suffering in patience, who have been quietly seeing their population dwindle away census after the census, who find that the finances of the various provinces are scarcely sufficient to carry on their business in a satisfactory manner, and who are handicapped very much because of their limited revenue, to get busy now and try and secure from this government the measure of compensation that they are entitled to. They should take a leaf out of the book of Manitoba. They should agitate, they should remonstrate with the Prime Minister, who, we are proud to acknowledge, is one of our own people from the maritime provinces and whose sympathies are, or should, naturally be with us. It is up to the people of the maritime provinces to make their grievances known and to press their grievances in season and out of season, so that they may secure that measure of justice to which they are entitled.

Mr. HUGHES, Kings, P.E.I.). I find in the Morning 'Chronicle' of Halifax of the 6th of this month a telegram dated from Charlottetown, which says that Premier Matheson of the province of Prince Edward Island and two members of his government were here lately presenting the claims of that province for increased subsidy for the non-fulfilment of the terms of union in regard to winter communication and for an increase in subsidy in respect to the land which is given to Manitoba and which is intended to be given to Ontario and Quebec, that a committee of the government was appointed to take these claims into consideration, and that that committee is now considering them. I wish to ask the Prime Minister if that statement is correct? Perhaps I had better read the telegram.

Mr. BORDEN. I do not think it is necessary to read the telegram.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.). That telegram is here.

Mr. BORDEN. Very good.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.). It is this:

Charlottetown, P.E.I., March 5.

Premier Matheson has returned from Ottawa where he had gone, accompanied by Hon. A. E. Arsenault and Hon. John McLean, two members of his government, to press the claims of the island for better financial treatment by the federal government. Claims on account of the Prince Edward Island railway's failure to maintain regular communication in winter, and for compensation to this province, on account of public domains being acquired by other provinces, whose boundaries have been extended, were strongly pressed. The question was submitted to a committee, consisting of Premier Borden, Finance Minister White, Hon. G. E. Foster, Hon. Messrs. Rogers and Perley.

Mr. Matheson makes no definite announcement as to the result of the trip but says he believes justice will be rendered this province. Delegation also succeeded in arranging that the rights in certain harbours and other waters, now vested in Canada, be vested in the province, in order that oyster cultivation be carried on.

I just desire to ask the Prime Minister if he would give any information as to whether the matter is being considered, whether a decision has been reached yet by the committee, or whether he expects that it will be reached in time to submit the question to parliament during this session?

Mr. BORDEN. The Prime Minister of Prince Edward Island and his colleagues presented certain claims to the government which are under consideration.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.). That is not very definite information; in fact, the telegram contains a great deal more than that. I am rather inclined to think that the Premier of Prince Edward Island will give the people of that province more information than the Prime Minister has given to me or to members of this committee. I would ask the Prime Minister, is the mater under consideration?

Mr. BORDEN. I have already said so.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.). By a committee of the government.

Mr. BORDEN. By the government.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.) There is no doubt that the province of Prince Edward Island is presenting to the government certain claims which they expect to be considered and which are really at the present time under consideration. The government of the province of Manitoba is also presenting claims which, we understand, are to be settled by arbitration. If this Bill passes there is no doubt but that other claims will be presented by nearly all the provinces because this Bill will unsettle the financial arrangements between the federal government and the provincial administrations.

Would it not be a just thing to do, to accept the amendment of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) and call together all the provinces to present all their claims so that the Dominion government may dispose of them at one and the same time? If you adopt this Bill you will practically issue an invitation to all the provincial governments to come here and present the claims they have or think they have, and then you will be compelled to dispose of these claims in a fragmentary way. Prince Edward Island thinks it is entitled to consideration because of the public domain that is being given to the other provinces, and it appears to me this government has some idea that there is merit in that claim because the Prime Minister, speaking on the subject, gave us an intimation that when the three prairie provinces are given the ownership of their lands the government would consider the claims of the maritime provinces for compensation in reference thereto. I fear it will be many years before that matter is disposed of, and if Prince Edward Island has to wait that long for compensation, it is certain the subsidy to that province will not be increased in the near future. I would, however, point out to the Prime Minister, that although he himself gave that promise, and although it was concurred in to some extent by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, no other member of his government who spoke appeared to take the same view. The remarks of the Minister of Labour would lead us to suppose that he did not think there was anything in the claim of the maritime provinces with regard to this; the Minister of Finance appeared to take the same ground, but the Minister of Public Works and the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) strongly disapproved of the idea that the maritime provinces had any claim in regard to the public domain that would be handed over to the other provinces, and the Minister of Public Works indeed said that the hinterland of Quebec and Ontario had always belonged to these provinces and that it was always understood it would be handed over to them in due time. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) told us that we should not approach this question in any huckstering spirit, but in a broad and generous way, and judging by his attitude, it would seem to me that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) would be quite pleased to take the land for Quebec and to leave the broad and generous spirit to the maritime provinces. Surely there can be no better time to settle this whole matter than the present. It is a matter that concerns us in the maritime provinces very intimately.

When this matter was first discussed the member for Kings and Albert (Mr Fowler) made the statement that this measure would not pass until the maritime provinces got fair-play and justice, and the hon. memebr for Queens, Prince Edward Island, agreed with him in that view. These gentlemen are not here to-night but if they were I have no doubt they would be just as insistent as we upon this side of the House are in seeing that we get a more definite statement in regard to this question. I have presented my views on the matter, I think they are fair and reasonable views, and I believe they should receive just consideration from the government. We do not want to retard this legislation; we do not want to be unfair to Manitoba or to any province in the Dominion, but we want to get fair-play for the maritime provinces.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.). Surely that is a fair claim to make, but judging from the manner in which these gentlemen opposite receive these remarks they would seem to think that the maritime provinces have no right to present their case in this House. I leave these gentlemen to their responsibility for taking such an attitude as that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I wish to present a few figures to the committee which have been omitted to be given by the Minister of the Interior. In addition to the swamp lands, it ought not to be forgotten that the federal government has given to the province of Manitoba two sections in every township for educational purposes. I shall give the figures taken from the speech of Mr. Armstrong, the provincial treasurer of Manitoba, made in the year 1910, and which shows what a very valuable asset these lands have been to the province of Manitoba. The school lands fund, resting with the Dominion government for the benefit of the province on the 31st of March, 1909, is $2,185,211; deferred payments on lands sold to 31st of March, 1908, $2,750,600. In addition to that there were at that time unsold 1,789,674 acres, which at the low valuation of $8 per acre—which I think is very much below what the school lands sell for—amounts to $14,317,792, making a total value of the school lands in Manitoba including the cash on hand and the deferred payments and the value of the unsold land at $8 per acre the very handsome sum of $17,977,136.

Mr. Armstrong also stated that the province was at that time receiving a revenue from the school lands, cash, and deferred payments, of $166,056. I think that this must necessarily be taken into consideration in dealing with the question as to whether this proposed settlement is fair or unfair to the other provinces and particularly to

the smaller provinces of Canada. In my opinion, instead of passing this Bill as it is, instead of going through this farcical arrangement of taking back from the province of Manitoba its swamp lands, with the idea that two or three or four or five years from now they will be handed back, in connection with some arrangement with the three prairie provinces, it would be infinitely better, in view of the fact that the Dominion to-day is administering for the province two sections in every township, or one-seventeenth of the entire area of the lands of Manitoba, to let the province keep her swamp lands, keep as she will under this Bill the school lands, keep the lands in the added territory if you like, and give her a fair and reasonable, nay, a liberal sum, to enable her properly to administer affairs in the added territory. This is an additional reason why the amendment which I have the honour to propose to the committee should be adopted.

Amendment negatived: yeas, 62; nays, 101.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I mentioned last night that I had another amendment to move to clause 4. I move, seconded by Mr. Pardee:

That section 2 of section 4 be struck out and the following substituted therefor: The first half-yearly payment under this section shall be made on the 1st day of July, 1912.

As it is a pretty late hour of the night, and as this is a 'bona fide' amendment and is likely to be a contentious one and to take some time to discuss, I think I may fairly ask for an adjournment.

Mr. BORDEN. If it is going to take a good while to discuss it, we had better utilize some of the time this evening.

Mr. GUTHRIE. The subsection which I propose to amend occurs as subsection 2 of section 4, and as subsection 6 of section 5. In section 4 it applies to the payment of arrears on debt allowance, and in section 5 it applies to the payment of arrears in regard to lands. I fancy that the same argument will probably apply to both cases, and that, without infringing any rule, I can discuss both subsections under my motion, although the language of the amendment which I propose is directed merely to subsection 2 of section 4.

That brings up the whole question of the payment of arrears which to my mind—having examined the Bill as carefully as I could, and having listened now for several days to all the arguments which have been offered by supporters of the government in favour of the Bill both in principle and in detail—is perhaps the most objectionable feature in connection with the whole measure. It is certainly a feature which offers an opportunity for sound argument in opposition to it, and I noticed that the Prime Minister laboured very much as he sought to justify the payments proposed under subsection 2 of section 4 of this Bill. I followed very closely the argument of the Finance Minister upon the question, and I submit to any hon. member who will give the matter unbiased judgment, that the Finance Minister did not justify, nor attempt to justify, the payment of these arrears. I noticed also that, in the somewhat lengthy speech delivered by the Postmaster General, the only subject which he dealt with, apart from the school question was the payment of arrears, and I understood him to say that it did offer reasonable ground for argument. I should have liked very much had we had the benefit of the opinion and the learning of the Minister of Justice in regard to this particular clause. I cannot understand upon what principle it is proposed. I know of no principle of law, no principle of equity, which would justify such a proposal. I have not heard anything advanced which justifies the proposal so far during this debate, and I appeal to hon. members, whether on this or on the other side of the House, to give this question their earnest consideration. I am going to discuss it as seriously as I know how.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I regret very much the hour is so late for the discussion. I have waited patiently for two days in the hope that I might bring this matter before the House, and before a serious House——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Which would give this matter real consideration, and neither howl it down nor shout it through. The proposal as it affects subsection 2 of section 4 arises as to the debt allowance. It would almost seem unnecessary at this stage of the debate to approach the question of debt allowance from an historical point of view. Yet it is necessary to make some reference to it in order that one may place before the House a connected statement in regard to the matter. From what I have been able to gather myself, and from what I have gathered from the remarks of hon. gentlemen on both sides, I have come to the conclusion that the whole question of debt allowance is more or less of a fiction. The payment of the debt allowance itself is a fact but founded upon fiction. In the year of confederation, or the year prior to that event, when negotiations took place, and when the agreement was made between the representatives of the various provinces, the question of debt was a most difficult one to handle.

In old Canada, or in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, large sums

had been expended on public works. We had not paid the money, we owed the money. New Brunswick had a debt, and Nova Scotia had a debt, and after many conferences and much discussion the founders of confederation finally reached an agreement that the debt of Canada, or of Ontario and Quebec should be assumed by the Dominion. At first it was stated at $67,000,000, but latterly at $62,000,000, that of New Brunswick at $7,000,000, and that of Nova Scotia at $8,000,000. Now the peculiarity of that assumption of debt was this: The provinces were relieved of their obligations and of their payment of interest. From thenceforth the Dominion of Canada was to bear the obligation and to pay the interest.

We transferred our assets to the Dominion of Canada, we made nothing out of the transaction at all; the Dominion of Canada assumed the debt and took over the assets. themselves. Now, under conditions such as I have narrated, why should a new province entering confederation without debt have a debt allowance at all. That, I submit, is the fiction in connection with the whole matter. I do not believe there ever should have been a debt allowance to provinces which came into confederation without actually having a debt. But the custom has been followed, in all cases since confederation to make a debt allowance when any new province did enter confederation, so that it is probably too late at this present time to raise such an objection. But I am convinced in my own mind the whole theory of debt allowance is wrong, the whole thing is founded in fiction and should not have been allowed in the first instance. But we have done otherwise, and having done otherwise in regard to all the other provinces, I do not think we should make an exception in regard to the province of Manitoba. As each province entered into confederation a debt allowance was fixed. The amount was settled by agreement between the parties interested, and once having been fixed, settled, and adjusted, it should, I think, have been the proper course to have pursued that the settlement made should have remained final and unalterable. But I must admit that it has not in the case of various provinces had that finality. The debt allowance of the various provinces has been on more than one occasion revised, and on more than one occasion altered, but the principle has been adhered to as nearly as possible. The original principle upon which the provinces entered into confederation under actual agreement should be adhered to as nearly as may be, particularly where any change might work to the prejudice of one of our sister provinces.

The province of Manitoba comes to this government asking—as I read the memorial that has been presented—for equal treatment with the sister provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta. The Finance Minister (Mr. White) and the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) also emphasized the point that the guiding principle in the terms set forth in this Bill is to effect this equal treatment. There is no very good reason why such a parity should be established. Superficially, it sounds very well to say that the three prairie provinces are now placed on equal terms. I do not know that there would be very great objection to that course if the Bill did place the three prairie provinces on such terms, without doing harm or injustice to the other provinces of the Dominion. But my first point is that in regard to this debt allowance you are not placing Manitoba on equal terms with Saskatchewan and Alberta, but are giving Manitoba a distinct advantage over the other provinces.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I will try to elaborate that a little, I am convinced that it is so. In 1905 we incorporated into the confederation Alberta and Saskatchewan. The assumed population of each province was 250,000, and we gave them a debt allowance, which was considered fair having regard to the amount of the Dominion debt and to the number of our people, at a per capita rate of $32.43, making a capital sum of $8,107,500, as stated in these resolutions and in the Bill, and on this these provinces were entitled to receive 5 per cent as interest payable half yearly At that time, Manitoba's debt allowance was a comparatively small sum—about $400,000. But the population of Manitoba in 1905 was much less than the population of Manitoba to-day. To-day it is stated at 455,000 in round numbers, while the population of the sister province of Saskatchewan is about 40,000 more than that of Manitoba. It is proposed by the Bill to give Manitoba as a debt allowance the same capitalized sum as is enjoyed to-day by Saskatchewan with 40,000 more population according to the census of June last. If you are going to make Manitoba and Saskatchewan equal you would have to give Saskatchewan a further sum of $32.43 per head for that 40,000, or about $1,280,000 more for debt allowance.

That is only one discrimination. But the greatest discrimination, I submit, arises in connection with the amendment I have moved. The debt allowance, while founded in fiction, has been allowed since the year of confederation. And for what purpose? To assist the provinces in the administration of law within their own boundaries, to assist in regard to civil government, to help to pay some part of what would otherwise be a provincial tax upon

the people of the province. That is the assumption upon which that allowance is made to any province in regard to debt. The proposal in this Bill is to date these allowances from the 1st of July, 1908, in other words, to pay the province of Manitoba for four years of arrears the compensation which the government proposes to allow Manitoba in maintaining government and peace and order within the boundaries of the province. I submit that there is no ground for such compensation. I ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. White) if he can point out any such ground. If you pay arrears, there must have been some debt, but in this case there was no debt, no obligation, no expense. Manitoba, from 1908 to the present day, has not spent a five cent piece in regard to these extended boundaries. That is a statement that, I think, cannot be controverted. Then, not having spent a cent; not having had it within its power to spend a cent for this purpose, upon what principle are you going to compensate; upon what principle are you going to pay arrears? The same reasoning, I think, applies to the arrears proposed under this Bill in respect to the lands of Manitoba. For, in respect to the land, you propose to pay arrears of three or four years. When Saskatchewan received indemnity for its public lands, those lands were actually within the provincial boundaries, and were administered by the Dominion of Canada. The province might be put to some expense in the maintenance of peace and order, and carrying on the government in respect to these lands and the people who occupied them.

It was for that reason that allowances were made to Saskatchewan and Alberta. But Manitoba has not had the lands, she has not the additional territory yet. For four years for which you propose to pay this land bounty, not one acre of the land has been within the boundary of that province, she has not and could not spend a dollar upon it. We would naturally expect that a strong case would be made out before any government would be justified in paying out of the public treasury $2,180,000 which under this Bill it is proposed to pay to Manitoba for arrears. For what? Compensation for what? Indemnity for what? Damages for what? Not one five-cent piece has Manitoba expended, not one five-cent piece has Manitoba suffered by way of damages. On July 13, 1908, parliament passed a resolution setting forth that the boundary between Manitoba and Ontario should be the line made permanent under this Bill. I can understand that if Manitoba had then passed an Act accepting that boundary and taken possession of those lands, there might be some justice behind this claim, some reason for paying these arrears, but Manitoba did not take that course, the province refused to accept that proposition and never agreed to accept that territory until March, 1911. We know that under the British North America Act, 1871, the Dominion parliament cannot alter the boundaries of a province without the consent of the province expressed by an Act of its legislature. Such an Act was passed by Manitoba in March, 1911, but it was not officially notified to this government until October or November last. I could understand the payment of this sum by way of bounty or gratuity, but you cannot properly put it on the ground that it is a debt, that Manitoba has any legal or equitable right to it. Manitoba has had and still has a vast area of swamp lands in her possession. She has realized $2,400,000 for 800,000 acres or a net sum of $3 an acre. She has been administering these lands since 1908, when we passed the resolution. She has had the ownership of these lands, and has derived the revenue from them, and still has an enormous amount of swamp lands in her possession. The best evidence of the value of these lands is to be found in the prospectus issued by Manitoba in which the claim is made that the swamp lands still remaining in the possession of Manitoba are worth £5,000,000 sterling. They have these lands to-day, they have had them for a number of years. Then why under such circumstances should the Dominion, made up of nine provinces all contributing in taxation to the exchequer, present $2,000,000 to Manitoba? It would not be right, it would not be just, and I sincerely hope it will not be done. I can best illustrate the position by an ordinary case of vendor and purchaser where a contract for purchase and sale of land is entered into to be carried out a year hence, the vendor remaining in possession for that year and then on the payment of the purchase money at the end of the year the possession to be changed; the vendor continuing to enjoy possession and saying to the purchaser at the end of the year: I want interest for the year. He would laugh at the man, such a claim would not be entertained for a moment. That is on a par with the position here.

Here is Manitoba since 1908 in full possession of the land, still in possession and enjoying the increment from the land, and when this Bill comes into force with these terms you turn round and say: Notwithstanding that you have had possession, notwithstanding that you have enjoyed the profit, we are going to hand you four years' arrears on this transaction, out of the treasury of the people of Canada. I do not know how many of my hon. friends from the province of Ontario, who sit behind the government, appreciate the significance of this question to On-

tario. I am inclined to think that the five ministers from Ontario cannot and do not appreciate the true significance of the position. I believe that they have been asleep to the situation, or else the influence of the Minister of the Interior has been prepondering over them. He simply walked over them in connection with this transaction. It may be a great tribute to his ability—it is; it may be a great tribute to his tenacity—it is; it may be a great tribute to his influence in the Cabinet, and it is a great tribute to any one man who by his influence can drive through a bargain such as is grafted upon the present Bill, whereby Manitoba can come to the treasury of Canada and take out $2,000,000 odd of the taxes of the people. Upon what principle? I have not heard anyone state upon what principle. Upon no principle. There is no principle to it; it is nothing more nor less than a straight treasury raid. What is the significance to Ontario? I know that part of the province from which I come and I wish I had some of my neighbours in that province here tonight. I want my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. Clarke), my hon. friend from Dufferin (Mr. Best) and my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson), who support this government, to tell me how they are going to justify to their people this proposition. Here is the province of Ontario with a population, in round numbers, of 2,500,000, out of a total population of 7,200,000. We have about 35 per cent of the people of this country living in the province of Ontario, and at the same time we pay, as nearly as may be, 40 per cent of the taxes of the whole Dominion. We have a greater interest, in the province of Ontario in the amount of money which is taken out of the treasury than any other part of the country has. We contribute more in taxation than any other portion of the country. Where do we get our money? How is it going to come into the treasury? Where does it come from? The money comes from taxation, and the chief source of that taxation is our customs taxation. We received $73,000,000 last year from customs taxation, and $16,000,000, or $18,000,000 from excise. Ontario paid something over $29,000,000 in customs taxation out of the $73,000,000 collected, which is nearly 40 per cent, and we have 35 per cent of the population. We are paying more than our share. What does this proposal mean to Ontario? It means that you are going to pay out of the treasury this $2,000,000 odd to the province of Manitoba and that $800,000 of taxes of the people of Ontario are going to be handed over to Manitoba without the slightest justification, as 40 per cent of that amount will come out of the taxes of the people of Ontario. What are we going to say to our people? How are we going to explain it?—merely by the fact that in 1905 we constituted two new provinces and gave them terms adequate, proper and just at the time they were incorporated and that we did not at that time do so with respect to Manitoba? Is that a good reason, is that a good excuse? Will it do to say that in 1908 we unanimously resolved in this House that we would enlarge the boundaries of Manitoba? Would that be an excuse because Manitoba said: No we will not take those boundaries. If that were the ground upon which the transaction rested these arrears should only go at the farthest to October of last year, when Manitoba formally accepted that boundary. If you do not rest it upon that what are you going to rest it on? I do not know of any principle. I have tried to think of one. I have tried not to involve the matter but to get it as clearly in my mind as possible and to present it as concisely as I could to the committee. I know that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. White) is a gentleman who has had very great experience in dealing with large financial transactions. I know that the Minister of Finance is perhaps the most experienced man in this House in dealing with large bulks of trust money. I know he will realize that in handling the money of the people of Canada he is handling trust money and that as in his career up to the present time in the city of Toronto he has handled very large amounts of trust money, I believe that if the case is fairly presented to him it will appeal to him that, as the trustee for the people of Canada, as the trustee of the money in the public treasury, he must have a much stronger case than has been made out here to authorize him to take $2,000,000 odd out of the treasury and hand it over to Manitoba when that money belongs to the people of Canada and when forty per cent of it has been paid in taxes by the people of Ontario. I think that if the case is fairly presented to him he will be impressed with the responsibility which he must carry with regard to this transaction. I do not believe that members of the government from Ontario have seriously considered this aspect of the case. The hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) has discussed this question and he is in his place tonight. I know he is a lawyer and a good one, but I do not believe that he has ever looked into the question of the payment of these arrears. I do not believe that any ground exists upon which that money can be legally paid. The only thing that you can do is to say to Manitoba: Here, out of the treasury of Canada, is $2,000,000 odd which we are going to give to you as a gift. It is a gift. Let the people

know that you are giving it as a gift. Do not say that you are giving it on the ground of arrears. I noticed my hon. friend dealing with it, labouring with it and endeavouring to explain that feature of the proposition to the House. Any one who watched him could well understand the difficulties that he had to contend with. I do not believe that he satisfied his own mind and he certainly did not satisfy hon. members who sat on this side of the House, that there was anything right or anything proper in connection with the payment of these arrears. The hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier), I believe, was prepared to swallow the whole thing in one gulp, but even he had to say that it was an awkward point which had been raised in regard to these arrears and that there was ground for argument. Is there not a ground for argument? I appeal to the Minister of the Interior and ask him what justification there is for handing over this sum of money. Suppose we give this sum on account of debt allowance, suppose it is right—which I do not admit—suppose the land allowance is right too, suppose the boundary line is right also, what justification can my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior give to the committee for this transaction? To me it appears to be nothing short of an outrage, nothing short of an enormity. I do not look upon it as political payment to the people of Manitoba. I believe that the public men both here and in Manitoba are above that sort of thing, but I believe it is wrong to take the money of the people of Canada and hand it over to Manitoba unless the province of Manitoba is legally entitled to it. I have stated the facts as they present themselves to me, I have endeavoured to state them fairly and accurately, and if there is any right or justification on the part of the government of Canada in paying over this money to Manitoba I would like to hear about it. In the meantime I propose to move a resolution. It applies not only to subsection 2 of the present clause, but it is likewise applicable to subsection 6 of clause 5.

My amendment, which will probably be moved again on the third reading of the Bill is:

The first half-yearly payment under this section shall be paid on the first day of July, 1912.

Mr. BORDEN. I would be inclined to concur with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Guthrie) that the expedient of debt allowance in respect to the new provinces, was only an expedient after all, and perhaps a somewhat awkward one. There was justification for a debt allowance in the first place, in that the provinces had incurred debt for the purpose of constructing public works which were at confederation handed over to the Dominion of Canada, and with respect to which it was proper the provinces should receive consideration. When Alberta and Saskatchewan were constituted as provinces, the system of debt allowance was continued, and the argument of the hon. gentleman appeals to me when he declares that it was only an expedient for giving to these provinces a certain amount for the purpose of enabling them to carry on their government. The hon. gentleman argues that there is discrimination in favour of Manitoba as against Saskatchewan, because Saskatchewan has 40,000 population in excess of Manitoba, but he surely knows that when the two provinces were started in business in the first instance, Saskatchewan had a larger population than Alberta, although section 19 of the Alberta Act, and the same section 19 of the Saskatchewan Act, put these two provinces precisely on the same basis. Therefore, on his argument, the very measure which he supported in this House, created a discrimination between Alberta and Saskatchewan.

Mr. GUTHRIE. My argument was based on the assumption that the case of the government was founded on the principle of equalization. I did not argue that Saskatchewan and Alberta were equal, but what I said was, that the excuse for this legislation was to make them equal.

Mr. BORDEN. Does the hon. member understand that there was no principle of equality when Alberta and Saskatchewan were constituted provinces? Did the measure proposed by the late administration which he supported establish a basis of inequality as between Alberta and Saskatchewan? The hon. member contrasts the population of Manitoba with that of Saskatchewan, but why does he not contrast the population of Manitoba with that of Alberta, or the population of Saskatchewan with the population of Alberta? In order to make a point against the measure we have in hand, the hon. gentleman is driven to conclusions which would point directly against the measure he supported in 1905. He asks us to name the principle upon which we make this debt allowance, after he has himself declared that the debt allowance to Alberta and Saskatchewan was based on no principle at all. But, I have a very good answer to his question and it is that we base the debt allowance in this case upon the principle that the province of Manitoba is entitled to be placed on an equality with the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. I have already conceded that in the case of Alberta and Saskatchewan it was only an expedient for enabling these provinces to proceed with their national housekeeping

and to take care of their public expenditure.

Then the hon. gentleman asked why in the name of all that is sensible any land allowance should be made to Manitoba especially during the past three or four years when Manitoba has not had these lands. The hon. gentleman has argued this whole question more or less as if he were arguing a lawsuit, and I would remind him of the well known principle: that equity regards that as having been done which ought to have been done; and inasmuch as the province of Manitoba should have and would have had these her boundaries extended in 1908, if the financial terms now accorded had been granted to that province at that time, I say it is no more than just that we should compensate Manitoba now. The hon. gentleman seems to overlook the fact that according to the measure he himself supported in 1885 without a murmur, the compensation in lieu of lands was based on population, and I would ask him why it is that a very large allowance in lieu of public lands should be made to Alberta and Saskatchewan and only a trifling allowance in comparison should be made to Manitoba. Inasmuch as these three provinces have not their own natural resources, inasmuch as these resources within their boundaries are administered by the government of Canada, we are disposed to regard them all as in the same category, and for that reason, and taking the principle which the hon. member (Mr. Guthrie) supported in 1905, we say that Manitoba to-day is entitled to similar compensation in lieu of her public lands to that which was given to Alberta and Saskatchewan in 1905 and which has been enjoyed by both of these provinces ever since.

For the reason that I have already mentioned, we say further that the allowance in respect of public lands ought to date, not from to-day, but from the 1st day of July, 1908. My hon. friend seems to think that there is no precedent for this. There have been a good many precedents for antedating allowances. It was done in the case of Nova Scotia in 1869; it was done in respect of all the provinces in 1884. Nova Scotia under a statute of this parliament passed in 1869 received an allowance, not from 1869, but commencing on the 1st day of July, 1867.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I think that was on finding that her debt was really more than it had been considered to be by the conference. It was ascertained that she had really spent more money in the interval.

Mr. BORDEN. I do not know that there is any particular reason why this parliament has not the same power to correct an error in 1912 that it had in 1869. What I find in the statute is this:

> Nova Scotia shall receive from Canada for the period of ten years from the 1st day of July, 1867, an allowance of $82,698 per annum, in addition to all other sums payable to the said province under the British North America Act, 1867.

That was passed on the 22nd of June, 1869, and a similar statute was passed in 1884. Under these circumstances, I think my hon. friend, on reflection, will come to the conclusion that the allowances proposed to be made by this Bill are no more than just and fair, and I do not think that the appeal which my hon. friend seems disposed to make to this province or that province or the other province, especially to the province of Ontario, will find very much response. If the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan are entitled to be placed on the basis which he himself supported in 1905, it seems to me that the present government is doing no more than simple justice in extending to-day the same treatment to the province of Manitoba.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I thank my right hon. friend for the very courteous manner in which he has replied to my remarks; but he has directed his reply more to the question of debt allowance and allowance in respect of lands than to the question of the payment of arrears. My motion is directed entirely to the question of arrears. I did not ask for any justification in regard to the payment of debt allowance or the allowance in respect of lands; but what I do ask for is some justification to be laid before the House upon the question which my hon. friend the Postmaster General struck in the course of his remarks the other night. It was the one branch of the question which he touched upon, and he saw that there was an argument in it. My right hon. friend refers to the case of Nova Scotia. I can only depend on my memory and on the statements made in the course of this debate, to say that when the arrangement in the preliminary agreement was made with Nova Scotia, the debt of Nova Scotia was placed at a certain amount, and before Nova Scotia had actually come into the confederation it had spent a million or two million dollars more. Then, two years after the union the question was raised, and it was enacted by the Act which the right hon. gentleman has just read that Nova Scotia's debt allowance should be paid and interest should be paid from the date of confederation. So it was with the re-arrangement of 1884. Then it was discovered that instead of the allowance which Canada, that is, Ontario and Quebec, got of $62,000,000, the allowance should have been $73,000,000, and changes were made in respect of other provinces. Canada was paying interest from 1867 upon

$10,000,000 upon which she should not have paid it, and the Act of 1884 provided that the interest payments should be to Canada as of the confederation year. There was a principle for which there was full justification. But surely that is different from this case. Alberta and Saskatchewan were incorporated five years ago. But leave that out, and come to the year 1908. Since 1908 Alberta and Saskatchewan have been governing and controlling all the territories within their boundaries and have been entitled to the subsidies which we gave them. Manitoba on the other hand, has not been in possession or control of the added territory at all, nor has she spent a five-cent piece or incurred a responsibility there, while on the other hand, she has had possession of the swamp lands, which have been estimated as worth from $25,000,000 to $30,000,000, and has enjoyed the proceeds of those lands. Is there any parity in these cases? My right hon. friend cites the well-known maxim of equity, that equity considers that done which ought to have been done. What would have been done if Manitoba had passed an Act in 1908 accepting the boundary then offered? But she did not do it. Manitoba was in default and not Canada, and why should the treasury of Canada suffer to the extent of $2,000,000 because of that default on the part of Manitoba? That is the ground of my amendment.

Mr. CARVELL. The right hon. leader of the government has not attempted to answer the argument put forward by my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) against taking $2,178,000 from the people of the rest of Canada, and giving it to the people of Manitoba. My right hon. friend did not elucidate that point any more than he did when he introduced the Bill, when he said:

> I have already said that Manitoba urged, and urged with great insistence, that inasmuch as her claim should have had consideration in 1905 it would be proper, and only just and fair, that whatever financial provisions were to be embodied in the Bill providing for an extension of her boundaries, should date not from today, but from the period in 1905 when the new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan were first constituted.

But he goes on to say that he hardly knew whether that was right or not, and he finally made a compromise under which he dated from the 1st of July, 1908. Well, Sir, the only earthly reason my friend gave last Monday for the payment of these arrearages was that the province of Manitoba had been wanting an extension of its boundaries, and they had not got it. Then my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, who I notice is not here to-night—will have great difficulty in coming here and defending this thing.

Mr. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman is speaking in very bad taste indeed. The Minister of Finance is detained from the House by illness.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. CARVELL. Do not get excited.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. CARVELL. Well it is early in the evening yet.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. CARVELL. If you will give me time to do so I will be only too glad to take it back. I had no idea whatever that the Minister of Finance was ill. I had no reason whatever in the world to imagine that he was absent on account of illness and therefore I make the most humble apology possible. Now if the Minister of Finance were here, I think there is no man in Canada who would feel as ashamed of himself for being a party to this transaction as would that hon. gentleman. The Minister of Finance, as has been stated here a great many times, is a man who has been used to handling financial transactions of great magnitude and he is too good a financier not to know that there is not one particle of foundation on which this thing can be based. You have the statement by the Minister of Finance when the resolutions were introduced, that Manitoba had a grievance and was dissatisfied, and therefore, something must be done to relieve that grievance and dissatisfaction. That is all the excuse that can be urged. The Minister of the Interior last evening attempted to give us an excuse for this—I will not say hold up, although if it were a business transaction I think it would be treated as such—but the hon. gentleman said that in 30 years, or thereabouts, the province of Manitoba had had something to do with administering the affairs of Keewatin. But when it was called to his attention that the Dominion had paid the Governor of Manitoba a salary for his services, the hon. gentleman was driven back to the statement: Well our police magistrates sometimes have issued warrants in connection with criminal affairs. And the hon. gentleman went so far as to say farther: We have to pay them salaries, and possibly we pay them salaries a little in excess of what we would otherwise do, on account of their looking after the administration of affairs in this territory. Well it is a pretty small excuse to urge that salaries have been paid by Manitoba to a few police magistrates in the province of Ontario for the last four years to administer the affairs of 700 or 800 white people, and probably they have not issued half a dozen warrants in that territory during that period. It is a pretty

small excuse to come to this Parliament and ask us to pay $2,178,000 for that small amount of work. I have taken up the argument of the three responsible Ministers of the Crown, and I come now to the arguments of the Prime Minister when trying to answer my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie). The latter hon. gentleman's amendment complains not of the debt allowance, and not of the allowance for land, although he does claim that the debt allowance paid is based on scientific principles. I want to tell my hon. friend in passing that the original debt allowance was not based on scientific principles, it was based on good mathematical grounds, and grounds which could be justified before any legislative assembly. But the right hon. gentltman beat around the bush, he failed to come to the point, until finally when he saw that he had to say something in justification of this, and then what reason did he give? Oh, well, equity considers that as being done which should be done. And he says that because Manitoba wanted an extension of her boundaries in 1905 and in 1908, and did not get that extension, because she wanted to be put in the position that Alberta and Saskatchewan were put in 1905, and the request was not granted, therefore, she ought, in all equity, to be put back in the same position as though she had received her lands, and received her boundary extensions in 1905. I would ask my right hon. friend if Saskatchewan and Alberta did not want autonomy some four or five years before it was granted to them, I want to show the fallacy of the argument which the right hon. gentleman made. These two provinces wanted autonomy for four or five years, and it was not granted to them, but finally when their wish was acceded to, what were the principles upon which the financial arrangements were made? They were to get a grant for government purposes the same as any other province gets. They were to get an allowance in lieu of debt, based if you will on scientific principles. Then they were to get an allowance in lieu of their lands, which I think is based on scientific principles. And fourth they were to get a certain amount for the erection of public buildings. Did they get these payments extended back for four or five years previous to that because they had wanted it? Again, whenever the right hon. gentleman has been driven to the wall he makes the retort: The present leader of the present opposition did 'it when he was in power, and, therefore, because he did wrong we are entitled to do wrong. Pressed a little further on this question he says: Alberta and Saskatchewan got certain things in 1905. I submit that these provinces got on $2,000,000 of arrearages because they had a grievance which had not been remedied for the last four years. Therefore I think the right hon. gentleman has to look further than the financial arrangements made with Alberta and Saskatchewan in order to justify this raid on the public treasury of Canada at the expense of the rest of the provinces.

Section 4 agreed to.

On section 5,

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would suggest that as there are some gentlemen who wish to make remarks on this section 5, that perhaps it could stand, and we might proceed with sections 6, 7, 8 and 9, which are non-contentious.

Mr. BORDEN. Let section 5 stand; pass sections 6, 7, 8 and 9.

On section 9.

Mr. MONDOU. I gave notice of an amendment yesterday to section 7.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I regret that I cannot——

Mr. MONDOU. I wish to know when there will be an opportunity for me to speak to the amendment of which I have given notice?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Section 5 stands, and perhaps the hon. gentleman——

Mr. MONDOU. I do not understand the procedure, but I want to know when will be the proper time for me to speak to my amendment?

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Borden House adjourned at 1.50 a.m. Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 8, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

EXTENSION OF BOUNDARIES—MANITOBA.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 115) to provide for the extension of the boundaries of the province of Manitoba.—Mr. Borden.

Mr. A. A. MONDOU (Yamaska). (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I beg leave to amend the Bill now before the House by the insertion, after section 5, of the following section:—

Nothing in the present Act shall affect prejudicially the school rights of the minority,

Roman Catholic or Protestant, which inhabit the territory now annexed to Manitoba.

And beg leave to withdraw the notice of motion in amendment which I have given on a previous occasion.

It is with great pleasure, Mr. Chairman, that I address this House for the first time in the language that is dear to me, and I have a special motive for doing so, considering that the English reporters, in the report of the remarks I made the other night to explain the stand I was taking on the amendment to the Bill, on the first reading, and to explain the reason why I did not vote, have not given to my words the meaning I intended them to convey.

I consider that this report, owing no doubt to my imperfect knowledge of the English language, does not give the exact meaning of what I intended to say, when I first addressed the House in English.

At first I declined to vote on the amendment of the hon. leader of the opposition, and later on, I voted for the second reading of the Bill, but it was after the remarks of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) who had stated that when the Bill was drafted, the minority in the district of Keewatin had no vested rights safeguarded by the constitution.

My own opinion, after a fairly thorough study of the law, was not in accord with the one given by the hon. minister. Notwithstanding, since the hon. Minister of Public Works was stating positively that, under the constitution, the minority was not entitled to claim school rights, I saw nothing in the way to prevent me from voting for the second reading of the Bill as it was.

There was nothing in it that I did not approve of; it rather sinned by omission. I considered the Bill to be incomplete; but if the intention of those who drafted the Bill was such that it did not admit of vested rights for the minority, there was nothing according to my views to prevent the addition of a saving clause on the lines of the one I am proposing by this amendment. If the minority, Catholic or Protestant, of Keewatin have no vested rights, the adoption of this amendment can do no wrong, but if the minority have rights, they will be put in a position by this amendment to claim those rights before the proper tribunal.

By voting this amendment parliament would be giving due regard to the minority who have a perfect right to be respected and are entitled to live.

For my part, Mr. Chairman, I do not conceal that the stand I am taking on this question is rather strong and resolute. For the last fifteen years, in the province of Quebec, this question has been causing a considerable amount of agitation. It is probably for the last time in the political history of this country—certainly, for a great number of hon. gentlemen who are in this House to-night—that we are called upon to legislate on such matters.

I say again that the rights of the minority in Keewatin, be it Roman Catholic or Protestant, must be respected.

My intention is not to intensify the agitation that is going on on this question, nor do I wish to stand on narrow grounds. In all my business relations and in the discharge of my professional duties, I have given ample proof that I am free from prejudices, political, racial or religious. In submitting this amendment, I am moved by a sense of duty and loyalty; my only motive is to secure to the minorities the constitutional rights that are theirs.

In my opinion, this question is not so intricate as it might be supposed to be in some quarters, and perhaps I will be allowed to give my personal view on the subject. I am possessed of more light today than I had at the beginning of this discussion. I have been studying that question with great caution and with the sole aim of arriving at a practical result, and also with the object of discerning who are those in this House who are really seeking the welfare of the minorities. I want to have an expression of opinion, clear and straight, and I think that my amendment leaves no loophole on that score. What are we doing at this very moment? We are studying a deed—I am a practising public notary of the province of Quebec, and as such, I am fairly well acquainted with such matters—we are studying a deed between the province of Manitoba and the Government of Canada. I liken the situation to that of two private individuals who have decided, the one to sell and the other to buy a property. They both go to the notary, quite decided to close the bargain.

When the Bill was first brought before the House, nobody objected to a deed between the province of Manitoba and the Government of Canada. For my part, I thought it my duty to ratify the principle of the Bill and to uphold the government in all that relates to financial and other arrangements in the Bill. Following my comparison, let us suppose that we are now in the notary's office and we are examining the clauses of the deed by which we are giving to the province of Manitoba a territory that is under our jurisdiction. We have the right to impose the conditions that we deem proper. Consequently, I ask that we put in the deed the clause that I have just moved. If the province of Manitoba which is invited to submit to that condition declines to accept it as too burdensome, the deed will be put aside and the whole thing will have to be started over again.

Negotiations on that boundary question have been going on for a long time between the two governments. Everybody seems to agree on the principle, but it is not so when we come to the conditions of the deed. As a member of this House, I ask that the minority in the added territory be protected, and in doing so I am sincerely convinced that I am discharging a sacred duty devolving upon me. I came to the conclusion long ago that the majorities in this country don't want any protection, and that those who take an interest in the common wealth would be putting their time to better use in caring for the weak and those who are not in a position to uphold their rights and privileges. We are bound to champion all legitimate claims, to show spirit and energy; we are bound to stand erect and prove that our constitution is as immovable as a rock; that it is the foundation of our social life, if we want to see harmony and goodwill between races and creeds in this country.

Under the circumstances, in accepting this amendment, we would be doing a commendable thing and would demonstrate that, true to its duty, the Canadian parliament is ready to extend its solicitude to all, without stopping to inquire if those who are seeking redress represent only a few individuals or a million of people; the number does not affect the principle. If vested rights do exist, they must be upheld by a guarantee.

Relying on that principle, I hope that my amendment will receive the endorsement of the majority of this House, or at least will induce the House to have the Bill stand until we have ascertained if the province of Manitoba absolutely rejects all arrangements upon those lines.

Let us examine for a moment the stand taken by the other party to the deed. Has that party always abided by the constitution? In all transactions there must be honesty. Cannot that province be taxed with contempt of court?

Are they not still ignoring the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada and even of the highest court of the empire, His Majesty's Privy Council? No effect is given to that decision because it runs against the will of a majority who refuse to accept it. So long as this situation will endure, the decision of the Privy Council will remain a dead letter. Even if my presence in this House should result in nothing else than giving me this opportunity of upholding the rights of the minorities and the respect of the constitution, I should feel that I have not been sent here for nothing, because we are not entitled to be called legislators if we disregard the constitution; unless that by mutual consent, after thorough consideration and for very serious reasons—

that this parliament will have to discuss—the conclusion is reached that we have no constitutional right to modify the British North America Act. I raise all these objections because we have good reason to be on guard when dealing with Manitoba. The situation would be quite different if we had any guarantee that the Manitoba government would deal generously and fairly with the minorities. It is an admitted fact that the provinces in which the rights of minorities have been upheld, never had any trouble of that kind in the administration of their public affairs. Difficulties and troubles on that score are found to exist only in those provinces where the majority has been unfair towards the minority.

There is no doubt in my mind that vested rights exist in the territory of Keewatin, and I can find the proof of it in what has been said in this House during this debate. The Northwest Territory Act that is to be found in the Revised Statutes of 1906, ch. 62, is my authority for the stand I am taking. Section 10 of this Act relates to the minority and says:

> The Commissioner in council if authorized to make ordinances respecting education, shall pass all necessary ordinances in respect thereto; but in the laws or ordinances relating to education it shall always be provided that a majority of the ratepayers of any district or portion of the Territories, or of any less portion or subdivision thereof, by whatever name the same is known, may establish such schools therein as they think fit, and make the necessary assessment and collection of rates therefor; and also that the minority of the ratepayers therein, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish separate schools therein, and in such case, the ratepayers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic separate schools shall be liable only to assessments of such rates as they impose upon themselves in respect thereof.

I come from the province of Quebec, and I pray to God that I will never see the day when the rights of the Protestant minority will be in jeopardy, but if that day must come, I give my solemn word that I will be seen in the front ranks of those who will fight for those rights whoever may be the party on which we will have to rely to give fair play to that minority. I am free from all political faction. I stand on higher grounds and I say it is high time that all that agitation comes to an end. It is high time that those who wish to remove all causes for discord and bad feelings stand and raise their voice to affirm that the time has come for the recognizance of such rights as we deem dear and sacred.

It is said, Mr. Chairman, that the counsel to the commissioner of Keewatin has never been appointed and the responsibility

for that is put on the late government. I concede that the late administration has a great part of responsibility, but I do not admit that the present ministers of the Crown are justified in taking refuge behind the wrongdoings of their predecessors. This tu quoque argument is played out.

I hold the principles far above the maintenance of any government; we are in duty bound to stand up and to unite to safeguard what we deem most sacred: individual, civil and religious liberty.

Can it be contended that because a Canadian government has not appointed a counsel to the commissioner of Keewatin, the parliament is to-day debarred from legislating on this question? In my opinion there is absolutely nothing in that contention, as can be seen by section 3 of the Imperial Act of 1871 amending the constitution of 1867:—

3. The parliament of Canada may from time to time, with the consent of the Legislature of any province of the said Dominion increase, diminish, or otherwise alter the limits of such province, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the said legislature, and may, with the like consent, make provision respecting the effect and operation of any such increase or diminution or alteration of territory in relation to any province affected thereby.

I am well aware that if we were creating new provinces we would have the right to impose any school system we deemed proper; but the question is quite different. We are engaged at this moment in the discussion, as the Bill puts it, or 'such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the the legislature,' and such terms and conditions as the parliament of Canada may exact.

This section 3 leaves no doubt in my mind as to the right of this parliament to exact the condition contained in the amendment I submitted to the committee. That right exists virtually if not in the actuality; and if it does not exist in the actuality it is because certain proceedings have not been taken that can be taken. We have plenty of time yet to act; the parliament can order the Bill to stand for a time to allow the Governor-in-Council to pass the necessary ordinances. I say again that this right exists virtually if not in the actuality.

I am free to admit that for some years past, I have not given much time to the study of legal questions and it is my intention in future to devote more of my time to the law, and more especially to the study of constitutional law, but at the same time I submit the above remarks to the committee as my humble opinion upon this question. I will say further that if there is some doubt as to the existence of constitutional rights for the minority in Keewatin, what wrong can be done by having this amendment added to the Bill? If no rights exist, the clause will amount to nothing, but if rights do exist the minority will be protected. It goes without saying that the question is worth studying. The right hon. leader of the government himself expressed a doubt on this point when he said in his speech of March 6, at page 4582 of the unrevised edition of the Debates: 'But whether I am right or wrong in believing that that is constitutionally impracticable.'

Everybody knows that when it comes to the construction of the text of a law, we have very often conflicting opinions. Every day judgments of the Superior Court are invalidated by the Court of Appeals, and after having gone through all the courts of the country, a case often goes to the Privy Council in England.

For my part, I hold that the deed with the province of Manitoba which the parliament is asked to confirm, cannot be accepted unless there is added to it the clause contained in the amendment that I have the honour to submit to the committee.

I do not propose to say anything more at this moment; I had no time to prepare a long speech, and I just gave expression to my sincere conviction. I hope that the House, after full consideration, will accept the amendment and will give ample justice to those who are entitled to it.

The position is thus: If this clause was inserted into the Bill it would prevent the government of Manitoba to do any injustice to the minority if it were so disposed.

Do not let us forget that the man who enters a house with the intention of appropriating to himself certain articles which are not to be found in that house, is committing nevertheless an act that in law is called robbery. This clause of mine puts a gate in front of the door of the house and this gate is needed all the more because those who are dwelling in that house are more than one thousand miles away from those from whom they can claim assistance.

I have voted for the Bill as a whole, I have accepted the financial arrangements, because I trust the present government, and that I have no doubt that in drafting this Bill they gave due weight and consideration to all its sections. When I was speaking on the address. I stated that I had confidence in the government, because it was composed of business men. Now I think it is the time to settle that question in a business-like way and not from the viewpoint of religious and racial prejudices. If the amendment is carried it will be up to Manitoba to conform the school system actually in force in that province to the school system of the added territory. The

other night, when speaking on this very question, I said that it was more than fifteen years old and that it was at the root of all the agitation that had been going on since, and those who are responsible for that situation are exactly the same people whom we are dealing with to-night. For any one who will study that question, not from the viewpoint of a political party —it is far above such considerations— but from the loftier viewpoint of the union between the different races and the different creeds, it is quite evident that the government of Manitoba could settle this question in an instant. The only thing to do is to give effect to the Manitoba Act of 1870, and if that is done nobody will hear any more about the 'Manitoba school question.'

We all agree upon the necessity of having union and harmony between the different nationalities and creeds of this country, and if the Manitoba government would give effect to that Manitoba Act of 1870, it would go a long way in the direction of that ideal situation we are aiming at and we could then bend our energies toward the development of our resources in peace and harmony.

Every day members of this House are pressing upon parliament the claims of other people. That is exactly what I am doing at this moment, and I say that now is the time to act, because we are now discussing the very last sections of the Bill. It is the time, now or never, to take a strong and well defined stand.

I listened the other day with great attention to the remarks of the hon. leader of the opposition on that Bill. I have always professed a great admiration for his personality, but instead of taking example from the Duke of Wellington fighting the French at the gates of Lisbon and remaining within the lines of Torres Vedras, he should have taken example from Henry of Navarre saying to his men—as the hon. gentleman himself said to his friends during the last election in the province of Quebec—'Follow my white plume, it will lead you to victory.' It is true that Henry of Navarre came back victorious, while the right hon. gentleman has been completely routed.

In concluding I say that I feel the full responsibility of the stand I am taking and I am quite willing to assume it, Even if I had done nothing else in all my public career, I would still feel that it is sufficient to atone for all the political sins that I might have committed.

Mr. J. A. M. AIKINS (Brandon). I have the greatest respect for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mondou) who has moved this amendment, and I appreciate the sincerity and honesty which has actuated him in presenting it to the committee, but I cannot agree with the propriety of the conclusions at which he has arrived. His amendment reads as handed to me by the clerk:

> Nothing in this Act shall affect prejudicially in any way the rights of the minority, either Protestant or Catholic, to separate schools, as they now exist in such part of the territories, now annexed to Manitoba.

This amendment assumes that there are separate schools existing; it assumes that there may be a Protestant minority or a Roman Catholic minority which has a right in respect to separate schools. But, I submit that this parliament should not legislatively decide that there are existing now in the territory to be added to Manitoba any separate schools or separate school rights. It becomes a matter for consideration (having regard to the wording of the resolution) before we can intelligently vote upon it. What educational system does exist there? On the 15th of July, 1870 Rupert's Land, the Territories, including Keewatin, and the province of Manitoba, were added to confederation. By the Manitoba Act there was created for Manitoba a constitution, and power was given to it to govern and legislate according to that constitution and subject to its limitations. That Act was confirmed by an Act of the Imperial parliament. The same Act provides for the union of the territories, as well as Manitoba, to the Canadian confederacy. It was also necessary to create for the territories a constitution, a government and a legislature to enact the necessary laws respecting those territories. This parliament passed, in 1871, an Act under which the Lieutenant Governor and a council to assist him were authorized to pass ordinances necessary for the government of these Territories. Keewatin was made a separate district from the Territories. The Lieutenant Governor of the province of Manitoba, under the instructions of the Governor in Council of the Dominion, governed the district of Keewatin, and continued to do so from that date until 1906, when it was added to the territories. In 1875 this parliament passed an enactment which empowered the government of the Northwest Territories to enact legislation respecting schools subject to limitations, but it was amended in 1880, and again in 1885; these provisions practically continued in the Northwest Territories till 1905. But, that legislation was not legislation creating school districts or creating school rights in this territory. It only enabled the government of the Northwest Territories to legislate in respect of separate schools, but with that enabling power there was a limitation. The section passed in 1875 reads:

When and so soon as any system of taxation shall be adopted in any district or portion of the Northwest Territories, the Lieutenant Governor, by and with the consent of the council or Assembly as the case may be, shall pass all necessary ordinances in respect to education, but it shall therein be always provided that a majority of the ratepayers of any district or portion of the Northwest Territories, or any lesser portion or subdivision thereof, by whatever name the same may be known, may establish such schools therein as they think fit and may make the necessary assessment and collection of rates therefor. And further, that the minority of ratepayers therein, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant, may establish separate schools therein, and that, in such latter case, the ratepayers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic separate schools, shall be liable only to assessments of such rates as they impose upon themselves in respect thereof.

As you see it was simply a clause enabling the government of the Northwest Territories to establish schools, should they pass any legislation respecting education. Therefore, as I have said this legislation did not create separate schools in the territories. It merely enabled or empowered the government of the territories to do so, but when that government did so it was to be subject to the limitations mentioned in the section I have read. That section was amended in 1885 by striking out the first words as follows:

When and so soon as any system of taxation shall be adopted in any district or portion of the territory.

So that the government of the territories were authorized and empowered to pass school legislation at any time, subject to certain conditions. The form of the government of the territories was changed from time to time until it stood in the position in which it was prior to the passing of the Act of 1905 creating Saskatchewan and Alberta and making new provision for the territories. Therefore until the Act was passed in 1905 creating Alberta and Saskatchewan and making a new government for the territories, no government was empowered to pass any school legislation for the Northwest Territories except the Governor in Council, or the Governor with the Territorial Assembly. The question then is, what legislation did they pass? They did pass legislation such as the Ordinance of 1901, but under the Ordinance of 1901 no separate schools were established in the portion to be added to Manitoba. The government that existed in the Northwest Territories did not act under their power to establish any separate schools or any other schools in the Northwest Territories. At that time the Northwest Territories, included a strip of land of about fifty or seventy-five miles in width immediately adjoining to the east the present province of Saskatchewan. It did not include the district of Keewatin. Therefore, when on the 20th of July, 1905, the new Northwest Territories Act was passed, the only government authorized to legislate in respect of education was the government of the Northwest Territories and it did not make this legislation effective in that strip of land or area and no government had passed any effective legislation or created any school district or given any school rights in that strip of land originally in the territories which is now proposed to be added to the province of Manitoba. Another point, for serious consideration, in this connection is that the district of Keewatin, under the old Keewatin Act, was governed by the Lieutenant Governor of Manitoba under the instructions of the federal authority and there were no educational ordinances or law for the district of Keewatin, at all events until 1906. I am aware of the fact that the late administration, purporting to act under the Keewatin Act of 1876, did make a proclamation. That proclamation recited the Act of 1876, and recited that that legislation had authorized the government to detach amongst other things—but I had better read the words of the Act:

The Governor in Council may at any time when it appears to the public advantage to do so, detach any portion of the district of Keewatin therefrom and re-annex it to that part of the Northwest Territories of Canada included in the said district, and that portion so detached shall then be subject to the same government and laws as that part of the Northwest Territories of Canada to which it is re-annexed.

It seems to me perfectly clear that the authority given to the Governor in Council was only to detach a portion and to add that detached portion to other territory. Now, if I understand anything aright, it is that the whole is greater than a part, and therefore the interpretation that has to be put on that language of the section is not that it is a power to take the whole of Keewatin and attach it to the Northwest Territories, but only to 'attach' according to the words of the Act, that portion so 'detached' from Keewatin. No reasonable interpretation of this section would, it seems to me, justify any attempt on the part of the federal government to attach the whole district of Keewatin to the Northwest Territories, and yet that is what the late Liberal government did. I submit that what was said by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) in that respect was correct, and that the proclamation made by an authority which was simply authorized to 'detach' a portion, did not enable them to 'attach' the whole. Therefore that action of the late government was unconstitutional and had no

authority in law. Consequently the laws of the Northwest Territories did not apply before the new Act passed in 1905 respecting the Northwest Territorities. In other words, the ordinances of the Northwest Territory that were passed by the Lieutenant Governor and the legislative assembly of the Northwest Territories never applied to the district of Keewatin.

In 1906, however, the revised statutes declared that the Northwest Territories should include Keewatin. At that time there was no provisional government created by this parliament with the power to legislate with respect to education for Keewatin; consequently the limitation concerning education in the territories was not in force in Keewatin. We have to look to the Northwest Territories Act, chapter 27, of 1905, to see what the law was when the new government of the Northwest Territories was established. Remember, the government of the old territories had, by virtue of this Act, ceased to exist, and the new government and legislative power was established. That government was given power to legislate in respect to schools, but with the same limitation as was on the government of the Northwest Territories. That government might have passed school legislation, but it did not. Therefore, there never existed, and I submit does not now exist in Keewatin, any legislative enactment making school districts, or giving educational rights either to the minorities or the majorities, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic. This resolution assumes that separate schools do exist, because it says: 'Nothing in this Act shall affect or prejudice in any way the rights of the minority, either Protestant or Catholic, to separate schools.' In other words, it assumes that there are rights to separate schools. I submit, on a consideration of the law, that there are no separate schools existing in that territory; therefore, there can be no rights affected. If that be so, the amendment proposed is entirely inapplicable and inoperative, and it would be dangerous for this House to pass it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I should have translated it to read: 'school rights that the minority, either Protestant or Catholic, may have.' There is no mention of separate schools.

Mr. AIKINS. I would like to have the proper translation. If the Chairman will give it to me in French, I can understand it.

Mr. MONDOU. 'School rights,' means either public schools or separate schools. The law with regard to the schools must remain as it is.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The translation reads now as follows:

Mr. AIKINS.

Nothing in this Act shall affect prejudicially in any way the school rights of the minority, either Protestant or Catholic, as they may now exist, in such part of the territories now annexed to Manitoba.

Mr. AIKINS. The argument that I was making in respect of the translation that was given to me is applicable to about the same extent to that. This resolution would make the parliament assume that there do exist school rights of some nature. It would be dangerous, it seems to me, for the parliament to adopt such an amendment. As I have pointed out, the Northwest Territories Act simply enabled the Territorial government to pass enactments relating to education. The Dominion parliament never created by legislation private schools, or public schools, or separate schools, or denominational schools. All that the parliament did was to create a body, a government which might legislate in respect to education, but which did not act thereunder to create school rights in any part of the added territory. Another important point which I wish to consider is that if this amendment could constitutionally pass, then the government of Manitoba, to which this territory is to be added, would not have power to pass any reasonable legislation with respect to schools, because there would be no legislation which would be passed in subsequent years by the province of Manitoba that would not in some manner affect somewhat school rights if any exist there. Could the province of Manitoba assess the property of the people for the support of schools of any class? That right does not exist now. The people might very well say: You cannot assess our property for schools, because we have a right to carry on our schools without any assessment, our right now is not to be assessed. It could not make any regulation in respect of schools, because the people educate by right there without regulation. The proposed amendment is intended to be such a limitation on the legislative power of the province of Manitoba in respect of this added territory, that it could not possibly pass any enactment which would affect present school rights, which right is to teach as people please without taxation, or regulation, or teacher qualification. It is true, it says, 'shall not prejudicially affect school rights.' Who is to decide whether those rights I have mentioned, are prejudicially affected or not? You pass an Act respecting schools, either public or private, giving the right to tax and the right to apply the money, and any person affected might say: That prejudicially affects me, because I have a right to be free from taxation, from regulation, and I can employ any teacher, qualified or unqualified, as I please.

Consequently such an amendment passed in such wording as that would certainly create confusion, because indefinite and would lead to litigation. Now there is a constitutional point that has to be considered. As I have said the Northwest Territorial government was given the Northwest Territory to govern, including the westerly portion of the area that is to be added to Manitoba, to legislate under the instructions of the Governor in Council, in respect to education. But the power to legislate was subject to certain limitations. The parliament of Canada itself as I have said did not legislate to create school districts, did not pass any school law and apply it to that territory. It never purported to enact any law immediately applicable to school districts of the people in respect of education. It empowered the Commissioner in Council in the Northwest Territories under the Act of 1905 to do so, if empowered to do so by the Governor in Council, but the Governor in Council never gave them the authority to do so and the Commissioners in Council never purported to pass any school law relating to education. Therefore, I submit that there does not exist now any legislative rights in respect of education in the Northwest Territories, except the one right that the people there have to educaate their children as they please. But that does not create a public right at all, it is a private right, and they can carry on that education in any way they may; there is no system of school, separate or sectarian or general. Is it right or proper that we should say to the province of Manitoba: You have no right to interfere with the way in which education is now carried on in the area to be added; a go-as-you-please system. Of course the laws in force there will continue until altered by competent legislative authority. There must be adopted some system of education such as is applicable in all the provinces, and the province of Manitoba should have the right to inaugurate that system subject to the limitations of its constitution. Remember one thing: That this Act is not creating a new government for the province of Manitoba. It is simply adding territory to come under that government and under the constitution of that province. It was quite different when the late government created the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. There they created governments and they put limitations on the governments, and on the power of legislation. But what right has this parliament to put limitations on the power of legislation or alter the constitution of a government already created and existing, the constitution and the government of the province of Manitoba? I submit that, as was stated by the Prime Minister only the other night, this parliament has not the power to change the constitution of that government or to put limitations on the power it has in respect of education, other than those now existing. As was stated very clearly section 22 of the British North America Act gave to the Manitoba government the power of legislating in the matter of schools subject to limitations. Those limitations were practically the same as the limitations in the British North America Act. That was stated very clearly by the judgment in the Privy Council in these words:

In the case of Brophy vs Attorney General of Manitoba:

The second section of the Manitoba Act enacts that after the prescribed day the British North America Act shall——

Here the judge read the section:

It cannot be questioned, therefore, that section 93 of the British North America Act (save such parts of it as are specially applicable to some only of the provinces of which the Dominion was in 1870 composed) is made applicable to the province of Manitoba except in so far as it is varied by the Manitoba Act. The 22nd section of that statute deals with the same subject-matter as section 93 of the British North America Act. The second subsection of this latter section may be discarded from consideration, as it is manifestly applicable only to the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. The remaining provisions closely correspond to section 22 of the Manitoba Act. The only difference between the introductory part and the first subsection of the two sections is that in the Manitoba Act the words 'or practice' are added after the word 'law' in the first subsection. . . In view of this comparison, it appears to their lordships impossible to come to any other conclusion that that the 22nd section of the Manitoba Act was intended to be a substitute for the 93rd section of the British North America Act.

So that we have in the province of Manitoba the same limitations in respect of education, the same rights and privileges protected in respect to education, as in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. The province of Manitoba, therefore, has this limited constitution in respect to education. That constitution was confirmed by an Imperial Act, and I submit that this parliament has not the power to change Manitoba's constitution as it would be affected if this parliament passed the section suggested by the hon. gentleman who has just moved his amendment. Section 3 of the British North America Act of 1871 says:

The parliament of Canada may from time to time, with the consent of the legislature of any province of the said Dominion, increase, diminish, or otherwise alter the limits of such province, upon such terms and

conditions as may be agreed to by the said legislature——

Those terms and those conditions, must be terms and must be conditions within the competence of this parliament to pass and not otherwise. But has it the right to change the constitution of Manitoba? Look a little further on at section 6:

Except as provided by the 3rd section of this Act, it shall not be competent for the parliament of Canada to alter the provisions of the last mentioned Act of the said parliament in so far as it relates to the province of Manitoba or of any other Act hereafter establishing new provinces in the said Dominion, subject always to the right of the legislature of the province of Manitoba to alter from time to time the provisions of any law respecting the qualifications of electors and members of the legislative assembly, and to make laws respecting elections in the said province.

I submit that the province of Manitoba has not the power to consent to the amendment of its constitution by the parliament of Canada. Would it not be necessary to go further, and obtain an Imperial Act in order to change that constitution? Further I submit, and think the right hon. gentleman opposite (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will admit the same fact, that those terms and conditions referred to in section 6 must be terms and conditions within the competence of this parliament, and relate only to the increase of its area, its finances, and not its constitution. That appears to me to have been the view of the right hon. the leader of the opposition and his administration, for in the Act which they proposed to pass for the purpose of adding to the province of Manitoba, there was no mention whatever of any such restriction or condition or term. That is the position as I understand it, and the leader of the opposition will correct me if the letter and the proposed Bill, which I am about to read, are not correct. On the 26th of February, 1909, the right hon. gentleman wrote as follows to Mr. Roblin, the Premier of Manitoba:

Dear Mr. Roblin,—I have the honour to inclose the draft Bill for the extension of the boundaries of the province of Manitoba. This Bill is on the line of the resolutions adopted by the House of Commons at its last session. The amount of allowance to be paid to the province in lieu of lands has been left in blank. According to the aforesaid resolution of the House of Commons, this amount should be fixed by negotiation between the Dominion and the government of the province.

We will be happy to confer with you at any time that may be convenient to yourself and to your government.

(Sgd.)WILFRID LAURIER.

The draft Act recites:

Mr. AIKINS.

Whereas, a petition has been presented to the House of Commons on behalf of the legislative assembly of the province of Manitoba, praying amongst other things for an extension of the boundaries of that province northward and eastward, and for an additional subsidy to the province in lieu of the ownership of the public lands in the territory to be added to the province by such extension, and it is expedient to grant the prayer of such petition to the extent and in the manner provided in the enactments hereinafter contained; therefore His Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons enacts as follows:—

Boundaries of the province.

1. Upon the legislature of the province of Manitoba consenting thereto, the limits of the said province shall be increased so that the northern boundary of the province shall be the sixtieth parallel of north latitude; the western boundary shall be the present eastern boundary of the province of Saskatchewan; the eastern boundary shall be the present eastern boundary of the province to the northeast corner thereof, thence in a straight line to the most easterly point of Island Lake, and thence in a straight line to the point where the eighty-ninth meridian of west longitude intersects the shore line of Hudson Bay, thence following the said shore line to its intersection with the sixtieth parallel.

2. And whereas in accordance with the provisions of the Act establishing the province of Manitoba the ungranted lands of the Crown in the territory so to be added to the said province will continue to be administered by the Government of Canada for the purposes of Canada and the Province will not have such lands as a source of revenue, it is further enacted that there shall be paid by Canada to the Province an increased allowance by money payment to an amount of. . .

3. This Act shall come into force upon a date to be fixed by proclamation of the Governor in Council.

Now, that was the proposed Act by the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and his government. There is no provision in that Act respecting education such as has been suggested by the hon. gentleman in the proposed amendment. I submit that there must have been some good reason why the right hon. gentleman and his administration did not put such a clause in their proposed Act; that reason is, I presume, the very same reason that governs that action of the present government, namely that they do not wish to change the constitution of the province of Manitoba, in which constitution the rights of the minority and of the majority in respect of schools, are protected just in the same way and to the same extent as the British North America Act, section 93, guards the rights of minorities in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. I presume there was no such addition in that proposed Act because it was assumed that this parliament had no right to amend the con-

stitution of the province of Manitoba. Moreover if this parliament had it would be a rather singular thing that Manitoba should have one constitution for one part of its territory and a different constitution for another part of its territory. Such a thing, I submit, was never contemplated by this parliament nor by the Imperial parliament when they framed the Manitoba Act. Therefore, the reason for adding this territory to the province of Manitoba without such suggested limitations was that the present constitution of the province sufficiently guards the rights intended perhaps to be guarded though indefinitely by the hon. gentleman who moved this amendment. Assuming any school rights do exist those rights will be protected under section 22 of the Manitoba Act which, in effect is section 93 of the British North America Act, 1867. If such rights exist, they will continue to exist, I submit, as was demonstrated by the hon. the Minister of Public Works the other evening, that under the general law in a territory coming under a new government the laws in force remain in force until changed by competent legislative authority. In view of this and in view of the ambiguity of the amendment itself I submit the amendment should not be entertained by this House.

Amendment, Mr. Mondou, negatived.

Mr. OLIVER. I desire to move an amendment to section 5——

Mr. MONDOU. Mr. Chairman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The amendment is lost.

Mr. OLIVER. I desire to move, in amendment to section 5, as follows:—

Inasmuch as under the provisions of this Act the province will not have the public lands as a source of revenue, there shall, subject to the provisions hereinafter set out, be paid by the government to the province, by half-yearly payments in advance, on the first day of January and July in each year, an annual sum based upon the population of the territory proposed to be added to the province as from time to time ascertained by the quinquennial census thereof, as follows—

The sum payable until the population of such territory reaches 100,000, shall be $200,000.

Thereafter, until such population reaches 150,000 the sum payable shall be $250,000.

After such population reaches 200,000 the sum payable shall be $300,000.

I move this amendment as embodying the views of the late government in regard to subsidy in respect of land in connection with the increase of the area of the province of Manitoba. The late government in negotiating with the province made the proposal set out in this amendment. It carries with it no return by the province of any of the land or the property which now belongs to the province. I wish to lay some stress upon reasons why the offer of financial terms to the province of Manitoba in connection with the extension of its area was framed in accordance with this amendment and why there was not taken into consideration the question of any return of the property of the province, or the prospective property of the province, to the Dominion. It was absolutely necessary, in considering the resources which would be accorded to the province under the new arrangement to consider what the province was receiving directly and indirectly from the Dominion government, especially in consideration of the fact that it was to some degree desirable that there should be parallel arrangements in the matter of financial assistance—measurably parallel, at any rate—as between Manitoba and the western provinces. But, more important than the question of actual financial arrangement, more important than the value that might be attached to the property which had been handed over by the Dominion to the province, was the effect that this retention by the province would have upon the development and progress of the province as compared with that which would take place if that property were handed back to the Dominion. For good reasons—undoubtedly for good reasons—in 1885, when the adjustment of the subsidy was made with the province of Manitoba, in addition to the cash subsidy to be paid, it was provided that all swamp lands within the province should become the property of the province. The reason why this was done was not so much because of the cash value of those lands, because at that time these lands had no cash value. In 1885, good agricultural land in the province of Manitoba and in the other two western provinces was not worth $3 an acre—it was not worth $2 an acre.

The Canadian Pacific railway, sometime between 1882 and 1885, sold to the Dominion government six million acres of land at $1.50 an acre. This was selected land, selected agricultural land, fairly fit for farming; and if first class agricultural land fairly fit for farming was worth at that time only $1.50 an acre, the swamp lands of Manitoba had practically no value at all.

The reason why the swamp lands were left in the hands of the province of Manitoba was in order that they might be reclaimed, developed and made productive—that they might be drained. It was thought that the province itself was the proper authority, and had the most suitable means to do that work, and consequently they were left in the hands of the province, it was thought right and proper to leave

them in the hands of the province which was expected to make the expenditure to reclaim those lands and make them valuable The proposition was not to give revenue to the province of Manitoba in place of a cash subsidy, it was an arrangement whereby this large area of land could be reclaimed, could be made productive That arrangement, I am sorry to say, did not work out as was expected. When money is readily available, and when the prices of land are high, when it is possible, as it was not possible during previous years, to raise money on the security of the lands to be drained, the government of Manitoba might well have entered upon a policy of effective drainage of these low lands, a policy of effective reclamation of the four, five, six, or seven million acres that are to-day classed as swamp lands. The provincial governments have not entered upon such a policy. It is perhaps not in place here to criticise the drainage policy of the Manitoba government, but there may be no harm in mentioning it. It is a policy whereby certain areas are set apart as drainage districts, bonds are issued on the security of the lands in those districts, and purchasers of the lands not only pay the price of the lands to the provincial government, but carry the debt that has been laid upon them for the purpose of drainage. That may be a good policy in a limited way, but it cannot be a policy under which this vast area of land can be properly reclaimed. This area, as I said the other night, is two-thirds as great as the total area under cultivation to-day in the three prairie provinces, that cultivation which has made the Dominion rich and great. That is the area which is waiting to be reclaimed, developed, and made productive under an active, energetic and progressive provincial government such as we hope to see in that province in the not distant future. That land is to be handed back to the Dominion government, a government which has not the proper authority or jurisdiction, and which is not responsible for the drainage or reclamation of those lands. Is it possible, as the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Aikins), said the other day, that these lands are only being temporarily handed back to the Dominion, to be again returned to the province? Possibly, that is the case.

Mr. AIKINS. Does the hon. gentleman say that the member for Brandon said that?

Mr. OLIVER. I understood him to say it.

Mr. AIKINS. The hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. OLIVER. Then I was mistaken in my allusion. The lands, however, according to this Bill, are to be handed over to the Dominion, I suppose we are agreed upon that, and if they are to be reclaimed at all, they are to be reclaimed at the expense of the Dominion. Now the Dominion is not vested with the proper authority to do drainage work in the province of Manitoba, it has not the legislative jurisdiction whereby it can do that work properly. So far as this Bill shows anything, it shows the intent utterly to reverse the policy of 1885, to reverse the idea of reclaiming this enormous area of valuable land, to turn it back to the Dominion to be treated simply as a cash asset, without regard to the development or progress of the province. I consider such a policy detrimental to the province of Manitoba and detrimental to the Dominion of Canada, far beyond the matter of one, or two, or three hundred thousand dollars, or of any subsidy to be paid out of the Dominion treasury into the provincial treasury. We will suppose these millions of acres of land were reclaimed and made productive, and they produced 100 million bushels of grain, they would add anywhere between 50 and 75 million dollars a year to the wealth of this country by their reclamation. I say, what is the matter of $200,000 or $300,000 a year one way or the other in regard to such a stupendous interest? I cannot understand on what principle this government, charged with the responsibility of securing the development of this great country, particularly of those western provinces, can come to this House with a Bill which hands back to the Dominion these swamp lands, thereby reversing the policy entered upon in 1885, abandoning a policy that looked to the development of these lands and making them productive.

The late government, in dealing with the province of Manitoba, had no such thought. They desired to give the province consideration for the cost of government in the added territory, and they made the proposition which is embodied in the amendment I have placed before you. I submit that in every interest, both of the province and of the Dominion, that proposal is very much better for both than the proposal contained in the present Bill, aside altogether from the question of money values. Let me bring before you some evidence of the soundness of the views I have placed before you. I am sure the Minister of the Interior will not object to be called as a witness as to the policy involved in the drainage of the swamp lands by the provincial government. I find by reference to the records that on March 3, 1910, on

the occasion of a resolution moved in the legislature of Manitoba criticising the provincial government in connection with the swamp land administration, my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior moved an amendment, and part of the amendment reads as follows:

And whereas, the settlers near the said swamp lands are being injured by non-drainage thereof and are pressing for needed improvements; now, therefore, be it resolved that in the opinion of this House, the remaining swamp lands should be transferred from the Dominion to the province forthwith with the view of the formation of drainage districts so as to render available an increased acreage for the purpose of agriculture.

The Minister of the Interior, a member of the provincial government at that time, in March, 1910, declared for a policy of drainage and reclamation not only of the swamp lands which the province has, but he demanded, in the interests of the settlers who were already settled near these lands and in the interest of the development of the province, the handing over to the province of the rest of the swamp lands within the province. In October or November, 1911, he comes forward with a proposition to hand the whole of these unsold swamp lands back to the Dominion government, foregoes the policy of drainage and reclamation by the province and lets the settlers, who are waiting and hoping for the drainage of these lands, sit and wait and hope on until this Dominion government shall enter upon a policy looking to the drainage of these lands in Manitoba.

Mr. BRADBURY. Why should it not?

Mr. OLIVER. Because it has not the jurisdiction over the question that the provincial government has.

Mr. BRADBURY. Do you not think that the good roads policy of the present government will have the effect of draining a lot of these lands?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not think it will. If the conditions in Manitoba were not as extreme as they are no doubt the building of roads would have some effect—no doubt it will have some effect—but, in so far as actual swamp lands are concerned, it is absolutely necessary for the government to consider a provincial drainage policy which will involve large expenditures in order to secure the reclamation of those lands. Everybody knows that it is in the provincial government that the authority rests to deal with matters of civil rights; and for the Dominion government, without jurisdiction, to go into the province of Manitoba and undertake to carry on a drainage policy would certainly bring on complications, as between the provincial and Dominion governments, that I do not think this present Dominion government has the faintest idea of. The settlers who were hoping and waiting in March, 1910, on the authority of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, are going to be left to hope and wait indefinitely because of his action in the fall of 1911.

What is the consideration for this radical change in policy, admittedly to the detriment of the province of Manitoba and particularly, on the authority of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, to the detriment of the people who are now settled in the vicinity of these swamp lands and whose prosperity and welfare depend upon the drainage of these lands? The consideration, as set down in the Bill before the committee, is a cash payment in excess of the amount now received from the Dominion treasury as to land of $313,000 a year. In consideration of the receipt from the federal treasury of some $313,000 a year, more than it is now receiving on land account, the province foregoes its policy, hands back the land to the Dominion and the settlers who are now without drainage simply sit and wait for it to come. I quite appreciate the possibility that the province of Manitoba, like many a settler in the country, is hard up for money. Many a settler, as soon as he gets his patent, mortgages his homestead worth from $5,000 to $10,000, for a few hundred dollars. I can appreciate that the province of Manitoba, under the administration of its present government, is probably in that very position and is so far behind in its ability to meet its present requirements that $313,000 of extra cash a year is more important to it to-day than the carrying out of the policy of reclamation by drainage which is the proper policy for any government of that province. It is a pity if that is the condition, but it is not the fault of this government if it is the condition. A payment of $313,000 in cash per year for the abandonment of the policy of draining and reclaiming 7,000,000 acres of swamp land in Manitoba, is, to all intents and purposes, no consideration at all. It is not a consideration, it is an insult to the province.

Let us step aside now from the question of the policy of drainage and its results to the progress and prosperity of the province and let us consider this matter simply as a cash transaction. Let us consider the swamp land as simply having a certain value and let us see whether the arrangement contained in section 5 is a good arrangement for the province of Manitoba or not, put on the lowest possible ground, on the ground of cash received on the one hand and the value of the cash given on the other. There have been several estimates of the value of this swamp land at $3 an acre. The average price of the swamp land which has

been passed over to the province and, by the province, sold to private individuals, something over 800,000 acres, has been placed at $3 per acre. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) assured the House that it was the choice land that had already been sold and that what remained to be sold would not bring nearly so much money. But, in looking through the records again, I noticed that on this same 4th March, and in connection with the same debate in the Manitoba legislature, that the Minister of the Interior gave some information to the legislature as to the value of these lands sold. I find that he told the House at that time that in the district of Makinack—that would be in the constituency of Dauphin—in township 21-15, certain swamp lands were sold at $8 per acre; in township 22-15, $6.50 per acre; in township 26-15, $10 per acre; in township 26-15 W. $9, $15 and $30 per acre.

Mr. STAPLES. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) tell the House what was the average price per acre of the St. Peter's reserve land sold by himself.

Mr. OLIVER. I would if I had time, but the House on former occasions has heard a great deal about the price of the land of the St. Peter's reserve. The government of which the Minister of the Interior was a member, saw fit to issue a Royal Commission to investigate that claim, and it will be for the Minister of the Interior to tell the hon. member (Mr. Staples) everything in connection with it when the opportunity occurs.

Mr. STAPLES. The hon. member (Mr. Oliver) sold the lands for less than $5 an acre and it is only twelve miles from Winnipeg.

Mr. OLIVER. The land on the St. Peter's reserve was sold by auction and it brought all it was worth at the time.

Mr. STAPLES. And it was not swamp land either.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). Was it all sold by auction?

Mr. OLIVER. All the land that the government sold was sold by auction.

Mr. BRADBURY. You gave the Indians 21,000 acres to give away.

Mr. OLIVER. We gave the Indians certain lands that were adjudged to be theirs and they sold them as they had the right to do. My hon. friend (Mr. Bradbury) discussed this matter in the House frequently and a Royal Commission was issued by the government of Manitoba and that Commission has reported, and when that report is laid on the table of this House we will discuss it at the proper time.

Mr. BRADBURY. That commission reported that my contentions as brought before this House with regard to St. Peter's reserve were correct and that the contentions which the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) is responsible for were not correct.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend can wait until the records are laid upon the table and then we will know whether his statement is correct or not. I am bound to say that my reading of the record, so far as I have seen it, is absolutely to the contrary of what the hon. member (Mr. Bradbury) has stated.

I was going to say that in township 26, range 15, two sections of swamp lands were sold at eight dollars an acre, and in township 24, range 16, certain swamp lands were sold at six dollars per acre. I have, I think, established very thoroughly that so far from three dollars per acre being the maximum average price it must in the nature of things have been very much below the average price of these swamp lands. As a matter of fact in the budget speech made by the provincial treasurer of Manitoba to the legislature in February, 1910, he stated that the average value of the swamp lands sold in the year with which he was dealing was $5.48 per acre. Now, I am not going to value this land at $5.48 per acre; I am not going to value it at six dollars, eight dollars or ten dollars, which the Minister of the Interior boasted in the House the land brought, but I do say that the evidence that was placed before the Manitoba legislature by the present Minister of the Interior and by the provincial treasurer on that occasion, is ample proof that when the general valuation of three dollars per acre is placed upon the swamp lands of Manitoba, it is below the actual cash value at the present time. Taking then the value at three dollars an acre, we find that in the statement made by the Hon. Mr. Armstrong, provincial treasurer, on the 22nd of February, 1910, that the province held at that time—not that they were going to hold, but did actually hold—1,425,712 acres of land, valued at $4,277,136. This statement goes on to say that there were to be turned over by the Dominion government to the province, 4,000,000 acres of land, which in his budget speech he valued at $3 an acre or a total of $12,000,000. That represents four and a quarter millions for land owned by the province that was unsold, and $12,000,000 for lands to be turned over to the province and to be sold by the province, or a total of over $16,000,000 which the provincial treasurer of Manitoba, delivering his budget speech to the legislature declared to be the actual value of the swamp lands of that province. Now, Mr. Chairman, it does not take very

much figuring to show that $16,000,000 at 5 per cent interest yields $800,000 a year. On the one hand, by this bargain the province of Manitoba gets in cash $315,000 increase in regard to land, and it gives away property which at the valuation placed upon it by the treasurer of the province is worth $800,000 a year. Mr. Chairman, I do not know how our friends hope to justify this feature of this Bill to the people of Manitoba. They have made merry in the House because it has been argued that the terms were too generous to the province of Manitoba, and at the same time that they were not generous enough. This is not generosity; it is a question of policy looking to the development of the province. But if you bring it down to the basis of a cash transaction, the province is a loser (in the face of the statement made by the provincial treasurer of Manitoba on his responsibility as provincial treasurer to the legislature of the province); the province is a loser by the difference between $315,000 and $800,000 a year.

But, it may be said, that the province is getting an increase on its debt account, and is getting a bulk sum as arrearages, and it does not make any difference whether it gets it on land account or debt account or any other account, the transaction is better for the province in money than the offer made by the Liberal government less than a year ago. Let us see how that works out. Under this present arrangement the province gets an increase of $202,000 on debt account; it gets an increase of $315,270 on land account; and if the arrearages and building allowances are capitalized and interest is allowed at 5 per cent, which I claim is a fair calculation, the province gains $119,013 per annum on arrearages account.

That is, the province makes a total gain over the present subsidy of $634.283. But if that is compared with the offer made by the Liberal government, $200,000 must be deducted from it. So that the account stands thus: The province is better off by the Bill now before the House to the amount of $434,514 in cash than it would have been if the government of Manitoba had accepted the offer of the Liberal government made last spring, and it is something over $800,000 worse off in cash value as the result of this present offer—$400,000 to the good on the one hand, and $800,000 to the bad on the other hand.

Mr. BLAIN. How does my hon. friend explain that the Manitoba government are perfectly satisfied with it?

Mr. OLIVER. I explained that in the beginning of my remarks. I said that many a homesteader who has secured his patent, has mortgaged a farm worth $10,000 for a few hundred dollars; and the government of Manitoba is in exactly that position. Having gone behind in their provincial finances, they need the money, and when this government offers them $434,000 in cash per year, their financial position is such that they are compelled to take it rather than realize on the property, according to the figures of their own Provincial Treasurer delivered only two years ago. There is no way of escaping from the results of these figures, which are the figures given by the government of Manitoba itself. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I desire to move the amendment which I have placed in your hands.

Mr. ROGERS. The hon. member for Edmonton has sought to convey a wrong impression of certain conditions of this Bill. He has said that this arrangement will be detrimental to the Dominion in view of the fact that the province of Manitoba undertook to drain the swamp lands belonging either to the Dominion or to the province. I want to tell my hon. friend that such has never been the case. We have in the province of Manitoba a Drainage Act under which it is possible for any individual who owns a certain tract of land which he considers to be swamp land and desires to have drained, to file a petition with the government of the province for that purpose. Then the government issues bonds or debentures to the amount fixed by the engineer, who makes an estimate of the necessary cost of carrying on the work. The government simply acts as trustee for the people who own the land or control it, and never has undertaken to do any drainage work on the lands which the province of Manitoba owns as swamp lands. My hon. friend moves an amendment which is simply a copy of the proposition which was made by the late government to the province of Manitoba on the 7th of March of last year. In case the House is not aware of the fact, I would like to state that when that offer was made to Manitoba, the legislature of the province unanimously rejected it. The resolution rejecting the offer was moved by Mr. Roblin, the Premier of the province, and was seconded by Mr. Winkler, the chief whip of the Liberal party, and was supported by every member of the legislature. It was as follows:

And whereas it appears, by a minute of Council, approved of by His Excellency in Council on the seventeenth day of March, 1911, that, after frequent urgings, a proposal is made by the federal authorities that the limits of the province be extended eastward and northward to the Hudson bay, to comprise an area of 106,304,000 acres, and that there shall be paid to the province annually, in

lieu of public lands, mines, minerals and royalties in the said territory, the sum of $200,000 until the population thereof reaches 100,000, the sum of $250,000 until the population reaches 150,000, and thereafter the sum of $300,000;

And whereas it is the opinion of this House, after due and careful deliberation, that the said proposal does not recognize the principle of equality as aforesaid;

Therefore, be it resolved, that this House firmly but most respectfully declines to accept the proposed addition of territory upon the terms offered in the minute of Council of His Excellency in Council, as hereinbefore set forth, and reiterates and reaffirms the request of the province, as a constituent portion of the confederation of Canada, for equality of treatment with either the provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick or the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, that is to say:—

(a) The control of all the public lands, mines and minerals in the said proposed territory, or

(b) Financial and other considerations of a character similar to those given or to be given to the said provinces of Saskatchewan or Alberta.

Either of which propositions this legislature is willing to favourably consider.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to accept the amendment of my hon. friend would mean the renewal of the refusal on the part of a unanimous legislature in the province of Manitoba. It would be idle for this House to undertake to adopt that amendment, and make a proposition such as my hon. friend has suggested, knowing full well that the same could not, and would not be accepted by that province. I am sure that my hon. friend understands very well the conditions in Manitoba province, and he is well aware that it would not accept this proposition.

I would like to correct my hon. friend in another statement which he has made in respect to this arrangement being necessary because of Manitoba's financial conditions. I would be sorry —and I am sure my hon. friend did not intend to throw out such an idea—if the statement were to go broadcast, that the province of Manitoba was in any sense in financial difficulties. I want to tell my hon. friend that there is no province in Canada whose credit stands higher to-day than does that of Manitoba. Sir, that is true notwithstanding the fact that we have suffered in respect to this matter of swamp lands as a result of the administration of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) opposite. The hon. gentleman makes a calculation of the amount of swamp lands that we got, and that we were entitled to, like my hon. friend, I think from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) who last night made the statement that Manitoba had been in possession of 20,000,000 or 30,000,000 acres of swamp lands for some years and that the province was now wishing to return them. I want to draw attention to the fact that one of the grounds of complaint registered by Manitoba time and time again was in respect to this very matter of swamp lands. It is true that the Liberals were not in power in Manitoba in the year 1900. A Conservative government was then elected in that province, and we came to Ottawa at that time and presented our claims in connection with the swamp lands. Although we pressed these claims as strongly as we possibly could, we were only able to secure in the first part of the year 160,000 acres, and in the latter half of the year 33,000 acres more. The following year we were not able to obtain a single acre, but the next year again we got 160,000 acres in the first half of the year, and in the second half 20,000 acres more. Let me tell the ex-Minister of the Interior, as he knows well, that from September, 1909, down to the day he left office he did not hand over to Manitoba a single solitary acre of swamp lands. That was the treatment of which we complained.

Mr. OLIVER. Did my hon. friend make an allusion to myself?

Mr. ROGERS. The allusion was to the department over which my hon. friend presided, and from 1909 down to the time he left office——

Mr. OLIVER. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that there was not a single acre handed over to the province of Manitoba?

Mr. ROGERS. Not an acre.

Mr. OLIVER. During that time?

Mr. ROGERS. From September, 1909, down to the time my hon. friend left office. I have the return here and will send it over to my hon. friend.

Mr. OLIVER. How much land was handed over before that?

Mr. ROGERS. The total amount of lands that we received was 2,500,000 acres. I do not think it is necessary for me to add anything more on this subject. I merely wished to make one or two corrections in respect to the statements made by the hon. gentleman. I think the committee will not accept the amendment which he has moved because it is only intended as a piece of factious opposition on his part, and in order that Manitoba might again refuse, as they did very properly and unanimously refuse a similar proposition on a previous occasion.

Mr. ROBERT CRUISE (Dauphin). As a representative of the constituency of Dauphin, province of Manitoba, I feel that it is my duty to offer a few remarks on the question of the extension of the boundaries

of that province, more particularly as Manitoba is probably more concerned in the matter than any other province in the Dominion. The object of the Bill is to enlarge the boundaries of Manitoba, and as to that I have no objection; the territory given to the province is perfectly satisfactory in my judgment; but I strongly oppose the handing back to Ontario of a single foot of land belonging to Manitoba.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CRUISE. This Bill gives to Ontario a strip of land five miles wide and 150 miles long for the purpose of building a railroad, and it also proposes to grant to Ontario a strip of land one-half mile wide and ten miles long, down the Nelson river to use as it pleases. The province of Ontario has also the privilege of taking 200 feet from Fort Nelson to Fort Churchill for the further construction of a railroad, and if they avail themselves of it, it practically gives them all the water front that is of any value on Hudson bay. For these reasons I strongly object to handing over to Ontario these valuable concessions. The strip of land to be granted to Ontario has been referred to here as the red line, but I would prefer to mark it on the map as the black line, because the fact that this territory should be given to Ontario so that it can go as it pleases through a sister province, is a black eye to Manitoba. I would want to say further that Ontario has no more right to such a grant, or to a port at Port Nelson than Manitoba has to a strip of land five miles in width to Fort William or to Port Arthur. In this respect I take the same stand to-day that I took years ago. We were told in the province of Manitoba some years ago by the hon. Minister of the Interior, a man for whom I have the greatest respect, and also by the Hon. Mr. Roblin, that Ontario had no right whatever to one foot of land in the territory belonging to Manitoba. On October 17th, 1905, Mr. Rogers, speaking at a party gathering in the Maw block, Winnipeg, made the following statement:

> I want to say, as representing the province of Manitoba, that the province of Ontario has no more claim, as far as I understand the law and the facts as shown by the public records, than the province of British Columbia. The mere fact that Ontario lies to our east does not give her any claim either in equity or law.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CRUISE. Mr. Rogers cited the Privy Council judgment and the subsequent legislation by the Dominion House, and then said:

> The government of Sir John Macdonald never changed a line or letter of that statement as drafted by Ontario, and yet Sir Wilfrid Laurier, in order to further hamper, punish and discipline the province of Manitoba, undertakes to drag in the province of Ontario, which settled the boundary for itself on its own terms.

Now, Sir Wilfrid Laurier has been accused of dragging Ontario into the settlement of the boundary question. Who is guilty of dragging Ontario into the settlement of the boundary question at the present time? I say that it is not a square deal to Manitoba to make these concessions to Ontario which properly belong to Manitoba, and therefore I object to these provisions in the present Bill.

Now a word in connection with the swamp lands. I strongly object to handing over the swamp lands of the province of Manitoba to the Dominion. For years our local government had been demanding more swamp lands from the Dominion which was perfectly right; and now they have in the neighbourhood of seven or eight millions of acres of these lands. These they propose now to hand back to the Dominion. I contend that as a business proposition that is not favourable to the province of Manitoba. It is the local government's business to drain these swamp lands and bring them into condition to be cultivated, but if these lands are handed over to the Dominion, I do not believe this work will be done. We have been told by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers), that he has a great immigration policy, an immigration policy that knows neither east nor west. I hope that this is true, for we want immigrants in the Dauphin district. But I would ask the minister this: when these swamp lands are handed back to the Dominion and the work of draining them ceases, what is he going to do for his immigrants to Manitoba? It is most important to the province that these lands should be drained and settlers brought in to cultivate them. A great deal has been said about the value of swamp lands, some putting it at $3 an acre and some putting it at a higher figure. I know something about these swamp lands, and I know that when drained they are the most productive lands we have. That has been proven beyond a doubt, especially in my district where we have a considerable area of these swamp lands. For these reasons, I object to these lands being handed back to the Dominion. We are told that the government will hand these lands back again to Manitoba at some future day. That may be true or it may not be true. We were told by the present Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) when he appeared in the western country that if he were returned to power he would not give the people of Canada reciprocity. He was admired by the western people

for his courage in making that statement. But he went further and stated that if returned to power he would carry out the Farmers' Bill of rights to the letter and would give them government ownership and control of elevators. Where do we find him to-day? The people took him at his word, but he has not delivered the goods and given us government ownership and control of elevators. How do we know, then, that he will hand back these lands to Manitoba? It seems to me that this is nothing better than a hold-up. The lands, we are told, will be handed back to the province at a future date. But when? At the next general election? In that case, what will be the argument? It will be: If you vote for the Conservative party you will get your lands back? That is not a square deal. And for that reason I object to it. I support the interests of the province of Manitoba, where I lived for many years and hope to live for a good many yet. These are my reasons for objecting to certain clauses in this Boundary Bill.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I desire to speak on the general question, but more particularly with respect to the amendment of the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr Oliver). I have no objection to the boundaries of Manitoba being extended. There has been a general desire on the part of the people of Manitoba for a number of years for an extension of the boundaries of their province. But there has also been a general desire on the part of the people of Saskatchewan for an extension of the boundaries of their province toward Hudson bay. As to that, I hope to speak more directly before I conclude, but, in the meantime I wish to offer a few observations with regard to the financial terms under this Bill. Hon. members who take the trouble to go back to the debate of 1905 and read the speeches of men who were then in opposition, and are now on the treasury benches, will be apt to wonder how these gentlemen who opposed the financial terms given to Saskatchewan and Alberta can to-day support the terms being given to Manitoba, particularly as the government say that the object of the Bill is to place Manitoba on the same footing, financially and otherwise, as these other provinces. One of these speeches was by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster). He criticised the late government for the financial terms that were being given to Saskatchewan and Alberta, and said practically that these provinces were getting too much.

Mr. STAPLES. No, he did not.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). He said to the government: This measure will bring down upon the government every province of the Dominion; already I hear the rumbling of discontent among the western provinces; and he went on to say that he hoped the Minister of Finance, before he pressed the Bill forward, would revise the financial considerations about to be given to the new provinces. And now we are told by the leader of the government (Mr. Borden) that Manitoba is being placed on exactly the same footing as Saskatchewan and Alberta. How can the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), in view of his statement then with regard to Alberta and Saskatchewan, support to-day the terms being given to Manitoba under this Bill?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. It makes the provinces equal.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). But the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) said that the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta were being given too much; to-day he says the province of Manitoba is being given just enough; and yet, according to the Prime Minister and other hon. gentlemen opposite, the province of Manitoba is being given exactly what these other provinces were given. I do not say that the treatment of the provinces is equal. I had here beside me a copy of volume 2 of 'Hansard' of 1905 containing a speech by the present Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk). I am sorry that it has been taken away, for it deprives me of the opportunity to quote the hon. gentleman's exact words. But it was practically the same line of argument. He said there was no reason why Quebec should be called upon to assist in paying these immense subsidies to Alberta and Saskatchewan. But, to-day he is prepared to support the same terms when given to Manitoba. I do not wish to be understood as finding fault with Manitoba getting a square deal. If the Manitoba members are satisfied with this Bill, all right. If I were a member from Manitoba, I should not be satisfied with it. But there are certain features of this Bill which show discrimination in favour of Manitoba against Saskatchewan and Alberta. One of these was well stated by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie). According to the Bill, Manitoba obtains a debt allowance on a population of 250,000, the same, I believe, as the debt allowance that was given to Saskatchewan and Alberta.

To-day in the province of Saskatchewan we have a population of something like 495,000, while the province of Manitoba has 455,000; we have 40,000 more than Manitoba. Therefore, in order to place Saskatchewan on the same footing as Manitoba we should have in Saskatchewan an increased debt allowance based on our 40,000 additional population, which would mean a debt allowance of

$1,280,000. That is one of the discriminations in favour of Manitoba against Saskatchewan and Alberta. There is another point. The population in Manitoba is confined to a comparatively small area. If you draw a line diagonally from the southeast corner of Manitoba to the northwest and take the country south of that, you will find an area of 40,000 square miles of inhabited country. In the province of Saskatchewan only the southern half is well populated, covering an area of about 125,000 square miles. It is not so expensive to administer the province of Manitoba as it is to administer the province of Saskatchewan. In Manitoba to-day roads, bridges and schools must be provided for over an area of about 40,000 square miles, while in Saskatchewan roads, bridges and schools must be provided for over an area of 125,000 square miles. It is therefore less expensive to administer the province of Manitoba than the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. So this constitutes another discrimination in favour of Manitoba.

There is another matter. The province of Manitoba secured 150,000 acres of selected lands for university purposes. Saskatchewan never secured any land for such a purpose neither has Alberta. The 150,000 acres of university lands selected in Manitoba are being written off, according to this measure, at $2 per acre. I would like, as a representative from Saskatchewan, to be allowed to select 150,000 acres of land in that province for university purposes at $2 per acre. I say that this government, in order to place Saskatchewan and Alberta on an equal footing with Manitoba in this respect, must give us the right to select 150,000 acres of land for university purposes in each one of those provinces.

Now the question of arrearages has been referred to. I do not profess to be able to throw any new light on the subject, and will only present it to you as it appears to me, as a representative of Saskatchewan. After looking over the speeches that have been delivered by the Prime Minister and other hon. gentlemen of the opposition dealing with the payment of arrearages to the province of Manitoba, I confess that I have not been able to find any justification for it. What do they say? That as early as 1905, when Manitoba wanted to have her boundaries increased and her territories extended to Hudson Bay, the Prime Minister says he could not admit her contention that they should date back to 1909. When the resolution was passed by the late government extending the boundaries to Hudson bay, it appears, if I am correctly informed, that the Manitoba government never accepted those boundaries until the month of March, 1911, and never formally notified the government of Canada of their acceptance until the month of March 1911. To my mind the Manitoba government have not got a solitary leg to stand upon in respect to the payment of arrearages. I do not wish to cast any reflections upon the present government of Manitoba. The Minister of the Interior a few days ago ventured to say that the finances of the province of Manitoba were in the best position, in as good a position as those of any other province in Canada. I do not know anything about the position of the finances of the province of Manitoba; I do know, however, that on their telephone transaction, when they purchased the telephones throughout the province and operated them as a government concern for the past three or four years, they are something like $450,000 behind at the present time in the operation of that system. I also know that they have lost money in the operation of their government-owned elevators. I do not need to go outside the province of Manitoba to get information of her finances. About six weeks ago when I was in Winnipeg, I was told many times that the government of Manitoba were financially in a very bad position. I can only say that it is my belief that this sum of $2,178,000 to be handed over to Manitoba in payment of arrearages is merely being given as a sop to that province, and as a rope to pull her out of a hole. I do believe that were it not for the financial assistance which the Manitoba government expects to get out of this payment of arrearages, they would not have a ghost of a chance in the next election.

Because the old legislature of the Northwest Territories, as far as they are covered the province of Saskatchewan, passed a resolution to the effect that the time had come when a province should be formed, we might just as well argue, that the payments under the autonomy legislation of 1905 should date back to 1902 as hon. gentlemen can argue that Manitoba's arrearages should date back to 1908 as provided in this Bill. Let me further point out to emphasize my argument that pursuant to the resolution passed in the territorial legislature in 1902 Mr. Haultain drew up a draft Bill which he submitted to the late government as a basis on which the two provinces should be carved out of the Northwest Territories. With just as good reason, therefore, you might argue that Alberta and Saskatchewan should receive financial consideration back to 1902, as you can argue that Manitoba should be paid arrearages amounting to $2,178,000 dating back to 1908. In my opinion this is an outrage to the rest of the people of Canada, and a further discrimination in favour of Manitoba as against the other two provinces.

There is another matter that occurs to me in connection with this Bill, and that

is the question of our natural resources. Ever since the year 1905, in western Canada, every Conservative candidate always promised, not only in Manitoba but in Saskatchewan and Alberta, that immediately the Conservative party came into power it would restore our natural resources to those three provinces. Now here is an opportunity for the present Conservative government to fulfil their promises and show their good faith. Here is an opportunity for the Prime Minister to fulfil the promises which he made when he was touring western Canada last summer, when he told them he was in favour of restoring the natural resources to those provinces. No further legislation is required, here is an opportunity for him to do it. Let me refer to one or two statements that were made by the present Prime Minister in the west last year. First of all, let me read the statement that was made by the right hon. gentleman at Halifax on August 21, 1907—I believe it has already been quoted in this House. The hon. gentleman said:

In 1905 the Conservatives took the position that under our constitution the public domain within each province ought to be committed to the management and administration of the people of that province through their provincial governments. That was the basis of arrangement between the four provinces originally constituting the Dominion. At the present time every province in Canada controls and administers its public lands except the three provinces of Manitoba Saskatchewan and Alberta.

He concluded as follows:

We have not receded from the policy which we announced two years ago, and therefore we are prepared to restore their public lands to the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan upon fair terms.

The platform of the Conservative party circulated in western Canada during the recent election contained this paragraph about handing over their natural resources to the prairie provinces. That was the main argument of the Conservative party in my constituency, granting the natural resources to the prairie provinces. Then at Winnipeg, in 1911, when the right hon. gentleman was dealing with this question, he said:

Before discussing a subject of great public interest now under the consideration of parliament, I desire to touch upon certain questions of paramount importance to the people of the west. To-day in Canada six provinces enjoy the right to control and administer the public lands, mines, minerals and other natural resources within their boundaries. That right is not enjoyed by the three prairie provinces. The Liberal-Conservative party since 1902 has firmly asserted and maintained the rights of these three provinces to their public domain. We stand for that right to-day and we will maintain it. The public lands, and natural resources are vested in the Crown, to be administered for the benefit of the people. In six provinces the Crown, in dealing with the public domain acts upon the advice of the provincial ministers and under laws enacted by the provincial legislatures. In the three prairie provinces the Crown in dealing with such lands acts upon the advice of the federal ministers and under laws enacted by the federal parliament. Why should there be any such discrimination against the people of these three provinces? The day is not far distant when Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta will receive from a Liberal-Conservative government at Ottawa the just recognition of their undoubted right to their public lands and natural resources.

There is a Liberal-Conservative government at Ottawa at the present time; why does not that Liberal-Conservative government implement its promise, particularly to the province of Manitoba, and give these natural resources to that province? That was a speech made by the right hon. gentleman at Winnipeg. But I have here an extract from a speech made by the Prime Minister at Brandon in the month of July, 1911. He said:

In 1902, in 1905, in 1907, and again in 1910, we have stood for the right of the western provinces to own and control their public domain. It is the right of the people of those provinces to have their public lands and natural resources administered by their own governments under the control of their own legislatures. They say that they are free men and being free men in a free country have as good a right to control through their own local legislatures, and by their own provincial executives, the administration of their public lands and natural resources as have the people of any of the eastern provinces who enjoy and have enjoyed that right. The Liberal-Conservative party supports that claim and will enforce it at the first opportunity.

As far as the province of Manitoba is concerned here is an opportunity; yet, the promise which was made at Winnipeg and Brandon during last summer has not been implemented. Not only have we the promise of the right hon. Prime Minister, but other members of the present administration have expressed themselves very strongly with respect to the control of the natural resources of the prairie provinces. I have to go no farther than to the hon. Secretary of State (Mr. Roche) who discussed this subject in the House of Commons in 1906, and, if I remember correctly, he made similar remarks in speaking at Regina, when I had the pleasure of hearing him. I may tell the Secretary of State that he did not do me very much harm when he was in Regina. Speaking on the question of the coal strike in 1906, on a resolution moved by the then member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) the hon. Secretary of State said:

The hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) has spoken about the humiliating position in which our country has been placed. In the first place I claim it was a humiliating position in which to place those new provinces to withold from their hands the control of their own public lands. Had the rights of the people of those provinces been fought for as they should have been fought for by hon. gentlemen supporting the government, the provinces would have control over their lands to-day, and the provinces would have been able to grapple with their own coal strike without calling on the federal government for relief.

If that was a humiliating position for the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta to be placed in then, I submit it is a much more humiliating position for the province of Manitoba to be placed in to-day in view of the assurances that were given not only by the right hon. the Prime Minister, but by other ministers and by every Conservative candidate throughout the west during many years past. Hon. members from Manitoba told us in 1905 that Alberta and Saskatchewan were being placed in a most humiliating position. Why do they not rise to the occasion now and help us to keep Manitoba from being placed in such a humiliating position and from being deprived of the management of her natural resources and lands?

Then, there is this question of the swamp lands to which I want to allude for a minute. There have been various estimates made of the value of these swamp lands which were handed over to Manitoba under the Act which was passed in 1885. I believe that it is estimated that something like 8,000,000 acres of swamp lands still belong to Manitoba. The estimate made by the provincial treasurer of Manitoba, Mr. Armstrong, was that these lands were worth something like $16,000,000. My hon. friend from Edmonton has stated that this sum, capitalized at 5 per cent, would produce $800,000 per annum and, according to the calculation of my hon. friend from Edmonton, Manitoba would be in a far better financial position to keep these lands, even provided they produced only $3 per acre, and get $800,000 per annum than to accept the terms proposed by the Bill now before the committee. I submit that $3 per acre is not a sufficient value for these swamp lands. If the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury), who used to wax eloquent in connection with St. Peter's Indian reserve, were in the House, I would call him as a witness. He used to estimate that these reserve swamp lands were worth from $25 to $30 per acre.

Mr. BRADBURY. The hon. member from Selkirk is in the House. I would like to correct the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). Just as soon as I get through the hon. gentleman may follow me.

Mr. BRADBURY. What the hon. gentleman has stated is absolutely incorrect.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I have not any doubt at all that 'Hansard' will prove that what I have stated is absolutely correct, that the hon. member for Selkirk did estimate the lands of St. Peter's Indian reserve to be worth from $25 to $30 per acre.

Mr. BRADBURY. I beg to say that the hon. gentleman is absolutely incorrect. There are not more than 8,000 acres of swamp land out of the whole 40,000 acres contained within St. Peter's Indian reserve.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I am forced to accept the hon. gentleman's statement. However, it is a matter of small import in any event. I submit that $3 per acre for the swamp lands in Manitoba is a very small valuation. I believe that these lands are worth at least $10 per acre. Take 8,000,000 acres at $10 per acre and you have $80,000,000 and therefore the argument presented by my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) that the terms offered by the recent administration, according to which Manitoba was to retain her swamp lands and get a grant of $200,000 per annum in lieu of the balance of land not granted, was a better proposition for Manitoba than the terms submitted by the present government, is quite correct.

Then, before I conclude my remarks, I wish to direct the attention of the commitee to a matter which is of great importance to the province of Saskatchewan and to refer to the rights of that province to have some consideration in connection with a port on Hudson Bay. If you go back to the question of what territory is involved in the territory that is being added to Manitoba you will find that it is made up of parts of the original territories of Saskatchewan and Athabasca, Keewatin and the territory which lies between Ontario and Hudson Bay. There are only three provinces which can possibly be interested in that territory and they are Ontario, to the east, Manitoba and Saskatchewan. The province of Saskatchewan, as early as the year 1906 or 1907, put forward a claim for an extension of her boundaries to a port on the bay. I submit that in deciding the question you must of necessity go into the history of these territories, and that, in as far as that portion of Athabasca and of the old district of Saskatchewan which is being added to Manitoba are concerned, the province which has the paramount and absolute interest is Saskatchewan. When the province of Saskatchewan was formed there were parts of the old district of Athabasca and the old district of Saskatchewan that were not included.

Those districts and those parts of those districts which are now being put into Manitoba, were formerly part of the old

Northwest Territories and were administered by the government of the old Northwest Territories. The school law of the old Northwest Territories which was in force until 1905 was in force in those parts of Athabasca and Saskatchewan district which are now being added to the province of Manitoba. Those parts of those districts, as a matter of fact, were represented in the old territorial legislature of the Northwest Territories, now represented by the legislature of Saskatchewan and the legislature of Alberta. The old government of the Northwest Territories was responsible for the construction of roads and bridges, and schools in those territories, and, as I have said, those parts of Athabasca and Saskatchewan were represented in the legislature by Mr. Samuel McLeod. Formerly, I believe, they constituted part of what was known as the district of Cumberland, and latterly the district of East Prince Albert. As a matter of fact these portions of territory were represented in this House of Commons in the old district of Mackenzie by a gentleman who still occupies a seat in this House. This territory which is being added to the province of Manitoba, was just as much a part of the old Northwest Territorities as the city of Regina, or the town of Indian Head, or any other municipality located in the central part of that province. In addition to the fact that the province of Saskatchewan has a paramount and absolute interest beyond any other province, in the part of this territory which has been referred to—the part that lies north of the Nelson river and between the Nelson river and Hudson bay—in addition to that I submit that in apportioning the territories among the three provinces, it is generally admitted that each of these provinces was entitled to have access to Hudson bay. If you will look at the map I think every one will agree that the province of Saskatchewan, beyond any other province in the Dominion, is entitled to access to a port on Hudson bay. Our province is the most vitally interested in the construction of the Hudson Bay railway. I submit that it is beyond dispute that the province of Saskatchewan will use that Hudson Bay railway for transportation facilities far more than will any of the other provinces of the Dominion. I believe than any railroad that is constructed out of Saskatchewan or Manitoba towards Hudson bay, will be used by Saskatchewan more than it will be used by Manitoba. The products of Saskatchewan are to-day greater in volume than are the products of Manitoba, and there will be greater disparity between the two provinces in this respect in years to come, so that of necessity any railway that is constructed towards Hudson bay will be more used by the people of Saskatchewan than by the people of Manitoba or of Ontario. I submit that Saskatchewan would only be getting a square deal if it were given access to Hudson bay, and given the same consideration at least as the province of Ontario is getting.

There are further facts to consider in connection with this matter. As far as any evidence I have been able to find goes, the inhabitants of the territory which is being annexed have never themselves evinced any desire to be annexed to Manitoba, but, on the contrary, they have evinced a desire to be annexed to Saskatchewan. I find in volume I of the Sessional Papers of 1906-07, that when the legislation of 1905 was under consideration in this House, the people of that part of Athabasca and Saskatchewan petitioned to be included in Saskatchewan, and I shall read a short extract from a petition which the people of these territories forwarded to the Prime Minister at that time:

> We, the undersigned electors of Mackenzie district, Northwest Territories, and residing at or near the Pas, Saskatchewan, having learned but recently that an effort is being made by the government of Manitoba to have that portion of the territories, lying north of Manitoba, joined to and included in the province of Manitoba, and such annexation being repugnant to us, and as we believe detrimental to the best interests of this portion of the country, we therefore humbly petition that our political affiliation may be with the territories and not with Manitoba, and in case of provincial autonomy being granted the territories, our destiny may be in and with that portion of the territories of which we form an integral part and for such, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Therefore, we have the inhabitants of this territory petitioning not to be annexed to Manitoba, and so far as I have learned, there is not on record any petition to the contrary.

The territory which I submit Saskatchewan is entitled to, is as follows:

> The territory bounded on the south by the province of Manitoba; on the west by the province of Saskatchewan; on the north by the thirty-second correction line of the Dominion lands townships system of survey, which is very nearly the sixtieth parallel of north latitude; on the east by a line commencing at the point where the 100th meridian of west longitude intersects the thirty-second correction line aforesaid, thence following the said 100th meridian south to the eighteenth correction line in the said system of survey, thence in an easterly direction along the said eighteenth correction line to a point where the said correction line intersects the Nelson river, thence southerly along the Nelson river to Lake Winnipeg, thence along the northern and western shores of Lake Winnipeg in a southerly direction to the point where it intersects the northern boundary of the province of Manitoba.

I presume that in view of the position taken by the government, and in view of

the fact that the Bill is submitted to us, there is very little use of my urging that the province of Saskatchewan should be given that territory. I present this view, however, as the view taken by the vast majority of the people of the province of Saskatchewan. However, I do submit that if the government desire to render Saskatchewan justice, or if it wants to render Saskatchewan as much justice as it is rendering to the province of Ontario, it should at least do for Saskatchewan that which it proposes to do for Ontario. I will read, so that it may be on record, a telegram which was recently sent by the Acting Premier of Saskatchewan to the Rt. Hon. R. L. Borden, Prime Minister:

Regina, March 6.

To Rt. Hon. R. L. Borden,
Premier of Canada, Ottawa, Ont

The government of Saskatchewan understands that legislation now before parliament contains provision whereby the province of Ontario will have the rights to secure access to Ports Nelson and Churchill on Hudson bay. On behalf of the people of Saskatchewan we deem it our duty to again call your attention to the claims of this province as set forth in the memorial now in your hands. We desire to protest in the strongest manner possible against the provision of the Bill now before parliament which ignores the just claims of Saskatchewan for access to the bay. We wish further to point out that if there is a single valid reason why the province of Ontario should be given access to the ports mentioned, there are many reasons which are made apparent in the memorial referred to why Saskatchewan should have its claims recognized.

In view of the fact that you did not grant the request of the government of Saskatchewan to be represented at the conferences held with the governments of Manitoba and Ontario we desire to take this means, the only course open to us at present, to notify the government of Canada on behalf of our people that if the legislation now before parliament regarding an extension of the boundaries of Manitoba and Ontario become law without proper provision being made therein for a recognition, not of the claims, but of the rights of this province, the citizens of Saskatchewan for all time to come will have just cause to complain of the treatment received by them. In dealing with the matter referred to, our people have the right to hope and expect that your government will be guided by principles of justice and equality, thereby ensuring that the various provinces in the confederation of Canada will have no cause to complain of unfair treatment.

Mr. BLAIN. Will my hon. friend read the reply to that?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I will do so. The position taken by the Saskatchewan government is mainly that that province is entitled to the territory outlined in the record which I have read from the sessional papers of 1907. But they also claim as an alternative that if the government of Canada do not see their way to give Saskatchewan any portion of that territory, with a port on Hudson Bay, that province should have at least the same consideration as has been given to the province of Ontario in the order in council recently passed. In asking for this, we are not asking for very much; for I think the present government, to use a common expression, has handed the province of Ontario a lemon. They have given it what is of no use to it. It does not own the land; it gets a simple right of way through the territory of Manitoba. This is simply handed out to the province of Ontario to hoodwink the people of that province. So that in giving the same kind of consideration to the people of Saskatchewan, I do not think the Dominion government would be giving us much. I think they should give us a great deal more to meet the need of the province for an outlet to Hudson Bay. The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) asked me to read the reply which has been sent by the right hon. the Prime Minister to the government of Saskatchewan. That reply is as follows:—

I beg to acknowledge your telegram of yesterday. The legislation now before parliament does not contain the provision alluded to. The province of Ontario considers it desirable to extend its state-owned railway to a port on Hudson bay.

At this point I would say that the present government has no guarantee from the government of Ontario that they are going to extend that railway to Hudson bay. All that the order in council says is that it might be desirable in the interest of the province to extend the railway to Hudson bay. I can say exactly the same on behalf of the province of Saskatchewan. Although we have no state-owned railway, it might be desirable in the interest of the province to have a state-owned railway running to Hudson bay. This is just as much assurance as the government has received from the government of Ontario. There is no agreement on the part of the province of Ontario to extend the railway. As I am not through, Mr. Chairman, will you call it six o'clock.

Mr. BORDEN. I understood that the discussion was to be concluded by six o'clock; at least that was the intimation conveyed to me.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There was no agreement, but it was said that we would not interpose any obstacle to having it concluded by six o'clock.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

MONTREAL, OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL.

House in committee on Bill (No. 30) respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co.—Mr. White (Renfrew).

On section 1—time for construction extended,

Mr. OLIVER. This Bill has been the subject of considerable criticism, and perhaps the hon. gentleman in charge of it would inform the committee what is the present position of affairs.

Mr. LENNOX. The Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Bill was partly considered in committee, and then referred to a subcommittee. The subcommittee met the representatives of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, and discussed the measure, and amended it to some extent. It was reprinted as amended by the subcommittee, and then came back to the Standing Committee on Railways. It was considered by them as reprinted, and it was adopted without any further objection. The main features that were in discussion were to have it defined clearly who should be the directors. It was proposed that the survivors of those that were originally directors should be the directors of the company. Now it is held that certain persons shall be the directors. The other proposition which gave rise to the most difficulty was, as to the right to take property belonging to the provinces without the provinces having anything to say in regard to that. It is now provided that, except for the purposes of the canal construction, the company shall not take any land without the consent of the province of Quebec, or the province of Ontario, as the case may be. Then I think there was a provision changed submitting to the jurisdiction of the Railway Board, and they have the Bill before them. I think those were the changes that were made.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not very familiar with the case, but I have seen some criticism of this Bill based, I think, on the ground that it may be used as a foundation of claim against the government of Canada, in case it was decided to go on with the construction of the Georgian Bay canal as a government work. If the railway company and the House at large are satisfied with that position I am not going to raise any objection, only I would like to have that point brought out so that it might be seen that we are not passing the Bill absolutely in the dark.

Mr. LENNOX. I think I can satisfy the House and the hon. member as to that point. The hon. gentleman will probably recollect that two or three sessions ago, probably, when the power given by this Bill was last renewed, a provision was inserted safeguarding the rights of the country in case the government should at any time determine to take over this work. It was pointed out that although we had the sovereign right to take over if we saw fit at any time, the plea might be set up that these men had vested rights, and they could get a very considerable advance on the actual outlay as a going concern, and so on. It was pointed out that we should not take over this work without paying the company for their franchise, and a provision was then inserted which provides that the government should not be called upon to pay more than the actual outlay that had been made by the company. It appeared to the committee the other day that, without making any special provision referring again to the enactment of two or three years ago, the probability was that it would be continued and enforced; but in order that there should be no question about the point, it is provided again by reference, that that clause is continued in force by the extension of time we now grant to the company. So that the point which my hon. friend referred to has, I think, been carefully safeguarded.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I would like the hon. gentleman to look at clause 7 which states as follows:

> Nothing in this Act shall affect or impair the rights of the government of Canada under or by virtue of the provisions of the section substituted by section 5 of chapter 128 of the Statutes of 1906 for section 43 of chapter 103 of the Statutes of 1894.

Then section 5 of chapter 128 of the Act of 1906 reads as follows:

> His Majesty, His Heirs and Successors, may at any time assume the possession of, and the property in, the said canals and works, and of and in all the rights, privileges and advantages of the company on giving to the company one week's notice of intention to do so, and thereupon all property in the said canals, works, rights, privileges and advantages shall become, and thence forward shall be, vested in His Majesty, His Heirs and Successors; and by way of compensation His Majesty shall pay to the company the value of the work actually done by the company up to the time of the giving of such notice in surveying and in the making of plans, and otherwise upon the ground, together with the value of all tangible property of the company of which possession may be so taken,—such values to be fixed by

three valuators, or the majority of them, one valuator to be chosen by His Majesty, another by the company, and the third by the two chosen.

Bill reported, read a third time and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No 39) respecting the Canadian Northern Montreal Tunnel and Terminal Company, Limited.—Mr. Guilbault.

Bill (No. 109) for the relief of Herbert Horsfall.—Mr. McKay.

Bill (No. 110) for the relief of Kenneth Molson.—Mr. Rhodes.

Bill (No. 112) for the relief of James Denny.—Mr. Aikins.

Bill (No. 117) to change the name of Ezra Butler Eddy Bessey.—Mr. Fripp.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 121) respecting the Rainy River Radial Railway Company.—Mr. Beattie.

Bill (No. 122) for the relief of William Holloway Adams.—Mr. McNutt

EXTENSION OF BOUNDARY—MANITOBA.

House resumed consideration in committee of Bill (No. 115), to provide for the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). When the committee rose at six o'clock, I was endeavouring to deal with the reply which was sent by the Prime Minister to the request received by this government from the government of the province of Saskatchewan for increased territory, or for at least similar treatment to that accorded the province of Ontario. For the purpose of placing the telegram completely before the House, I will read it:

I beg to acknowledge your telegram of yesterday. The legislation now before parliament does not contain the provision alluded to. The province of Ontario considers it desirable to extend its state-owned railway to a port on Hudson bay. For this purpose the Governor in Council has passed an order granting to that province a strip of land five miles in width from the western boundary of Ontario to the mouth of the Nelson river. This grant is made by virtue of the federal ownership of the land within the extended boundaries of Manitoba. In case the province of Saskatchewan should undertake the construction and operation of a state owned railway to the shores of Hudson bay, this government will be glad to give the proposal the most careful and earnest consideration. May I point out, however, that apart from this the claim of Saskatchewan was disposed of by the late administration on the 13th July, 1908; Sir Wilfrid Laurier expressed the decision of his government in the following words: 'After giving due consideration to this claim on the part of the province of Saskatchewan, it seemed to us that, as between the claim of the province of Saskatchewan and the province of Manitoba, to have the new territory which lies north of Manitoba and east of Saskatchewan alloted either one way or the other the weight of argument was certainly in favour of Manitoba, and we could not grant the prayer of Saskatchewan. We therefore had to ignore it.

There are two or three points in this reply to which I wish to call attention. The first one I mentioned before six o'clock, the words 'the province of Ontario thinks it desirable to extend its state-owned railway to a port in Hudson bay.' Now, I submit that that statement is not borne out by the order in council passed by the government giving certain rights to Ontario in the shape of a strip of land to a port on the Hudson bay. All the order in council says is as follows:

The government of the province of Ontario considers that it would or might be desirable in the interest of the province to extend the provincial railway known as the Timiskaming and Northern railway——

All that the order in council says is that it 'would or might be desirable'. The telegram says that the government of the province of Ontario considers it desirable. We have no evidence, and the government has no evidence and I do not believe that this road is going to be extended by the province of Ontario. I submit that in order to carry out the effect of that telegram word for word there should be some agreement between the government of the province of Ontario whereby it undertakes to build that railroad from Hudson bay, otherwise the whole contention of the right hon. gentleman in this telegram falls to the ground. Furtherfore, what does he say to the province of Saskatchewan:

In case the province of Saskatchewan should undertake the construction and operation——

The right hon. gentleman did not ask from the province of Ontario an undertaking to construct that Timiskaming road to Hudson bay, but he is asking from the province of Saskatchewan, before we can get similar consideration an actual undertaking to build a state-owned road from some point in that province to Hudson bay. But he does not say in the telegram that we will get the same treatment as the province of Ontario, even if we undertake to construct a road, but he simply says if such be the case this government will be glad to give the proposals the most careful and earnest consideration. The most the province of Saskatchewan can expect if she does undertake to build a state-owned railway from some point in that province to Hudson bay, is 'careful and earnest consideration'. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, to compare that treatment accorded to us with

the treatment accorded to Ontario. The province of Ontario was never asked for any undertaking, they got this consideration without any undertaking whatever.

Some hon. gentlemen will say that the late government disposed of this whole question. It is true the late government disposed of the question so far as the territory was concerned. But I point out that the late government did not concede the demands of the province of Ontario, and the present government has re-opened the whole question by giving to Ontario a certain strip of land and a certain right to a port on the Hudson bay. The late government did not concede that, therefore the present government have re-opened the whole question, and I say that in all fairness we are entitled to equal consideration with the province of Ontario. Hon. gentlemen opposite are very glad, and very anxious, to shelter themselves behind the decisions of the late government, and I do not blame them for it. The decisions of the late government were usually correct. But in this case the present government are sheltering themselves behind the decision of the late government in regard to Saskatchewan, but they do not shelter themselves behind the decision of the late government in regard to Ontario. Now I fancy that not many men sitting here from the province of Ontario believe that the Ontario government is going to construct the Timiskaming railway to Hudson bay. It does not seem to me to be reasonable that the Ontario government is going to extend that Timiskaming railway to Hudson bay, or from Cochrane to Hudson bay. It appears to me more reasonable that they might extend it to the city of Quebec, and especially in view of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite to keep the trade of this country running east and west. The distance from Cochrane to the city of Quebec is 475 miles, the distance from Cochrane to Ste. Margaret's bay, the nearest point on the Hudson bay, is 625 miles. The distance from Cochrane to Port Nelson terminus on Hudson bay is 700 miles. Now the common sense view of the matter appears to me to be that this Timiskaming railway from Cochrane will in all probability be extended to the city of Quebec.

I said before the committee rose at six o'clock that the province of Saskatchewan had more interest in transportation to Hudson bay than any other province in the Dominion of Canada. I do not require to elaborate that statement. But let me give you one or two figures to indicate that we are really more interested, because of our nearness to ports on the Hudson bay, in the traffic that may be conducted with any port, or through any railroad connected with that bay, than even the province of Manitoba. Take the distance from the centre of these provinces. The centre of Manitoba is very much closer to Fort William than the centre of Saskatchewan. From the centre of Manitoba to Fort William is a distance of about 500 miles. From the centre of Saskatchewan to Fort William is a distance of 800 miles. But from the centre of Saskatchewan to Churchill is a distance of 500 to 550 miles; whereas, the distance from the centre of Manitoba to Fort Churchill is some 750 to 800 miles by the nearest route. The centre of Saskatchewan is far nearer than the centre of Manitoba to either one of these ports on the bay. Therefore, I say we are more interested in transportation to Hudson bay than the province of Manitoba can be. Let me conclude my remark by giving a brief resume of the reasons I have given for the contention that we are entitled to added territory, but in any event we are entitled to equal consideration with the province of Ontario:

1. Those parts of old districts of Saskatchewan and Athabaska not included in the province of Saskatchewan were for 20 years, and should continue to be, united with the area forming that province.

2. The province of Saskatchewan and the province of Manitoba are both entitled to have their boundaries extended to Hudson bay.

3. By granting to the province of Saskatchewan those portions of the old districts of Saskatchewan and Athabaska, the Nelson river forms a natural boundary, and I submit, a reasonable boundary between that province and Manitoba.

4. The territory north of the Nelson river is tributary to the province of Saskatchewan rather than to Manitoba.

5. The province of Saskatchewan has a much greater interest in a transportation route via Hudson bay to the European market than has either Manitoba or Ontario.

6. If the territory north of Wilson river were given to Saskatchewan, no great injustice would be done to Manitoba because there would still be left 208,000 square miles of equally good territory with several hundred miles of coast line, which is amply sufficient to satisfy all reasonable claims both of Manitoba and Ontario.

I submit that in order to do even scant justice to the province of Saskatchewan we must be accorded like treatment with the province of Ontario. That statement cannot be successfully refuted. I have only this to say to the present government, that if they do not give the province of Saskatchewan access to a port on the Hudson bay in the same way as they do to the province of Ontario, the people of Saskatchewan will have a just cause for com-

plaint, and a just grievance against this government for all time to come.

Mr. BORDEN. I would like to say one or two words in reply to the observations of my hon. friend from Regina (Mr. Martin). He will pardon me if I do not advert to the major portion of his speech, because it simply contains arguments that have been made a great many times in the discussion of this measure, and which I think have been answered a great many times. But with reference to the alleged discrimination between Ontario and Saskatchewan, I want to point out that the word 'undertaking' was not used in the telegram in the sense which he attributes to it. It was used in the sense of embarking upon the project of building a railroad to Hudson bay, it was not used in the sense of requiring any undertaking from the province of Saskatchewan, and I regret that my hon. friend took that meaning from it. I may be permitted to say that inasmuch as he regards the arrangement with Ontario as either a lemon or a gold brick, I am not sure which, I am surprised that he should be exercised so greatly in order to get a similar lemon or gold brick for the province of Saskatchewan. He is of course entitled to his own opinion as to the character of the particular arrangement that has been made. If he still should be anxious for this alleged lemon or gold brick, as the hon. member has called it, for the province of Saskatchewan, I have already said in the telegram that the government would be desirous of giving its most earnest and careful consideration to any proposal that the province of Saskatchewan might make in that regard.

In so far as the desire of the province of Ontario is concerned, I do not recollect at the moment the exact words that were used in the order in council, but I do know that the government of Ontario, in so far as I can gather the intentions of that government, has it in most serious contemplation to extend the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario railway to a port on Hudson bay. My hon. friend is a little astray, I think, in one regard. In so far as the boundaries are concerned, they are left exactly as they were defined in 1908. The arrangement made with the province of Ontario is not a part of this legislation. If legislation is hereafter to be placed before this House for the purpose of carrying out that arrangement made with Ontario, my hon. friend's observations will be very much more to the point than they have been this afternoon and evening, although I concede, of course, that he is at perfect liberty and quite within his rights in making the comments upon the arrangement that he has seen fit to make.

I do not think that my hon. friend was a member of this House in 1908 when the resolutions were moved on the 13th of July, and therefore I cannot ask him why he kept silent on that occasion because he was not here to say anything for the province of Saskatchewan. Perhaps I am mistaken in that.

An hon. MEMBER. He was here.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I was not here in 1908.

Mr. BORDEN. That is my recollection. But, I would like to say to him that Saskatchewan was represented by capable and zealous men at that time, and I do not remember—I am speaking from recollection—that any member from Saskatchewan then found fault with the attitude of the late administration on that occasion. My hon. friend suggests that the present administration is desirous of hiding itself behind the late administration. We are not so desirous. The present government thought that the boundaries which were defined by this House in 1908 ought to be adhered to and, consistently with that, we thought it no more than right to give some effective consideration to the desire and claim of the province of Ontario to extend its state-owned railway to the shore of Hudson bay. In doing that we have not departed at all from the boundaries. We have simply, by the exercise of the rights appertaining to the government of this country in virtue of the federal ownership of these lands within the extended boundaries, given this strip of land to the province of Ontario in order that it may have an opportunity of extending that railway to the shore of Hudson bay. If the province of Saskatchewan should desire to enter into the project of owning and operating railways, and should desire to extend its railways to the shore of Hudson bay, I can only repeat to my hon. friend what I have already said to the government of Saskatchewan in the telegram which has been brought up, that this government will be prepared to give the most earnest and sympathetic consideration to any suggestions or proposals that the government of Saskatchewan may have to make in regard to the matter.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). Could that be done in any way at all after this Bill extending the boundaries of Manitoba has passed?

Mr. BORDEN. I am afraid that I have not made myself clear to my hon. friend. I trust that I have made myself clearer to most hon. gentlemen in this House than I seem to have succeeded in doing in so far as he is concerned. The boundaries are

adhered to exactly as they were before, but inasmuch as the Crown, in the right of the government of Canada, owns the greater part of the land within the extended boundaries, the government of Canada could make a grant for railway purposes to a corporation, or an individual, or to any one else. This is not strictly connected with the extension of the boundaries. If the boundaries of Manitoba had not been extended at all it would have been equally competent for the government of Canada to have made a grant to that province for the purpose referred to. The two things are not directly connected with each other, except in so far as they are connected in this way: Ontario made a claim that it was entitled to have a port on the shores of Hudson bay, but the boundaries having been defined by parliament in 1908, it seemed that the best course open to us for the purpose, was to make a grant of this strip five miles in width in order that it might be competent for the province of Ontario to extend that railway through the province of Manitoba just as it could have extended that railway through these territories before they formed a part of the province of Manitoba. I am putting aside for the moment, the alleged constitutional difficulties which have been raised by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House and to which I do not attach a great deal of importance. But, that is all that has been done. If the boundaries had not been extended the same thing might have been done, or if the boundaries of Manitoba were extended to-day and Ontario, three years from now, had come to the conclusion that it desired to extend its railway to the shores of Hudson bay, it would have been competent for this government at that time, to have done exactly the same thing. It is only in the way I have suggested, that the two proposals are connected with each other.

Amendment (Mr. Oliver) negatived on division.

Mr. BORDEN. Before clause 5 is adopted, there are just one or two amendments of a clerical nature that I would like to make. At the end of the 44th line, in subsection of section 5, it reads:

> Thereafter until such population reaches one million one hundred thousand, the sum payable shall be seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars.

My hon. friends on the other side of the House did not happen to observe, and I only observed myself a short time ago, that we are really discriminating against Saskatchewan by the use of the word 'one.' It should be 'two'; one million two hundred thousand, instead of one million one hundred thousand. Therefore, I beg to move that the first section of subsection 5 be amended by striking out the word 'one' at the end of the 44th line, and substituting the word 'two' therefor.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In clause 3 the provincial boundaries are described as being 'along the international boundary line to a certain monument thereon, at or near the northwest angle of the Lake of the Woods'. Should not that monument be definitely described in some way, or otherwise there may be disputes in the future.

Mr. BORDEN. This description has been gone over very carefully by the geographer and by the astronomer as well, and it was supposed to be absolutely accurate and definite in every way.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They have no legal training, and they may think that because they know where the boundary is, it is all right.

Mr. BORDEN. There does seem to be force in the hon. gentleman's suggestion. We may report the Bill, and before the third reading I will refer the matter to these gentlemen, who are more responsible than I am for the description, because I left it almost entirely to them.

Mr. OLIVER. The peculiarity about the boundary at that particular point is that the international boundary line which runs east and west, up to a certain point, runs north for a short distance, and the monument spoken of is at the north end of this northerly turn to the boundary line.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The description does not say so.

Mr. OLIVER. It does not, and it is rather important that the monument should be definitely defined.

Mr. MACDONALD. When the boundaries of Manitoba were definitely settled in 1908, the same resolution dealt with the boundaries of Ontario and Quebec, whereas in the present case, the government is dealing with the boundaries of each of these provinces by a separate Bill. In 1908 a resolution was moved by the hon. member for Colchester to the following effect:

> Be it resolved that the extension of the boundaries provided for by this resolution shall be accompanied by such conditions as will prevent such extension prejudicially affecting the representation of any province in parliament.

An amendment was moved to that resolution. which was adopted, I think, by consent, as follows:

> That in any legislation to be introduced to give effect to the foregoing resolution, nothing shall be contained or provided to impair the representation of any province in this House.

In view of this, I call the attention of the Prime Minister to the effect of the extension of provincial boundaries upon the representation of the provinces in parliament. The Prime Minister, coming from the maritime provinces, is aware of the interest which has developed in that portion of the Dominion in regard to this question of representation. In the organ of his party in the Island of Cape Breton, it was urged that the members of this House, irrespective of party, should, in connection with this Bill, take up this question of representation, and have it settled. During the discussion in 1908, the hon. member for Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler), and the then member from St. John county (Dr. Daniel), dealt at great length with that question, and the effect which the extension of these boundaries would have upon the question of representation. I do not propose to move an amendment, but I want to say a word or two to the right hon. gentleman in regard to this matter. I need not urge on the Prime Minister the desirability of keeping in view the working out of some arrangement so that the representation of the maritime provinces should not be reduced. There are two ways in which this could be dealt with. It could be provided in the Quebec Bill that the population of the additional territory which is given to that province, should not be taken into consideration in the computation which is made in order to ascertain the electoral unit. An amendment could be made in this Bill providing that the population in the added territory should not be taken into the computation of the population of the provinces when you come to make up the number which has to be taken into consideration when you make a comparison between the population at one census and the population at the previous census. But, of course, legislation of that kind would not in any way remedy the difficulty which exists. If no amendment providing for the safeguards is made to these Bills we would be left to the remedy suggested by the Minister of Marine, whereby, as a result of a conference to be held between the Premiers of the provinces of the Dominion, an agreement might be made under which you would have an irreducible minimum fixed for each one of the maritime provinces, or, what would be better, a minimum fixed for all of the original provinces which entered into confederation with the addition of Prince Edward Island.

I apprehend, from the statement made by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that a conference of the provinces is to be held at which that question is to be discussed. But supposing that conference is to be held, the Premier should move, and move speedily, in order to obtain effectual results from it, by asking this parliament to adopt an address to the imperial parliament, so that we would have imperial legislature in force and effect when we came to pass a redistribution Bill, and would be empowered to deal with it on that basis. The whole question of redistribution is inextricably mixed up with this problem, and it is important to have the opinion of such a conference brought to a head at an early day. My hon. friend has also told us that at some time he proposes to call the maritime provinces to council for the purpose of considering how they are to be affected by the granting of lands to the other provinces of the Dominion. When the boundaries of all the provinces are fixed as a result of these various resolutions, we shall have shut the door for ever on the possibility of any of the maritime provinces having any share in the present territory of the Dominion beyond what they have now, or on the possibility of their having any increased representation through the addition of territory, as will be the case with all the other provinces, as a result of the legislation we are now passing or may pass in the future. This problem is a very serious one. I am quite sure the Premier is sympathetic; but as a result of this legislation, without providing in any way for our representation being unimpaired, the door is being closed against any remedy being ever obtained in that way. As far as I am concerned, I am not moving any amendment to this measure, on the faith of what I assume the Premier will do, believing that we can count on him taking such steps as are in his power to gratify the reasonable wishes of the various provinces, particularly the maritime provinces, in regard to representation. The proposition is one which ought to be taken up with regard to all the original provinces of confederation, together with Prince Edward Island. The language of section 51 with regard to this matter is well worth recalling:

> On the completion of the census in the year 1871, and of each subsequent decennial census, the representation of the four provinces shall be readjusted by such authority, in such a manner, and from such time as the parliament of Canada from time to time provides——

Subject to certain rules. Although we have the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada and of the Privy Council based on a strictly legal interpretation of the terms of this document, it is quite evident to any hon. gentleman who has looked at the record of what occurred at the time the fathers of confederation assembled together to settle these matters, that they had in view a readjustment to be made by a comparison every ten years of the populations of the different provinces with that

of Canada consisting of the four original provinces. That that should be preserved as the basis of confederation is a proposition which is not an unreasonable one; and, realizing that though some guards could be obtained by the insertion of amendments in this Bill, but apprehending at the same time that they would be ineffectual, I ask the Premier, in connection with the various questions germane to this, which will of necessity come up in this and succeeding years, to see if he cannot work out the problem so that the representation of the various provinces will be maintained.

Mr. BORDEN. I realize the very great importance of the matter which the hon. gentleman has just mentioned. The maritime provinces lost a certain number of members under the census of 1901. If I remember correctly, they stand to lose five members by the census of 1911—two in New Brunswick, two in Nova Scotia, one in Prince Edward Island. The people of those provinces naturally take a deep interest in having their representation in this parliament maintained. I recall very well the debate in 1908, when those resolutions were introduced by the right hon. gentleman who now leads the opposition. The principal portion of the debate turned upon the matter which has just been mentioned by my hon. friend from Pictou. The maritime provinces, as I understand, depended on subsection 4 of section 51 as a safeguard to prevent the reduction of their representation. Subsection 4 is as follows:

> On such readjustment the number of members for a province shall not be reduced unless the proportion which the number of the population of the province bore to the number of the aggregate population of Canada at the then last preceding readjustment of the number of members for the provinces is ascertained at the then latest census to be diminished by one-twentieth part or upwards.

This worked out in connection with the other portions of section 51 in this way. In the first place, you ascertained the unit of representation by dividing the population of Quebec by 65, the constant number of members to which that province is entitled. Having obtained the unit of representation in that way, it was necessary to ascertain something more before you could reduce the representation of any province. You had to ascertain whether or not the proportion which the population of the province bore to the population of all Canada, as determined at the previous census, had been diminished by the results of that census to the extent of one-twentieth. If it had not been diminished to the extent of one-twentieth, the province would not lose any part of its representation. The difficulty which has arisen is this. Section 51 as it originally existed in the British North America Act had clearly related to the four provinces of Canada which constituted the confederation—the old provinces of Canada divided into Ontario and Quebec, the province of New Brunswick and the province of Nova Scotia. In 1904 or 1905, when this question was referred by the late administration to the Supreme Court of Canada, afterwards going on appeal to the Privy Council, it was determined by the Privy Council that the word 'Canada' in its application to the census of 1901, meant not Canada as originally constituted, but all the provinces of Canada, including Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, which were brought into the confederation in 1871 and 1873, and also the provinces of Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan, which were constituted afterwards.

At least I think the judgment of the Privy Council went that far. My hon. friend the member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), argued the case, and he will correct me if I am not stating it accurately.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They did not state whether it included the territories or not, but it included all the provinces.

Mr. BORDEN. They did decide that it included Manitoba?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN. Therefore, the same reasoning would lead to the conclusion that it included Alberta and Saskatchewan, after they were constituted into provinces.

Mr. MACDONALD. All the provinces.

Mr. BORDEN. Just one further circumstance may be mentioned in that connection, because it seems to me a very important one. I do not know on what the judgment proceeded in the Privy Council. If I remember correctly the Privy Council did not give any reasons for the judgment.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN. Did they give reasons?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN. I had forgotten that, but at all events in the Supreme Court of Canada, some of the judges laid stress upon the contention that the British North America Act of 1871, and the British North America Act of 1886, had an important bearing upon this question, by reason of the fact that in the British North America Act of 1886 it is declared that the Act of 1867, the Act of 1871, and the Act of 1886 shall all be construed together as if they were one Act, although doubtless there are other reasons why they were constrained to come to the conclusion which I have just mentioned. Now, I would like to say in that regard, that neither the Act of 1871, nor the Act of 1886, was passed for any such purpose——

Mr. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN. And if the effect of those Acts is to prevent this safeguarding section from having the operation which it was intended to have in the first instance, then it would seem to me that there is a pretty fair argument to be made, that the compact between the provinces of Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, which was effected by the British North America Act of 1867, has been inadvertently departed from.

Mr. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN. I can assure my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), and the hon. member from St. John (Mr. Pugsley), who take a great interest in this question that all of us from the maritime provinces are just as deeply interested in it as they are, and I can assure my hon. friend from Pictou that it will have the earnest and careful consideration of the government. Various suggestions have been made as to how the representation of the maritime provinces might be maintained, but I need not go into them to-night. I will be glad to discuss them at any time with any hon. gentleman in this House, who takes an interest in this question. I think, however, it must be apparent to every one of us who has given consideration to this question, and I have given a great deal of consideration to it, that no one of the methods suggested is free from difficulty. Doubtless some of these suggestions would be attended with less difficulty than others. One suggestion that has been made is, that a minimum representation should be established for the maritime provinces. Another suggestion is that the British North America Act should be amended, to the effect that in estimating the one-twentieth diminution which is required under the provisions of subsection 4 of section 51, only the four original provinces should be taken into consideration, so far as any diminution of the representation of those provinces is concerned. If I am right in the view that some of the judges went upon the grounds which I mentioned a moment ago, it would seem to me that perhaps that suggestion would afford the most reasonable basis for an amendment to the British North America Act.

Mr. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN. But I would not like to be understood as giving a final opinion in that regard, because the importance of this question demands very much more consideration than I have been able to give it during the past four or five months, as my hon. friends in the House will understand. I can only repeat in conclusion, that my hon. friend from Pictou can rest assured that this matter will engage the very earnest and careful attention of the government.

Bill reported.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Subsidies service between Baddeck, Grand Narrows and Iona—$5,825.

Mr. McKENZIE. Has the contract for the ensuing year been signed between the government and the company?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). No.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is there any proposition for a change in the terms?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). No.

Mr. McKENZIE. For the last few years boats used to call at a place called Camp Head, but I am not sure that they did last year. I am particularly anxious that that call should continue.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Yes, that call is required. That is after they pass Mackay's point.

Mr. McKENZIE. Last year, I believe, it was obligatory upon the company to call there only while the steamer 'Marion' was making her regular trips. It is very desirable that a steamer should call there during the whole of open navigation en route to Iona. I hope the minister will have that inserted in the contract.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I shall be very glad to look into that.

Steam service between Canada and Australia or New Zealand or both, on the Pacific Ocean, $185,509.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). What was the extent of the carrying trade last year of the line thus subsidized?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Last year twelve voyages were made. The total number of passengers was 6,016; freight, 53,680 tons; mail, 10,012 bags, and 937 sacks.

Mr. SINCLAIR. They are not paid extra for carrying the mail?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). No, the mail carriage is provided for in the subsidy.

Steam service between Canadian Atlantic ports and Australia and New Zealand, $120,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR. How does it come that we have two services to New Zealand?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). One is on the Pacific and the other by the Atlantic ports. These vessels on the Atlantic side make a sailing once a month, on the 15th.

In the summer the service is from Montreal to Auckland, Wellington, Lyttleton and Dunedin, in New Zealand, and Melbourne and Sydney in Australia. In the winter months, they sail from St. John and Halifax and make the same terminal ports in New Zealand and Australia.

Mr. SINCLAIR. How much did they carry last year?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The total distance is nearly 13,000 miles. The freight carried was 12,304 tons by weight and 73,640 tons by measurement. There is little or no passenger traffic and no mails.

Mr. SINCLAIR. What is the tonnage of the ships in the service?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It runs from 7,503 to 9,964 tons, there being four vessels. The speed is from 10 knots to 12 knots.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Are any of these steamship subventions new, and if any are new, will the minister please indicate that as we come to them?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). These are all old votes, most of the services having been established for a long series of years.

Ocean and mail service between Canada and Great Britain, $600,000.

Mr. MACDONALD. What is the minister doing in regard to that?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The contracts end on the 1st May, 1912. The government has had under consideration, for several years, as my hon. friend knows, various plans for the improvement of the service across the Atlantic. I find records of these plans on the files as I look them over. Some of them are pretty ambitious, and all of them anticipate a large amount of money in the shape of subsidies. We are paying now for Atlantic steamers somewhere in the region of $700,000 or $800,000, for what we call the distinctive mail service. Many of the smaller subsidies are for freight ships, passengers constituting a very small part. The present government has had no opportunity, no time, to take up these matters and give them the consideration they merit. These projects involve two things, first a large increase in the amount of money and also contracts for a considerable period of time, because a large enterprise like this will not begin on the basis of a year-to-year arrangement. Hon. gentlemen will quite see that it has been impossible for us to sit down and give any real attention to the subject. After the House of Commons has ended its session and left us, we hope to be able to get down to that question in the course of the recess and give it real consideration. There is another proposition on foot, which is to enlarge the number of vessels at present coming into our ports as beneficiaries of the subsidy granted on a tonnage basis. I have looked into that somewhat in connection with the Post Office Department, but I have not looked into it sufficiently to make up my mind in reference to it. The committee will see from the tenor of my remarks that what is likely to take place is that the present service will be continued temporarily and that during the recess the whole matter will be taken up and the consideration given to it which it deserves.

I cannot, myself, see any better way than that. I do not care to make long contracts under present conditions; I would not like to make a contract under the new conditions involving, as I said, much more money and for a long term, without time for consideration. In the meantime, although we may not have all that we ought to have, we have a very creditable mail service. The style of boats, the capacity of boats, the speed of boats having constantly increased since many years ago when we commenced to talk about a fast Atlantic service. Our speed now comes up to 17 and 18 knots, and the quality, the accommodation and the outfittings of our best boats are much to be commended. But the lines which are at present running those boats are not satisfied with the development. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company is now building two very fine boats for the Pacific service, and if my information is correct, those boats will be put upon the Pacific service inside of probably twelve months. That will relieve the present boats on the Pacific line for service elsewhere. There are also being built by steamship companies, improved boats, some of which will carry upon the Atlantic line. Last year, I think it was, the 'Laurentic' and the 'Megantic' of the Dominion-White Star line came to the river St. Lawrence and the port of Montreal. I think these vessels will also come this season, and it is not impossible that one or two other vessels of that line may make voyages to our ports.

There is one thing in connection with the St. Lawrence route which is not satisfactory, and that is that we have not so far been able to take out from Montreal the amount of freight that is offered at Montreal, and that might go via Montreal provided we had the tonnage. We have some 22 regular vessels coming into port there, large vessels, but they carry large numbers of passengers and large quantities of parcel freight, and they take a minimum of grain, according as their space is filled or is not filled. These boats, both

passenger and mail boats, are not able to take away the grain that offers at the port of Montreal, and last year, as in previous years, and as will occur no doubt next year, to a certain extent, grain will seek its way out through the port of Montreal and will not find in that class of ship tonnage sufficient to carry it. The difficulty is, coming down to the point, that the insurance rates are so high that any other than a regular steamer does not find it convenient or profitable, and maybe does not find it possible, to compete for grain from the port of Montreal. If you take the zone below us to the Atlantic ports of the United States, and compare the insurance rates with ours, our insurance rates are very much higher, and the difference in rates is sufficient to keep the tramp steamers from visiting the Montreal ports. There ought to be some method of solution by which lower insurance charges should be given to the irregular vessels coming into our more northern harbours. We have spent an immense amount of money on the St. Lawrence route and on the gulf, in lighting, and in all the conveniences for the warning of ships. We have a route there that we might well be proud of, which has been the interest of all governments since Canada had a government, and which can claim from both parties and all governments, and has received, fair and generous consideration. There has been a progressive diminution of casualties, consequent upon the increase of lights and appliances for warning vessels. Now it does seem as though the great insurance companies, and Lloyds is of course the greatest, ought to have some regard to that progressive feature in our marine history, and ought to come a little nearer to accommodating itself in the way of insurance rates to the wants and necessities of the St. Lawrence route and the Canadian ports.

Mr. NESBITT. Does the minister know how much higher they are now?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I have not the figures by me, but they are considerably higher.

Mr. NESBITT. They have been very materially reduced in the last five years.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). They have been reduced if you take a period of some length of time; but in the last two or three years, if my memory serves me right, the reductions have not been large. I may say that that matter is not escaping the attention of the government, my own department is taking that matter up, and I hope that in some way or other we may turn over a new leaf with reference to that matter, and that we may get for our ports and our trade a better insurance rate, which would enable us to remove from ourselves the reproach of allowing the grain that offers itself to our ports to go to other ports, owing to our lack of tonnage accommodation.

Mr. MACDONALD. What is the speed of the new Canadian Pacific Railway boats that are going on the Atlantic?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The new boats will have a speed of not less than 22 knots.

Mr. MACDONALD. We are to understand that, pending a review of the whole subject and a final arrangement, the contracts as they stand now will run during this year?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I am not saying that certainly, but that is the conclusion towards which the remarks I have made trend. Something might happen that would make it different, but I do not know of anything at present.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was going to suggest to my hon. friend that he let one of these items stand over, as there are some gentlemen who are not here who would like to speak upon them.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). We will leave the last item over, with the understanding that they may all be discussed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend mentioned the grain business. My judgment is that one of the most immediate needs of solving the difficulty about the grain business is to have more elevator accommodation at the St. Lawrence and Atlantic ports. We have not one-tenth part of the storage accommodation for grain which is needed east of the lakes. At Buffalo they have storage capacity for fifty million bushels of grain, and the result is that Buffalo has become a favourite place for the storage of grain, and when it is stored there at the proper time, and the market is satisfactory and freights are satisfactory, and tonnage is available, grain goes forward from that port to the markets of the old world. Our elevator accommodation east of the lakes is very limited in character. I am satisfied that the railway companies feel it. I have talked with the officials of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and they know that they realize that the elevator accommodation is not what it ought to be, but, of course, the railway companies usually move along under the pressure of business. It seems to me that the government ought to consider whether, at certain important points, a large amount of storage for grain should not be provided. I am satisfied that it would go a long way towards relieving the difficulty caused by congestion, and that the grain would go forward as tonnage was available and as the market suited

Mr. SINCLAIR. I am glad to see that the minister is taking an interest in the question of insurance in the river and gulf of St. Lawrence. There is a certain amount of prejudice among the underwriters in England against the St. Lawrence route. They, of course, make their calculations, upon the losses that they make from year to year during a given period of years and they will give you that as a reason why the rates are so much higher. I am certain that the situation is not well understood by the brokers in London. They close down very early in the season on insurance in the St. Lawrence; I think it is in October——

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). They raise their rates.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes, they raise their rates in October just at the time when the grain is being moved and at a time when the season is the busiest. There is no real reason in the condition of our climate why the rates should be raised so early in the season, because October and November are just as safe for navigation in the St. Lawrence as any other month. They raise their rates from Quebec away down to the Baie de Chaleur, Miramichi bay and northern coast of New Brunswick which affects the timber trade to some extent. It is quite true that tramp vessels do not find their way very much to the St. Lawrence largely on that account. Not only is the insurance all the year around too high, but it is very much heavier at the time of the year when the large bulk of the work is being done. I do not know whether anything can be done, but I think it would be a very good thing if the minister should get in touch with Lloyds people in London and give them the charts of the St. Lawrence and all the information that is available in the department in order to show them that navigation in these waters is quite safe in these early months of winter. If he does perhaps some of this prejudice, which I feel certain exists there, can be removed.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I would like to intimate to the Minister of Trade and Commerce that some time before the close of the session I wish to discuss the matter of a fast Atlantic steamship service. I will not do it to-night but I will give him notice at some later date.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would like to ask the minister with respect to the service between Moncton and Bay of Fundy ports. I cannot see that provision has been made for it this year. It was for a steamer plying between Moncton and ports in the county of Cumberland, Nova Scotia, and in the county of Albert, New Brunswick. I think the amount paid last year was $2,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I think my hon. friend will find an item before we get through in reference to that. I just want to say in connection with the point mentioned by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), that we have been making representations in two ways. We have been making representations by way of spreading information as to what has been done in improving, lighting and other conveniences in Canada and we have also been making representations, and we are at the present time making representations, to the insurance companies themselves and endeavouring not only to put all the information which we possess before them but to put it before them in such a way that we are getting them to canvass it and to talk over it with us. If anything can be done in that way during the present year to make everything as plain as it can be made, I propose that my department shall have that done. I do not think there will be any lack in that respect. In reference to the suggestion of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) that the solution of this matter would be the building of elevators, I do not want it to be understood here that the government propose to take over the duty and the work that belongs to the railway companies whose business it is to equip their roads with these terminal conveniences. Wherever the government has railways and termini and grain offers and those conveniences are necessary, I think the government will not be backward in providing them. As far as the great railway companies are concerned, I think they must themselves provide terminal conveniences. It is their duty to do it and I see no reason why we should not impress that duty upon them.

Mr. BENNETT (Simcoe). In connection with this question of grain elevators, I think that the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) perhaps does not bear in mind the fact that a very large proportion of the wheat that comes from the northwest is distributed in Ontario and the other provinces. The object of the elevator companies is not simply to make what they can in the way of charges for holding the grain over for the winter but it is the money made in the elevating of the grain and, in turn, discharging it into cars that is important to them. We have several places in Ontario to-day where large milling companies have erected grain elevators. There is a great deal of the spirit of gambling in connection with grain and while to-day the miller aims at buying grain when it is low, in order to accommodate the grain that he owns himself, he must have an elevator of his own. I have in mind two or three flour-milling companies in Ontario who have large elevator accommodation. I think it is hardly fair to expect the rail-

way companies, as a business enterprise, to build huge elevators, have them filled up with grain in the fall of the year and simply derive the charge from handling or storing it during the winter. This is a matter that, in my judgment, in so far as Ontario is concerned, will correct itself inasmuch as the flour milling companies will construct and maintain elevators of their own and thus relieve the congestion of grain at the eastern lake ports.

Steam service between Canada and Cuba, $25,000.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). What business did this line do last year?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The Canada and Cuba line did not do much of a business, and as far as I am concerned it will not go on the same another year.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). It is from St. John, is it not?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Well, it was. They made nine passages, they carried no passengers, they carried out 35,325 tons by measurement, and they brought back not a single ounce of cargo. When the service was first projected, it was with the idea that these steamers should carry things to Cuba, and carry things back from Cuba to Canada. What it has resulted in is that they carry out a certain large amount of produce from Canada, but after reaching Cuba they load up for foreign ports. Hereafter the service may touch at Cuba and do good work in carrying produce out of Cuba, but it has got to be so connected as to bring back something for Canada or else they will not get a subsidy.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That matter is worthy of further consideration by the minister. The important thing for Canada is to get a foreign market for Canadian products, and why should we be so anxious to buy goods in Cuba and spend Canadian money there? The minister tells us that the line to Australia and New Zealand has carried out forty thousand odd tons; does that mean the same measurement as he gave for the Cuba line?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). That means tons weight.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Let us suppose that at least half the quantity of Canadian products is sent to Cuba for this small subsidy of $25,000 as is sent to Australia and New Zealand for the large subsidy of $180,000, and the showing is not so bad after all. This subsidy was given for the purpose of developing the trade in potatoes, particularly between the maritime province ports and Cuba and it has been very effective in that respect. As to passengers, of course it is natural to expect that passengers would go to New York and take a passenger steamer there rather than travel by a freight boat. It has been explained to me by those in the enterprise that really there is not much return cargo from Cuba to Canada.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I think that is so.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We continued the subsidy as an encouragement for the export of Canadian products, and to give our people a foreign market, and in doing that we were accomplishing the most important object to be gained by this small subsidy. I have no doubt that the Minister of Trade and Commerce will look into the matter carefully before he takes any action.

Mr. EDWARDS. The position taken by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley), is very interesting when we contrast it with the position he took last year in regard to this matter. When these subsidies were up last year I called attention to the fact that so far as the trade between Canada and Australia and New Zealand was concerned the outgoing trade from Canada consisted almost entirely of manufactured articles, principally agricultural implements, and that the export of Canadian agricultural products to these countries was a mere bagatelle. The incoming trade from Australia and New Zealand to Canada consisted mainly of agricultural products which were coming in here and competing with the products of our own farmers. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley), now says that we should look mainly at these subsidies from the standpoint of getting outside markets, for our products, but last year he was willing to subsidize steamship lines to convey our manufactured articles to Australia and New Zealand, and to bring back to Canada agricultural products to compete with the products raised by our own farmers.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was getting a foreign market for our manufactures.

Mr. EDWARDS. Yes, but the hon. gentleman and his political friends represented themselves as the friends of the agriculturists, when in that respect they were showing themselves the friends of the manufacturers, and the foes of the agriculturists, because they were subsidizing steamship lines to bring back agricultural products which they proposed to let into the country free, to compete with our own agricultural products, while the outgoing agricultural exports from Canada did not amount to a bagatelle. It seems to me that this whole matter of steamship subsidies could be very well looked into with a great deal of care. I have never been able to understand on what basis these subsidies have been granted;

whether the steamers were supposed to be paid so much a trip or whether the subsidy was paid on the amount of tonnage carried inwards and outwards. It does seem to me that the volume of trade with some of these countries to which we subsidize steamship lines does not warrant the amount of the subsidy granted. The Auditor General's report for the year ending 31st March, 1911, shows that a subsidy was granted between Canada and Mexico of $125,000 which I suppose includes the service on the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, and of that amount $11,458.34 was not used. Then, $50,000 was granted for the Canada-New Zealand service, and none of it was used. Between the Canadian Atlantic ports and Australia and New Zealand there was a subsidy of $120,000 granted which I believe is to be voted again this year, and $20,000 of that was not used. I notice that in several of these items here the full amount voted was not used. That is why I ask on what basis these grants are voted. I would also like some explanation as to why they have not all been used.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The grants have not all been used because the money has not all been earned according to contract. There is a gross sum put in the estimates, which forms the maximum of the contract for a certain number of trips. The vessels are paid generously so much per trip. If they do not make the full number of trips, they do not get the full amount of the subsidy. A contract is entered into for each of these services. There are certain general features common to all the contracts; then there are special features which fit the individual case.

Mr. EDWARDS. In arriving at the amount you are going to pay, do you take into account the value of the goods they carry out of Canada and the value of the goods they bring back ?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I do not think that is taken as a basis. There are some services which are called services of necessity; there are others which are experimental. You do not get as much trade as you would like to get. You are working up a trade. If there were a full trade, there would be no necessity for the subsidy at all. The arrangement is for each individual service, and there is the usual bargaining between the steamship company and the government. If a lump sum is arranged for a certain number of voyages, for each complete round trip, the company gets its proportion of the whole subsidy. If it does not make the number of trips stipulated for, as a maximum, the payment falls short in that proportion. It would be almost impossible, in such services, to pay according to the amount of exports and imports, from the fact that you start a service, not because there is a plethora of freight offering to and fro, but because you want to work up to a larger and larger commercial intercourse. You will help the vessel at the first, and in course of time, some of these become paying and do not need subsidies.

Mr. EDWARDS. I would assume that in asking for a subsidy they would advance some argument to show why a subsidy should be granted.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). There is no doubt they advance arguments.

Mr. EDWARDS. It seems to me they ought to have something more tangible in the way of an argument than simply that they want the money. I would suppose that they would present arguments to show that such a trade could be worked up.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I do not think my hon. friend is ingenious enough to invent any argument that has not already been used by the companies as a reason why they should get a subsidy. But I will tell my hon. friend what I am doing. He will find in a report which is now in the printer's hands, and will soon be in the hands of the House, a statement with reference to every one of these subsidies. The salient terms of the contract are given, the capacity of the vessel, its speed, tonnage, etc. Then, there is the gross amount of what it carries in passengers, mails and freight. Next year this report will contain not only the gross amount of freight carried each way, but an analysis of the principal grades carried, so that there will be an opportunity of judging not only whether or not we are carrying a certain amount of dead weight, but what is the quality of the merchandise that is going and coming—whether it is all timber all agricultural produce, all manufactured goods, or, if not, what proportion and quantity of each. I have also come to the conclusion to insert in all the contracts that are made this year a clause asking the company to present a full account of its expenses and of its receipts, so that we shall be able to find out just about what is the outgo and the income; and when we arrive at a certain point, we shall be able to say to the company: Your passenger traffic has increased and your freight traffic has increased, your expenses have been so much, and your receipts have been so much, you have been able to pay a certain dividend, or you have not. In that way I think we shall get down to a better basis upon which we can adjust the subsidy to each case in hand. There will always be cases where there will be a necessity for communication but where

there is no possibility, within a short period at least, of a paying trade.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Will that statement be a solemn declaration or one made on oath?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I think we may assume that we shall get at the rights of the case. If we find that the accounts are not given properly, we will take measures to get them, because that is a condition of these companies getting subsidies. But I prefer to go on the assumption that the steamship companies with which we make these contracts will give us a fair statement of their returns.

Steam service or services between Canada and Newfoundland, $18,000.

Mr. MACDONALD. Before Christmas I mentioned to the hon. minister a proposal which had been made for a daily service. I understand that the new boat for this line has come out, and that the trade between Canada and Newfoundland is rapidly increasing. I hope the minister has given favourable consideration to the proposition to assist in extending this service so as to secure a daily service between North Sydney and Port aux Basques.

Mr. EDWARDS. How frequent is it now?

Mr. MACDONALD. Three times a week. A short time ago I was informed that the freight at North Sydney accumulates to such an extent that the Intercolonial Railway has been compelled to refuse freight for shipment at certain seasons of the year because of the impossibility of moving it fast enough by the present tri-weekly service.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). There is a continual growth in the trade. Last year there were carried 6,765 first-class passengers, 11,178 second-class passengers, 15,538 tons of freight, and 1,635 head of stock, with a very large quantity of mail, and if you take that trade in conjunction with the previous three years there is a gratifying increase. The company had the misfortune to lose their vessel. They have their new boat out now, I think, but I am not sure if she is on the service. However, the supplementary estimates are yet to come down, and before that takes place the matter will be considered. I may say that so far as I am concerned, I am very sympathetic with that trade and that route, and I think we ought not to be over parsimonious in forwarding the interests of that line of communication all that we possibly can.

Mr. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. McKENZIE. I am very glad indeed that the hon. member for Pictou has directed the attention of the minister to this service. I am particularly concerned in the matter because this service has its terminus on the Canadian side in my own town. I am pleased to be able to tell the minister that the 'New Bruce,' as she is called, left the other side a few weeks ago and has made her trip direct into the port of North Sydney. There are several pleasing features about this service. We are glad to get a very excellent boat on this route. It is now making regular trips backward and forward between Port aux Basques and North Sydney. Another thing that has been proven is, that this boat has been able at the hardest period of the winter, about the last of February, to make her way through the ice from Newfoundland to North Sydney. Thus we have the certainty of another outlet from Canada to Newfoundland, and from Newfoundland across to this side. In this connection I would like to ask the minister how much was paid for this service last year.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Last year about $9,000.

Mr. McKENZIE. I notice that the minister has $18,000 in the estimates this year. Is it the intention to give that amount to the company provided they put on another boat ?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The $18,000 is available for a daily service. The present tri-weekly service, if I am not mistaken, is to be made a daily service. In Newfoundland there is to be a daily service by train, so that a very great improvement is looked for both by Newfoundland and by ourselves in the communications this year.

Steam service between Canada and South Africa, $146,000.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I may say with reference to this item, that the development of trade between Canada and South Africa has been very satisfactory. For a long service it probably has been the most satisfactory we have had, and the trade shows signs of constant improvement.

Mr. MACDONALD. Where do the vessels sail from ?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The contract requires sailings from Montreal, calling at Quebec and at any other Canadian ports during the summer, and from St. John and Halifax in the winter. Last year there were twelve voyages. The number of passengers carried is not many by that route. There were carried 26 passengers, 31,385 tons of freight and 37,800 tons in measurement. There were carried besides, a considerable quantity of live stock, and I will say for the Elder-Dempster people that they show a very commendable ac-

tivity in canvassing freight throughout Canada for that service. They issue a weekly letter, and send their men out, and they are actively at work getting freight.

Mr. SINCLAIR. What is the character of the goods carried?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). That I cannot tell exactly, except from having simply seen some of the invoices. However, the character of the goods is very varied. Quite a large quantity of flour is taken, also implements and largely general manufactures. In another year I hope to have a thorough tabulation of these goods.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Have you only one commercial agent in South Africa?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). We have only one agent there.

Mr. LEMIEUX. At Durban?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Yes, he is at Durban. It appears from the statistics that Durban is by far the largest port.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The finest too.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It is by far the largest port, and it strikes more at the centre of the country as well.

Steam service between Halifax and Newfoundland via Cape Breton ports, $4,000.

Mr. McKENZIE. At what ports in Cape Breton did this boat call last year?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). A lot of ports. The vessel starts from Halifax and goes to the west coast of Newfoundland. It calls at St. Peters, Grand Narrows, Baddeck, North Sydney, South Sydney, Ingonish, Neil's Harbour, and Aspey bay in Cape Breton; and also St. Paul's Island, Bay St. George, Codroy, Bay of Islands and Bonne bay.

Mr. McKENZIE. The vessel makes a round trip calling at the same ports each way?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The same ports each way.

Mr. McKENZIE. How frequent is the service?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto.) The vessel made fifteen round trips last year, and carried 180 passengers, 8,558 tons of freight, and some mail.

Mr. McKENZIE. The passenger list may not be very large, but I may say in support of the service that it is a very useful one in the interests of the fishermen at these different ports of call.

Mr. EDWARDS. I understood the member for Pictou to say that the only service between Cape Breton and Newfoundland was a tri-weekly one. It seems to me that there are other services which would appear to be independent of the one to which he refers.

Mr. MACDONALD. The service from Canada to Newfoundland runs between the Dominion and the colony from the nearest possible points. It is a passenger line of communication. The service between Halifax and Newfoundland, via Cape Breton ports, starts from Halifax and runs through, I think, the Bras d'Or lakes and round the coast of Cape Breton.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Through the Bras d'Or lakes.

Mr. MACDONALD. The service goes to some of the outports of Newfoundland.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). On the west coast.

Mr. MACDONALD. The service covering Halifax, St. John's, Newfoundland and Liverpool, I think, is a service run in conjunction with the Newfoundland government, and affords communication between the other side and Newfoundland.

Steam service between Halifax, St. John's, Newfoundland, and Liverpool, $20,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I am informed that that is simply a freight service, carrying no passengers, but chiefly deals, competing in this trade with the tramp ships. I never could understand why a line should be subsidized to carry deals to the west coast of England, for that is a commodity that is in the market all the time and should be left to open competition. That subsidy has been on the list for many years, and I have never been able to get a satisfactory explanation of it.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I do not know that I can give my hon. friend much more information than he has. The contract is with the Furness-Withy Company. The subsidy is an old stager—I remember it away back. I see one good thing about it—they have to carry trade commissioners over and back free. Last year they made twenty-five round trips; not many passengers—16 in, 48 out, total 64; freight 114,357 tons weight.

Mr. HAZEN. Is it shown how much of that is deals?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). No; I was explaining before my hon. friend (Mr. Hazen) came in that we will have a tabulation of the different kinds of freight so that we may know what business is doing.

Mr. MACDONALD. They made a lot of money carrying apples.

Mr. SINCLAIR. They have been charging very high rates, I understand. I think the minister should look into that and see if he could not reduce the rates on apples from Nova Scotia to England. I am told that the rates ruling last autumn were something like 90 cents from the Annapolis valley to Liverpool or London. That is a very lucrative business for a ship. I know very many ship owners who would like to have the carrying of these apples at 50 cents a barrel. A small part of the rate charged, I understand, goes to the railway. There may have been changes in that rate on account of the Canadian Pacific railway coming in. If we are going to subsidize a vessel to carry apples, I think we should have some control over the rates.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I suppose the apple growers would like to have the rates as low as possible, but what they are more troubled about is that the apples do not get there in a sufficiently short space of time—the rate of going is not quick enough to take the apples to market in the best condition. A delegation of the apple growers came to see me, and we had a talk over the matter. I am going to try, if possible, to get a little quicker transit.

Mr. MACDONALD. How long do they take to go across?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). They run at 11 knots—perhaps not quite that. I think the growers want to get the apples there in about six days.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Do not these contracts provide that the government shall have control over the rates?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Yes, most of these large contracts. But there are difficulties in that which have always been faced, but never met. It is a pretty difficult thing for the minister sitting in his office to say what the freight rates should be. The freight rates go up and they go down. I think it would be an advantage to have some board or authority on freight rates to assist the minister to come to a conclusion as to what are really equitable rates. In some of the contracts it is provided that they shall not charge more than is charged by vessels from New York to the ports to which they trade. That forms a basis of comparison that is apparent. But when a complaint comes to the minister that they are charging too much on apples or on cheese, the knowledge or the arts of the steamship company generally get away with the minister, and he feels that he is not quite big enough to pass judgment on the point. There has been a large increase in freight rates recently. Charters have gone up and vessels are in great demand. All freight carrying steamers have increased their rates.

We have had protests against that from shippers. But when you go to the steamship companies showing an increase in rates all over, it makes it difficult to say that there shall not be an increase in rates even by a subsidized steamer. The argument on the other side is that a subsidy is given for the purpose of making the rates a little lower than would be the case by an unsubsidized vessel and there is a good deal in that argument. But in order to find a solution of the difficulty I hope to get some authoritative adviser who will make it his business to look after these things, and who will be able to advise the department as to what is right, and I hope to have that in the course of the next year.

Mr. McKENZIE. The minister has stated that this is a very old service and I am sure it would be the desire of the minister to make this service as useful as possible. Conditions in eastern Nova Scotia have changed a good deal since the commencement of this service. The minister knows that now, in eastern Nova Scotia, we have a large population who have come over from the other side of the water within the last nine or ten years. There is a large passenger traffic now to and from the old country and eastern Nova Scotia which was entirely unknown fifteen or twenty years ago. There would also be some freight traffic such as the exportation of canned lobsters dried fish and that sort of thing, which would go direct to the old country if there was opportunity. I think the minister could easily make this boat call at the terminus of the Intercolonial at North Sydney, or some other point on Sydney harbour, and give the large number of people at that place who go across to the old country and return, and people who may wish to come directly to the steel and coal works at North Sydney, an opportunity of reaching that point directly by this service. At present these people have to come up via Montreal, and sometimes from New York, at a much larger expense and more inconvenience. I hope the minister will give this matter some consideration.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I will look into it.

Steam service from the opening to the closing of navigation in 1912 between the mainland and the Magdalen Islands, $15,000.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The contract ends in 1913. The service starts from the town of Pictou.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I received a letter from the Halifax Board of Trade which unfortunately I have not before me. I have no doubt that the minister has seen a copy of the letter. It urges that this service should start from the port of Hali-

fax. It seems to me that Halifax would be the proper port from which to make this service start. A great deal of the business done with the Magdalen Islands originates at the port of Halifax, and it merely means starting from Halifax and calling at Pictou.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The matter has already been taken into consideration so far as the contract having been awarded is now running and I do not propose to break the contract. If my hon. friend will take the map and will look at the Magdalen Islands, he will conclude that there is no better point than Pictou from which to start this communication. It is on the line of the Intercolonial railway, and it is the nearest possible point to the Magdalen Islands from anything like a large port.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). If the frequency of the service demands a shorter distance between the point of departure and the Magdalen Islands, there would be some force in the statement of the minister. But what is the service?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It does not run in the winter time. But in the summer season it made 61 trips, carrying 1,416 passengers, 6,173 tons of freight and 1,269 head of live stock, hops, sheep, cattle, etc., and mail bags galore. So far as I know, it is a well conducted service.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I have no doubt about that. But I say that inasmuch as the service is but twice a week, there seems to be no reason why the steamer should not start from the port of Halifax, because that is the port that does the business with the Magdalen Islands. I do not understand the Halifax Board of Trade to urge that the steamer should not call at Pictou; I can quite understand that that would create some prejudice in that old historic port. But I say that this service might well start from Halifax and serve the Magdalen Islands two trips per week. It would not hurt, in the slightest degree, the port of Pictou or any other port. Of course, it might be that the steamer would require some additional subsidy.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I was wondering while my hon. friend was speaking, what would have happened to-night in the last five minutes if the fortunes of war had kept my hon. friend at Lunenburg instead of sending him to Halifax.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I am looking after the interests of my constituents.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, P. E. I.) It would be simply impossible for this boat to make two trips a week between Halifax and the Magdalen Islands. The whole six days of the week are taken up now in making the two trips from Pictou. The steamer has to call at several places on the way to the Magdalen Islands, and I think it takes her five days and a half to make the two trips. The suggestion of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) is simply impossible.

Mr. MACDONALD. I am afraid my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean) has not been properly briefed. His information on the subject is very scanty and entirely inaccurate.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). He is new to his constituency as yet.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend from Kings, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Hughes) has very effectually disposed of the suggestion he has made. I could summon as a witness my hon. friend the ex-Postmaster General, who represented the Magdalen Islands for a number of years, and who can testify as to the excellent service and the splendid character of the boat, and the fact that under the existing contract a better service is being rendered than has been rendered for the last 40 years. There has never been any suggestion from the Magdalen Islands that this service should start from Halifax. Whether it is that because the constituency is represented by the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) and by my very able friend here (Mr. Maclean), Halifax has got so ambitious that it wants to get all the steamship subsidies, I do not know, but there does not appear to be any other possible reason why they should have asked for this.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The desire of the inhabitants of the islands is that the service should be between Pictou, Prince Edward Island and the Magdalen Islands twice a week, but probably the islanders would like to have the service with Halifax because there are several months in the year when the service is closed. The service between Pictou and the Magdalen Islands is in operation only during the summer months, the fall and the spring. But, it is quite possible, during the winter, to send one or two government steamers or ice-breakers, from Halifax.

Mr. MACDONALD. Or Sydney.

Mr. LEMIEUX. From Halifax or Sydney to the Magdalen Islands.

Mr. HAZEN. We did that this year.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes. I congratulate my hon. friend upon having done that.

Mr. HAZEN. A most successful voyage.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I congratulate my hon. friend upon that. I tried during several years to have that done, but we were always told by the captains that they could not reach the islands in the winter time.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). There is a different government in power.

Mr. LEMIEUX. By what steamer was the service performed?

Mr. HAZEN. My recollection is that the 'Stanley' made one trip and that it was a most successful trip. We are going to have another voyage before the season closes.

Mr. LEMIEUX. In that case I would ask the hon. gentleman to suppress that political marconigram which is sent every week now that, through the good offices of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, communication has been established.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Now that you have the marconigram you might take away the other service.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, I prefer the service.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I would like to give the minister notice that before the next estimates are prepared I shall be better informed as to the claims of the port of Halifax and if provision is not asked for in connection with this service I shall ask for a new one altogether.

Steam service between Mahone bay and Tancook island, $1,000.

Mr. KYTE. I would like to call the attention of the minister to a petition that I forwarded to him a few days ago asking for a small subsidy for a steamship service between the ports of Arichat and Canso. These ports were served some years ago by one steamship company. The service was from Canso to Arichat and Port Mulgrave. But a few years ago the service was separated and one boat was put on between Canso and Mulgrave and another between Arichat and Mulgrave. In that way the service between these two important ports became disconnected. I would be very glad if the minister would give his attention to this matter before preparing the supplementary estimates and I would hope that he would see his way clear to putting $1,000 in the estimates this year for this service. Another request has been forwarded to the department in connection with the steamship service between Halifax, Petit de Grat, d'Escouse and River Bourgeois, all ports on the island of Cape Breton. These are important places, they have no communication by railway, they have no means of shipping the products of their industry to Halifax or elsewhere. I would urge that the minister would be good enough to also give attention to that request and endeavour, if possible, to provide a small subsidy of $2,000 for this service during the coming year.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I will be very glad to give these matters attention.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I have been asked by the people of Canso to press that matter upon the minister's attention and I would like him to give his best consideration to this proposed service between Arichat and Canso.

Steamship service from the opening to the closing of navigation in 1912, between Port Mulgrave, St. Peter's, Irish Cove and Marble Mountain and other ports on the Bras d'Or lakes, $6,000.

Mr. McKENZIE. The steamship performing this service is giving a good service to that part of the country. I think this service should be confined entirely to ports in the Bras d'Or lakes. It is a sea run of about seventy miles from the canal to the head of navigation in East bay, and the boat will have all she can do without going to Mulgrave at all. I submit to the minister that it is not desirable to be giving subsidies to steamships where they are in competition with railways. There is a railway from the canal at St. Peter's connecting with the Intercolonial railway at Point Tupper and any passengers or freight or anything else that the steamer 'Richmond' would bring to St. Peter's could be put on the railway there and carried to their destination. This boat is running from the canal to Mulgrave in competition with the Intercolonial railway and Cape Breton railway from Point Tupper to St. Peter's and in that way giving a service to a section of country which, I am sure, does not really require it, whereas such ports as Big Pond, the head of East bay and several other places in the Bras d'Or lakes, are in need of this service. Passengers and goods could be carried from these ports to meet the railway at the Grand Narrows. The boat should be kept here altogether without going up to Mulgrave, where there is no real necessity for it. I wish to direct the attention of the minister to this matter because I want him to apply the subsidy where he will get the best work done and where he will not be in competition with railways.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto.) There is a large family of children here that I find under my care. Some of them cropped up a good while ago and I know their faces, while there are others that are entirely new to me. This one deserves some consideration. This boat made 204 round trips and she carried on an average nine passengers per trip and two and a quarter tons of freight. The $6,000 subsidy, if we calculated it on the basis of the freight that was carried, would put us in the

position of paying $12 for every ton of freight that was moved. She has either to go somewhere else and get some more freight or else we are paying, seemingly, a very large amount for a service that does not appear to have very much in it. If it were growing it would not be so bad, but it does not seem to be growing. I think there is something in what my hon. friend says that we are trying to run against a couple of railways and we are getting the bad end of it.

Mr. KYTE. The service of the steamer 'Richmond' outside of the Bras d'Or lake is for the accommodation largely of the important communities of Marble mountain and West bay in the Bras d'Or lake, and d'Escouse, Poulamond and Lennox in the Lennox passage.

At Marble Mountain the Dominion Coal Company have extensive works, and from that point they ship dolamite which is used in the manufacture of iron and steel. The railway between Point Tupper and St. Peter's is unfortunately owned by a private corporation. Now, a car of flour, ordered by a merchant at Marble Mountain, passes over the Intercolonial to Mulgrave, is shipped on the Cape Breton railway to St. Peter's and from St. Peter's it has to be transported by steamer to Marble Mountain. That would mean that three rates would have to be paid by the merchant at Marble Mountain on a carload of flour from Ontario. The service has been maintained two days a week from Bras D'Or lake to Port Mulgrave for the purpose of taking passengers from these points not touched by a railway and also for carrying freight which is shipped by the Intercolonial railway to Mulgrave. This service enables the people there to get a very much cheaper rate than if they were obliged to pay the Intercolonial railway, the Cape Breton railway, and then the freight rate on the boat.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Inverness). I corroborate what has been said by my hon. friend (Mr. Kyte) with regard to this service. Marble Mountain is sixteen miles from the railway, and this is actually the only service the people there have. If this boat does not connect with Port Mulgrave, the people of Marble Mountain will not be able to get to the railway unless they drive fifteen or sixteen miles over a mountain. West Bay is in the same position except that it is closer to the Intercolonial railway than Marble Mountain. I would be very sorry, indeed, if the service were changed because these people living there would be set back to the condition they were in fifty years ago.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I did not say I was going to change the service this year, but I said it would bear looking into. I think that in some of these services there is a duplication and in some cases a triplication, and while I do not propose to disturb them very much this year, it is worth keeping tab on them to see whether a redisposition could not be made which would give a better service and perhaps not cost us as much.

Mr. McKENZIE. If the Cape Breton Railway Company which runs thirty miles of a road from Point Tupper to St. Peter were worth its salt, it would run its line down to the waters of the Bras D'Or lake on the canal, which is only about a quarter of a mile from the end of its line now. Then the traffic from North Mountain and all these points would simply be run down to the end of the line, and thus all this duplication would be done away with. As the railway is located now it is a little piece from the water, and the freight has to be carried from the head of the canal to the terminus of this railway. It shows a tremendous lack of enterprise on the part of that company that they do not connect with the Bras D'Or lakes, and put themselves into a condition to receive the freight. Then an arrangement could be made with the Intercolonial railway and the freight would run right into the ports on the Bras D'Or lakes, and thus avoid the difficulty we now have to contend with.

Mr. KYTE. I would remind the minister that the difficulty which my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) seems to have with respect to the connection there, will be altogether avoided the moment the present government carries out the policy of acquiring the branch line railways. Then, I will be willing that the service outside the Bras D'Or lakes shall be discontinued.

Steam service from the opening to the closing of navigation in 1912, between Pictou and Cheticamp, $2,000.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). Could the minister give us some information with regard to this service?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). This steamship line carried 227 passengers, making twenty-six and a half round trips; 1,173 tons of freight by weight, and 310 tons by measurement.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). Is it the intention that this boat will call at the ports of Arisaig, Georgeville, Ballantyne's Cove and Morristown, during the coming season. These ports intervene between Pictou and Cheticamp, and I understand that the steamer 'Electra' which gave the service, only called occasionally at those ports, or whenever it suited the captain. The people along that shore had a grievance inasmuch as the service was very irregular and when they remonstrated they were told that the boat was receiving no

subsidy for calling at points in Antigonish county and therefore they could not expect any improvement in that respect. Last year, an arrangement was made that the boat should call at these points and be paid an extra subsidy. In some way or other which is not necessary to explain just now the amount was not provided for in the estimates, and the arrangement was made with the captain that if he undertook to perform the service, as soon as the money could be obtained he would be paid. A service was then given which was fairly satisfactory. I had communication with the minister on the matter last year. I wish to ask the present Minister of Trade and Commerce if it is the intention to carry on that service next year. The points on the route that I have mentioned are distant from the railway on an average of twenty miles. Arisaig is about eighteen miles from the Intercolonial railway, Ballantyne's Cove twenty-five miles, and Morristown seventeen miles from the Intercolonial railway. In the spring and fall, when the roads are in bad condition, the people get their supplies in from Pictou by this steamer, and the service is the only convenience they have in that respect. I hope the minister will look into that matter.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The service will be continued between the two terminal points, and all the accommodation that can be given will be given. I have not been able to go into the matter thoroughly yet.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). I wish to know whether the extra subsidy was paid last year.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It was not paid; there was no contract.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). Was there not an offer on the part of the department that if the service were performed it would be paid for?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). If the department although I was not the minister, made a bona fide offer that they would be paid in so far as they carried out the service, they will be paid. I do not intend to go back on the arrangement if I find that it was bona fide made by the minister.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Inverness). Is it the intention of the department to continue the service this year as usual between Mulgrave and Cheticamp ?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I am not prepared to say that it will be continued just as usual. The service will be continued, but this is one of the cases in which I am looking to see whether it is not possible to avoid a triplication of services, and get just as good or perhaps a better service. Anyway, it will not be any worse.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Inverness). This is a very important item to my constituency, particularly to the north end of the county, where we have not any railways as yet, though we hope to have one in a short time. If a change is going to be made in the line, as I am told is the intention, I am afraid the service will not be improved. I think it is the intention to have one boat do the service from Pictou to Mulgrave and from Mulgrave to Cheticamp, calling at certain ports on the way, and going back to Mulgrave, making the trip twice a week. This to my mind is impossible, if we are to have a satisfactory service. I hope the minister will look into this matter carefully. If he makes a contract with some company that pretends to be able to do this, and is not able, it will be a serious thing for our people, who depend on this service as their only means of communication. I admit that there has been some duplication of the service, but I confess that I do not know of any other solution than the continuation of the service as it is. If a better or even as good a service can be had, I shall be satisfied, but I would be sorry if our people suffered from not having as good a service.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). We will try to avoid that.

Steam service between Prince Edward Island and Cape Breton and Newfoundland, $12,000.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Inverness). Last summer or the summer before last, an application was made by the people of North Inverness to have this boat call at Cheticamp in order to help along the cattle trade. The government or the company sent down an officer to determine whether there was water enough in the eastern harbour to permit the boat to call, and I think the report was that there was a scarcity of water. I understand that some dredging is to be done there quite early in the coming summer, so that it will then be possible for this boat to call. I think the company were willing that the boat should call if there was enough water.

Steam service between Quebec and Gaspé Basin, touching at intermediate ports, $8,500.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I would like to relieve the anxiety of the contractors for this service, who are Quebec gentlemen, Bouchard brothers. They have spent a considerable amount in getting the proper vessel to ply between these various ports, and they have been very good to the public. When I was the member for the county, they used to send me 25 or 30 passes for poor people.

Therefore I want to retaliate in their favour and ask the hon. gentleman to renew the contract with them. They are a little afraid that the new member for Gaspé might influence the hon. gentleman against them; but I hope he is too good-hearted to listen to such advice.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). My hon. friend took good care to tie the matter up before he went out, because the contract runs to 1913.

Steam service between St. John and Halifax, $10,000.

Mr. JAMESON. I would like to direct the attention of the minister to the fact, that it is very desirable to have the steamship operated in connection with this service, call at Westport and Freeport, en route for St. John. This will not take the vessel out of her way, and as the subsidy paid, is a very substantial one, it seems to me, there should be a call made at these ports. There is now a service between Westport and St. John, but it is maintained by a comparatively small boat. The trade of the communities at which this boat calls, has increased of late years, and the service now is not sufficient to meet their demands. I was approached, when in Halifax, recently, by some gentlemen who were interested in the operation of this service, and told that they could call at these ports, if they received an increase of $1,000 in the subsidy. I am not prepared to say that any such increase would be warranted, but I do not think it would take the vessel out of its way to call there. I trust that the minister in making any contract with these gentlemen will see his way clear to provide that such a call be made. The business of Westport and Freeport is suffering somewhat for lack of sufficient service. They are altogether out of touch with railways, and the only means of communication is by steamship. I had a letter the other day from a gentleman who is carrying on a very extensive fishing business, and he told me that because of the insufficient steamship service, the business of his firm had been prejudiced. The people of Westport and Freeport are very anxious indeed that this boat should call, and I cannot urge this matter too strongly upon the minister.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I doubt very much whether it would be fair to ask the persons who now have the contract, to extend the service without some compensation being granted. I doubt, in fact, if they would be allowed, even with extra payment, to call at Freeport and Westport, because I do not think they could properly perform the service they are now under contract for, namely a weekly service between St. John and Halifax, and call at so many intermediate points.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). As a matter of fact, the contractors are not performing a weekly service. The contract was for 52 trips, but I found that the contract was given them for 40 trips. I do not quite know why that was done. It may have been done from the representation that they found it impossible, from their point of view, to make 52 trips for the subsidy that was offered, and that a compromise was effected, by giving them the contract for 40 trips by the same route. I have not sufficient information on the point, and I do not know quite whether I ought to fix this contract on the same basis as last year or not. I have not looked into the matter sufficiently to tell. However, we can come back to this vote, as we are allowing one item to stand, and I would look into the subject a little more. With reference to the call at Freeport, looking at the map, one would think it was on a direct course, but you cannot always tell that by a mere reference to the map. If it were not to take the vessel off its course —that is, make her voyage longer—it would seem to me, that the contractors might take up the idea of calling at that port, as I am informed, there is good water and good landing. I will say to my hon. friend (Mr. Jameson) that I will take the matter up with the contractors and see whether or not this can be done.

Steamship service between St. John and Halifax or either, and the West Indies and South America, $79,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is there anything new in regard to the West Indies?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). No, there is nothing new. To be frank with the committee, the position of matters is just about this——

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I suppose you will discuss the matter with the delegates from the West Indies?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Yes. They will be here about the last of the month, and we will take up with them the steamship service, as well as other matters. At present I would not like to make any change either by dropping the vote or otherwise.

Steam service between Sydney and Wycocomagh, $3,000.

Mr. McKENZIE. The minister will find from various petitions and other communications on file in his department, that for many years I have been struggling to have this subsidy increased. The stretch of water from Sydney to Wycocomagh, with which, perhaps, the minister is acquainted, is served entirely by this boat, the steamer 'Marion.' There is no railroad touching places at all on either side of

the lake, and this boat moves on a very zig-zag route, crossing from side to side, and serving the people highly satisfactory in so far as any one boat can do it. The subsidy she receives, I think the minister will find, is small in proportion to the service she renders that very large tract of country which contains a very large population. I was trying before the present minister assumed charge of the department, to obtain a subsidy of $4,000 a year for this service. Petitions and communications on file would show that, and I really hope that upon ascertaining the service which this vessel has been rendering, the minister will see his way clear to give that necessary and desirable increase.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). When did my hon. friend enter the House?

Mr. McKENZIE. My first coming here was in 1904.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). My hon. friend says he has been struggling and has not accomplished anything.

Mr. McKENZIE. Not very much.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I see that in 1907, eighty round trips were made and a subsidy of $1,000 was paid. In 1909, 85 trips were made, and the subsidy paid was $2,000. That is 100 per cent increase in the subsidy. In 1911, 78 trips were made and $3,000 was paid in subsidy. Now my hon. friend has been exerting himself and yet did not know that he had accomplished so much in raising the subsidy.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The minister ought to go one better.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I think there is this to be taken into account—that a steamship company ought to consider it a privilege to carry on operations in such a beautiful part of the country. This vessel has had a substantial business in freight and passengers, and I find that business has been all the time increasing in both respects, which is very satisfactory. Last year the vessel carried 6,051 passengers, 1,690 tons of freight, and 4,738 head of live stock, which was a very good increase over preceding years. I am tender-hearted in a way and I will look into the matter and see what can be done.

Mr. McKENZIE. A subsidy of $1,000 was hardly worth mentioning in connection with such a service, and the goal of our ambition was that we should get the subsidy for that very excellent service increased to $4,000, when we intended to stop worrying the department any further. I hope that $4,000 will be given.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). If my hon. friend makes a threat of worrying too much he may get the $4,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR. If the minister will permit me I would like to return to the item for the service between Guysborough and Mulgrave. This is a daily service starting from the town of Guysborough every morning and connecting with the train at Mulgrave. In the summer time this vessel carries the mails.

In the winter the mails are carried by coach. This boat calls at Queensport on the way to Mulgrave every morning. But on the return trip, it takes her out of her course a few miles to call at Queensport, and she has been accustomed to make the trip direct. Queensport is the centre for a number of small places. Passengers for Queensport or any of these places are now taken to Guysborough, and remain there all night, going back to Queensport the following morning. Objection is taken by the town of Guysborough, because they want a direct trip from Mulgrave to Guysborough. I took the view that where there were passengers from Mulgrave to Queensport or any place reached from Queensport, the steamer should go the few miles out of her way necessary to land these passengers. Last year instructions to that effect were given to the captain, I believe. It was represented there were not passengers every day, and the compromise I suggested was that when there were passengers, the ship should call at Queensport; if not she should make her direct course to Guysborough. I would like the minister to look into that matter, and see if this can be arranged.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I have some complaint from Guysborough.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I would like to give notice that when we go into Supply on some occasion when the minister can listen to me, I intend to discuss the question of the Canada-France steamship line, and our trade relations with France.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I hope my hon. friend keeps Easter in view. Condense it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes. Always keeping Easter in view, may I ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce to press some of his colleagues to lay on the table the returns that were asked for long ago. I refer especially to the Postmaster General.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Will that make Easter come quicker?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto), moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What business will be taken up on Monday?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The third reading of the Grain Bill, and other government Bills.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Which Bills?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). There are two third readings, the Grain Bill, and the Bill to amend the Civil Service Act. The Bill for the Aid and Encouragement of Agriculture stands for second reading, and also the Civil Service Bill relating to the post office. These two Bills will be taken up as well. After that probably estimates.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.22 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 11, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

COURTENAY BAY HARBOUR WORKS.

Mr. EMMERSON. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works if the contracts for the harbour works at Courtenay bay have been signed.

Mr. MONK. They have not been signed yet, but they are being prepared for signature.

ST. JOHN VALLEY RAILWAY.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would like to ask the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Railways and Canals, whether the contract with regard to the St. John Valley railway has been signed ?

Right Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister). The Minister of Railways and Canals was asked that question a few days ago. He said it had been signed by one of the parties, and not by the other, as far as I remember.

THE NORTHWEST MOUNTED POLICE.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether or not it has been decided by the government to increase the pay of the Northwest Mounted Police ?

Mr. BORDEN. Yes, the necessary order in council has been passed for that purpose.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That order will be brought down immediately, I suppose.

Mr. FOSTER (N. Toronto).

Mr. BORDEN. It will be brought down at once.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska). I desire to ask the hon. Postmaster General when I may expect the various returns from his department which were ordered by the House at my request. One of these orders was made on the 22nd of January. As I intend to discuss the matter referred to in these papers before the session closes, I would be very glad if the minister would see that the papers are brought down.

Mr. PELLETIER. I will take a note of the question of my hon. friend. I may say that there are so many papers asked for that the department——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. So many dismissals.

Mr. PELLETIER. No, there are not many papers asking for dismissals, but there are many on other matters.

THE GRAIN ACT.

Mr. KNOWLES. I wish to ask a question of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and in order to do so I will read the following telegram from the secretary of the Grain Growers' Association of Saskatchewan.

Moosejaw, Sask., March 9, 1912.

W. E. Knowles, M.P., Ottawa.

Whilst fullest discussion was afforded before Senate committee last year, farmers are fearful that through the influence of elevator and transportation companies at Ottawa farmers' friends will be handicapped and their interests sacrificed. Our association is ready to send delegation if in your opinion their cause may be assisted.

FRED. W. GREEN,
Secretary, Saskatchewan G.G.A.,
Moosejaw.

I wish to ask the hon. minister whether he will give me an assurance or an intimation that the progress of the Grain Bill will be delayed for a sufficient length of time to give the Saskatchewan Grain Growers' Association an opportunity to send this delegation here. I should think it could be here by the end of this week. I understand that the Bill has now been waiting for a week, and I submit that the matter is of sufficient urgency that it might be further delayed till they arrive. I hope the hon. minister can give me that intimation so that I may answer this telegram.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I think my hon. friend may rest assured that the interest of the farmers is perfectly safe in the hands of the Minister of Trade and Commerce and of the government.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The farmers do not think so.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The farmers do not all think one way. There are a great many farmers in the Northwest, and I fear that comparatively few of them have been represented here. However, I think it is not necessary to delay the passage of the Grain Bill through this House. If these or any other gentlemen wish to come here, they will have an opportunity of conferring with me or with the leader of the Upper House or with their friends, and if anything is put before the department or the government which they consider to be vital in the matter, a change could be made in the Bill in the Senate just as well as in the House. I would not like at this stage of the session to delay the third reading of the Bill in this House.

PRIVATE BILLS.

QUEEN'S COLLEGE AT KINGSTON.

House in committee on Bill (No. 68) respecting the Queen's College at Kingston, and to change its name to Queen's University at Kingston.—Mr. Nickle.

Mr. NICKLE. The last time the Bill was before the Committee of the Whole the hon. member for the St. Lawrence Division, Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike), moved that the committee now rise, and said:

I do not wish to kill the Bill, but I have endeavoured on three occasions to get the opinion of the Justice Department on this question. My hon. friend from Kingston states that the Private Bills Committee has had that opinion. I am not a member of that committee, and I think we are entitled to have that opinion laid on the table of this House. There are some clauses in the Bill that we have pleaded with the promoters to leave out, because they are insulting to a large number of people. As long as clause 20 remains in the Bill, I will take every chance to defeat it. I stated to the promotor of the Bill that if that clause were struck out, I would not raise the question of jurisdiction.

From the utterances of the hon. gentleman, it is perfectly clear that he admits the general principle of the Bill, but finds fault with certain of its clauses. Under these circumstances, it seems radically unfair that he should place before the House a motion that the committee now rise, the effect of which would be that the Bill would be killed so far as this House is concerned. Perhaps it would be only fair, as the personnel of the committee to-day is not exactly the same as that of ten days' ago, that I should outline briefly the history of this legislation and the position of its promoters with regard to it. As I stated on a previous occasion, Queen's University was incorporated in 1841 by royal charter, and the preamble is as follows:

Whereas the establishment of a college within the province of Upper Canada, in North America, in connection with the Church of Scotland, for the education of youth in the principles of the Christian religion; and for their instruction in the various branches of science and literature, would greatly conduce to the welfare of our said province.

Provision is made in the charter that the university shall be managed by 27 trustees, 15 of whom shall be laymen in full connection with the church of Scotland, and 12 shall be ministers of the Presbyterian church, the Principal of the university to be a minister of the Presbyterian church. On the occasion of the union of the Free church with the old church of Scotland in Canada, legislation was sought in the Ontario legislature and also in this parliament, with the result that the control of the university was then vested in 27 trustees, who were given authority to elect their successors when a vacancy occurred on the board.

The whole spirit of Queen's from its inception has been against religious intolerance. It was founded as a protest against the restriction of King's College, Toronto, now Toronto university, where a student was bound to take a test oath before he could have the advantage of that institution. At no time has Queen's required a student to take a test oath. In 1902 the late Rev. G. M. Grant, then Principal of the university, had before the General Assembly of Canada, a measure for the cutting away from Queen's of her Presbyterian control, and in 1903 a Bill was introduced in parliament to that effect. Unfortunately the reverend gentleman died shortly after the Bill was introduced, and from 1903 until 1911 nothing was done in regard to the subject. However in 1911 the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in Canada consented to the university becoming separated from the Presbyterian church, but laid down as a condition precedent to that separation, that the distinctively Christian character of the university should be maintained, and at that time appointed two committees, one of which was to co-operate with the trustees of the university in securing legislation, the other to watch the interests of the theological faculty. In the Bill of 1903, as presented by the late Principal Grant, clause No. 26 was identical with clause 20 as it appears in the present Bill, but in the Bill of 1910, as originally drafted by the trustees, the words:

—save the profession of Christianity.

as they now appear in clause 20 of the present Bill, were omitted. When the two committees of the Presbyterian church and the committee of the university came together to confer on the terms of this Bill,

those who had the responsibility of protecting the rights of the Theological Faculty of the Presbyterian church objected to clause 20 standing as it was then drawn, and insisted that the words, 'save the profession of Christianity,' be introduced. The Presbyterian church, as I outlined a moment ago, gave consent to this separation on certain terms, and, bowing to the judgment of the Theological Committee of the Presbyterian church, the trustees and the co-operating committee of the church agreed to these words being reinstated, and it is in that way that the words now appear in the Bill. Perhaps it is only fair that I should place before the House my views on this question, because the Bill, as I have already pointed out, is private legislation. It is not a Bill for which I am primarily responsible. The Bill that I introduced in this House relates to an institution that is domiciled in Kingston. I might say that my personal views are that the incorporation of the words 'save the profession of Christianity,' is a mistake from the point of view of the university and from the point of view of the church. It is a mistake because, in my judgment, it will cut off the university from taking advantage of the intellect of certain of the Jewish people who display great aptitude in matters, legal, literary, and scientific. It will be a stumbling block in the way of the university when application is made to the government of Ontario for assistance, because the government may then feel justified in saying: 'You are not national in spirit because your restrictions exclude from your trustee board and professional chairs, certain representative Canadian citizens. I think also it is a retrograde movement, because is puts restrictions on Queen's that are not now there, and furthermore, I doubt if the movement is one in the right direction. But, Sir, there is another question that I have to consider, and it is one that has caused me great worry and anxiety. The question is this: How far am I justified in setting up my views as against the views contained in this Bill, which represent the wisdom of the Presbyterian church and the wisdom of the trustee board of Queen's university? The only ground on which I would be justified as a member of parliament, in voting against this Bill, is that within its four corners are inconsistencies and improprieties from a national point of view. I have listened to the arguments advanced by my hon. friend from St. Lawrence (Mr. Bickerdike), and of those whom he contends he primarily represents, and I have been struck with the fact that only on one ground can he hope to succeed in having either clause 3 or clause 20 amended or altered in any way. If I interpret correctly the argument of the member for St. Lawrence, it is that there is an inconsistency in having in the Bill clauses 3 and 20. If the members of the House will follow me they will see that clause 3 of Bill (No. 68) reads as follows:

> The management and discipline of the university shall be in every respect freed from all denominational restrictions, and it shall be national and non-denominational in its character and management;

Clause 20 is to the following effect:

> The university shall continue distinctively Christian, but no religious test or qualification save the profession of Christianity shall be required of or appointed for any officer, trustee, member of council, or official of the university. Laymen shall be eligible to any position therein.

The argument of the hon. member for St. Lawrence is that there is an inconsistency in the Bill in saying that a university shall be national, and at the same time saying that it shall be distinctly Christian. The promoters of this Bill answer those objections by referring to cases decided in the courts in England and in Ontario. In the case of the Crown versus Milburn, which is reported in the Law Reports, Exchequer Court Cases, 1867, volume 2, page 230 (234) Baron Kelly enunciated the doctrine that 'Christianity is part and parcel of the law of the land.'

They also draw my attention to a case that was decided in Ontario, in 1879, Pringle versus Napanee, in which the Divisional Court held that Christianity in general and not simply the tenets of a particular sect is part of the recognized law of the province.

In Shirley's Leading Cases, fifth edition, at page 155 to 158, the same principle is enunciated: that Christianity is part of the common law of England. The argument might be advanced that while Christianity was part of the law of England, yet parliament with plenary jurisdiction could vary in any way the desire to enact a law of this sort. But then the promoters of the Bill estop me still further by drawing my attention to 'Hansard' of 1896, page 5623, in which the late Minister of Justice spoke as follows when the Lord's Day Act was before this House for discussion:

> The general scope of this Bill is indicated by its title, an Act respecting the Lord's Day, an Act intended to secure the better observance of the Christian Sunday, throughout the whole of Canada. Christianity, I need scarcely say, is recognized as constituting part of the law of Canada, as it is of the law of the British Empire, and statutes declaring certain things to be offences because they profane the sanctity of the Chritian Sabbath have been frequent upon the statute books of the imperial parliament and of this parliament and of its predecessors.

As a member of parliament, in the face of such decisions and of the statements of the late Minister of Justice is it correct to say that Christianity is not a part of the law of this land, and that a Bill is inconsistent which states in one clause that a university shall be National and in another that it shall be distinctly Christian? After giving the matter the most careful consideration that I have been able, I have come to the conclusion that there is nothing necessarily inharmonious in this Bill. To say that a university is National and to say that a university is distinctly Christian, is practically saying legally one and the same thing, but in different terms. I might say for the enlightenment of my hon. friend (Mr. Bickerdike) that when this clause was drafted it was never thought for one moment that it would be offensive to the Hebrew citizens of this country.

Queen's is at all times willing to open her doors to men of other faiths, and I trust the time will never come when Queen's will feel that she need shut her doors in the face of any man who comes seeking for instruction. This university was founded by the Presbyterian Church and has been endowed with Presbyterian money; and it would seem that these people are within the sphere of their right when they ask this parliament to ratify legislation that widens the scope of her operations. Some people might object that a clear severance should be made between education and the state; and, I think, when they try to put on the term 'National' as used a narrow meaning, and say that because the university is declared to be a National university, therefore it becomes the ward, so to speak of the state, they do not give to the word its true and direct meaning. The idea that the trustees had in the use of that word was that 'National' meant that Queen's is a free institution to which every student could freely come, that it was geographically National; and, while certain restrictions were put on the staff, and on the trustee board, she was National in this, that she offered free opportunity to those who seek an education, who desire to take advantage of the opportunities she possesses. And I think that when my hon. friend from St. Lawrence, Montreal, (Mr. Bickerdike), considers the matter he will see the propriety of allowing the preamble of this Bill to pass, and that we should discuss in committee the modifications he desires, when it may be possible, that some solution of a very vexed question may be reached. It would be radically unfair that because certain terms are objectionable to him, and to those whom he purports to represent the whole Bill should be killed. The principle of the Bill was settled on its second reading, and it is not unfair to ask that the committee pass the preamble, and proceed to the consideration of the various clauses.

On section 3,

3. The management and discipline of the university shall be in every respect freed from all denominational restrictions, and it shall be national and undenominational in its character and management.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the excuses given by my hon. friend (Mr. Nickle), for being the champion of the persecutors of the Jews to-day, and I am sorry he did not make a better hand at it. I am pleased to see the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), in his place, because I intend to raise again the question of jurisdiction. The Bill came before this House, and had its first and second reading with clause 2 in it stating 'the university is hereby declared to be a work for the general advantage of Canada.' But at the request of the promoters of the Bill, that clause was withdrawn so that the Bill no longer stands as declaring the university to be for the general advantage of Canada. Well, if it is not for the general advantage of Canada, this becomes merely an educational Bill; and I would ask on what ground this parliament of Canada is asked to deal with it. I submit respectfully that this Bill should be referred to the Department of Justice, as there is a question of doubt, and a very grave doubt, whether this House has jurisdiction to deal with it or not. The very fact that the Ontario authorities sent a representative to the committee to enter a protest against this House taking up this Bill, against our usurping their jurisdiction in educational matters, is surely a reason why we should pause before going on with this measure. Though the clause has been eliminated declaring it a work for the general advantage of Canada, yet we have section 3 declaring that the university shall be 'National and undenominational.'

If it is undenominational, then section 20 is a direct contradiction. As to the question of jurisdiction, a man does not need to be a lawyer to understand the British North America Act on this subject. That Act states distinctly and defines exactly what this parliament can do, and what the legislatures of the provinces can do. This House has no more constitutional right to deal with an educational matter than the legislatures of Ontario or Quebec would have to grant a bank charter. So, I move that we do not proceed further with the consideration of the Bill, but that the Bill be referred to the Department of Justice to get their opinion as to whether we have or have not jurisdiction.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The motion is not in order in that form. I think the hon. member (Mr. Bickerdike) had better move to report progress.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Yes, the suggestion is that progress should be reported for the purpose of referring the matter to the Department of Justice. I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. DOHERTY. I think the hon. member for St. Lawrence (Mr. Bickerdike) labours, to some extent at all events, under a misapprehension, when he sets forth the view that the proper method of determining whether this Bill is constitutional or not, and whether this House should proceed to deal with it or not on the question of its constitutionality, is to refer the matter to the Department of Justice—as I understand him, for decision. I understand that the Minister of Justice and the Department of Justice are not the advisers of this House. As I understand it, the Minister of Justice is the adviser of the Crown and the different departments of government; but I do not understand that it is part of his functions to advise this House, still less do I understand that he has any privilege, or prerogative, or power, to decide for this House whether or no it shall proceed to pass certain legislation upon the consideration of its constitutionality. I think the question of constitutionality of a particular piece of legislation submitted to this House is to be determined by the House like any other question that arises in connection with the proposed measure. And yet, while all that is perfectly true in my judgment, I, of course, am quite willing to put myself at the service of any member of this House who thinks my opinion upon a question may be useful to him; but I wish to point out that any opinion I express would be only the opinion of a member of this House, and would be entitled to such weight only as might properly belong to my personal opinion.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. We will abide by it.

Mr. DOHERTY. It is true, the private Bills committee did send this Bill to the department, submitting to it this question of constitutionality, and one of the officers of the department did wait upon the committee and express to them, in the first place, the view I have just set forth, that it was not, perhaps, the proper function of the department to advise the committee, but, nevertheless the department, like its head, was at the service of this House or of any committee of this House that might consider that its opinion could be useful. Now, with regard to the question of the constitutionality of legislation concerning education, and more particularly concerning this particular educational corporation, I think it is well that we should bear in mind that we are not approaching a perfectly new question. We should have present to our minds the fact that this House has already three times assumed jurisdiction over this particular corporation, and acted on the assumption that it had jurisdiction to enact legislation with regard to this university. Now that creates a situation where, no doubt, things have been done in virtue of that legislation, very possibly, and very probably rights have been acquired under that legislation. I think that in that condition of affairs it behoves us to be very careful indeed before we undertake to pronounce, as we would impliedly pronounce by rejecting this legislation purely on the ground that we have no constitutional power to deal with the matter, that the previous legislation was unconstitutional. As I have said, that legislation has been enacted and rights have been created under it, and that being true, I think we must recognize that it is much more proper that the question of the constitutionality of that legislation should be left to be determined by the courts, than that we should take it upon ourselves, by saying now that on this new legislation we have no jurisdiction whatever, practically to declare that the previous legislation was unconstitutional.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. But I would call the attention of the minister to the fact that legislation similar to that of Bill (No. 68) has never been before this House; the three times that he refers to were on an entirely different Bill. Bill (No. 69) at present is the theological Bill. Bill (No. 68) is purely an educational Bill, a Bill the like of which has never been before this House.

Mr. DOHERTY. But the hon. gentleman does not deny that there has been before this House legislation with respect to Queen's College at Kingston.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. That was the theological college.

Mr. DOHERTY. Whether it was or was not, the purpose of this Bill is to modify that particular corporation, that is the corporation concerning which we are asked to legislate. I think the fact itself that parliament has already assumed jurisdiction with regard to this corporation to legislate on three different occasions, is sufficient reason why this House should deal with the Bill upon its merits, and determine whether or not, looking at it from the point of the merits or demerits of its provisions, they should pass it or not. After all, it is private legislation, and the parties promoting this Bill are those who will run the greatest and most serious risks if it should be passed and be subsequently determined to be unconstitutional. I think it is fair

for us to assume that they have been advised upon that question. That being so, if it be my proper function to advise this House, as far as any member may be disposed to ask for my advice, I would suggest that the Bill be allowed to pass upon a consideration of its merits or demerits, without regard to the constitutional question. I may say that the same matter was brought up in connection with the legislation of 1889 and on that occasion Sir John Thompson, I think, expressed substantially the view that I have now submitted upon the question of the constitutionality of the legislation. I do not think it would be proper for this House to go back to the position as it stood before that legislation, and undertake now to treat the question of our jurisdiction over this situation just as if that legislation had never taken place. That being so, I think it would be unfair that we should put on record an opinion that might even throw doubt upon the validity of the legislation which has been enacted in the past. For my part, I would be disposed to think that the proper line of action for this House to take would be to deal with the Bill upon its merits, and I would not at all accept the position, if it were thrown upon me, of expressing an opinion which in any sense this House should accept as decisive in determining this question under the present circumstances.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Under the circumstances, I will withdraw my motion, I always take the advice of the Minister of Justice in this House, on whichever side of the House he may be sitting. I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Justice to clause 3. I think he will agree with me this time that that clause is in contradiction with clause 20.

Mr. DOHERTY. I do not see that there is any question of law involved in section 3. I think it is a section that any layman is just as competent to deal with as a lawyer; therefore, I do not see that there is any reason why the Minister of Justice should be called upon to express an opinion. But if I were to express an opinion, I would say, speaking only for myself, I think that it is very undesirable that we should attach the name 'National' to any institution that is going to be governed, controlled and directed by any private individuals, or any corporation of the nature of this one. Without going into the consideration of the question whether there be or be not anything inconsistent in the terms of section 3 with those of section 20, I think the word 'National' as applied to an institution of this kind is very undesirable, because the word 'National' is susceptible of more than one meaning. The word 'National' may properly be attributed to an institution of any kind that was under the control and direction of the nation, or an institution which the nation chose to select and dignify, and set forth as its conception of what a national institution ought to be.

I do not want to say a word derogatory to this very great institution and to the great work it has done and is doing, and of course we must all join in approval of its aspirations to give to that work in the future a National character in the sense of making of it an institution open to the whole nation and conducted from the point of view of conducing most effectively to the spread of education throughout the whole nation. But while I feel that way about it, I do not think we should by an Act of parliament attach this designation of 'National' to the institution. I quite understand that the promoters of the Bill do not intend to have that designation attached to it as conveying any idea of connection between the institution and the nation, and I fully sympathize with their desire to affirm that their purpose is to carry on an institution which shall enure to the benefit of the whole nation, and to carry it on upon lines that will make it acceptable to the whole nation. But that is the sentiment that inspired those who control all of our great educational bodies; there are other great universities in this country whose motive and desire is to prove these institutions of National use and benefit, and I am sure the gentlemen of Queen's themselves would admit this desire to be quite as sincere as their own. That being so, if we enact in this parliament a declaration that this university shall be National in its character, then there is no reason why we should not enact the same thing for every one of these universities, and if this epithet or description is to be common to all universities it ceases to have any distinguishing meaning at all. Thus no matter how anxious we may be to recognize this desire of Queen's University to be so described at least from the point of view of being an institution desirous of doing good work for the nation, I sympathize with the suggestion of the hon. member for St. Lawrence (Mr. Bickerdike) that the word 'National' should not appear in this description of the university or of its proposed character and management as set forth in clause 3.

Mr. NICKLE. What would you use?

Mr. DOHERTY. I think we require nothing beyond what is in the clause:

The management and discipline of the university shall be in every respect freed from all denominational restrictions.

Mr. NICKLE. As I understand the difficulty lies here. Under the charter the university was particularly and peculiarly limited to the provinces of Ontario and

Quebec, Upper and Lower Canada. The promoters wish to incorporate in the Bill some expression that will clearly convey to the people of Canada that that restriction has been deleted and that the university is now as wide as the bounds of Canada.

Mr. DOHERTY. Is it contemplated that the operations of the university should be carried on in more than one province?

Mr. NICKLE. At present it draws students from every province in Canada and in fact from all over the world. The idea they want to impress on the people is that the university has ceased to be provincial in respect to Upper and Lower Canada and has taken on itself a wider and more significant prospect.

Mr. EMMERSON. If I understood the Minister of Justice his idea is that all of this section after the word 'restrictions' should be omitted. That would appear to me to be more correct legislation. Admitted that this parliament has power to deal with this Bill in common with the rights of the local legislature, it would be wiser if such legislation were referred to the provincial legislatures. I do not quite understand the purport of this Bill. I have got an impression from some source that this legislation has in view a participation in a fund established by a philanthropist the restrictions of which are that no educational institution controlled by any denomination shall participate in the benefit of that fund. It may be that this particular Bill has no relation to that fund, but I know that some universities in Canada have sought to free themselves from denominational influences with a view to securing the monetary advantages which would accrue by reason of such freedom. It would be improper for us to continue in this Bill the words 'and it shall be National and undenominational in its character and management' if we intend at the same time to enact section 20, which clearly and unequivocally places a religious test upon all those who seek admittance.

Mr. NICKLE. The test is applied solely to the management and there is no test in regard to those who seek admittance as students and there never has been from 1841 down to to-day. The test is on the controlling body.

Mr. EMMERSON. Therefore, it is not undenominational. The moment you require such a test with respect to any officer, professor or president, it ceases to be undenominational.

Mr. NICKLE. Oh, no.

Mr. EMMERSON. I submit that would be the logical result.

Mr. NICKLE. I was very careful to look that up. The word 'denominational' refers to the divisions within the Christian church itself and Queen's is nondenominational in this, that it in no way prevents any person who professes Christianity taking advantage of it. But it is not non-racial; it would prevent a Buddhist or a Japanese. It certainly does place restriction on a number of people. The word 'denominational' refers only to divisions within the Christian Church.

Mr. EMMERSON. Section 20 clearly narrows and restricts the terms of section 3. Let us look at the Bill from a broad standpoint. This is a private corporation, religious in a sense, and it has control and management within itself, and they can make any one an officer or a professor. Why should the parliament of Canada be called upon to require that there shall be a religious test with respect to any such officer or professor. It seems to me to be an invidious declaration and one not in harmony with the declaration of the third section of the Bill, and certainly not in harmony with the National aspirations of the university. I am heartily in accord with the remarks of the Minister of Justice and of the hon. member for St. Lawrence Division, Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike). It seems to me the third section should be amended by striking out all the words after the word 'restriction,' and that subsequently when we deal, with section 20 we should eliminate all religious tests with respect to the officers or professors. If we give that power to the managing board we enable them to narrow the character of the faculty, and to make it entirely inconsistent with the aims and aspirations set out in the preceding sections of the Bill.

Sections 3 and 20 allowed to stand.

On section 22,

Mr. NICKLE. This Bill has been before the law clerk since it passed the Private Bills Committee and he suggested the following amendment as more clearly carrying out the intention of the Bill. I move that section 22 be amended by striking out the first two lines thereof and the following be substituted therefor:

In order to provide for the maintenance of Queen's Theological College, the university shall form an incorporation of said college, and upon its being declared to be a successor of the faculty of theology of Queen's College at Kingston, pay to the said college.

Mr. EMMERSON. That amendment brings up the question with respect to Bill (No. 69) on the order paper. Whatever reason may be advanced in support of Bill (No. 68) because of previous legislation, no such reason can be given with respect to

Bill (No. 69). It seems to me that Bill (No. 69) is clearly within the jurisdiction of the provincial legislature and while, as a matter of expediency, this parliament may be willing to set aside its usual procedure, it should not, without very grave reasons, interfere with the jurisdiction of the provincial legislature in such a matter.

I have opposed the legislation on general principles, with a view to having correct legislation, and with a view to this parliament not interfering in any way with the jurisdiction of the provincial legislatures. I think you can range over the whole history of the legislation of this character, and you will not find any university or college established in any of the provinces except under the authority of a provincial Act. To seize upon this particular institution, and take it out from all the rest seems to me to be a strange procedure, and I think that as members of this committee we are entitled to have advanced very strong reasons for such a course.

Mr. BORDEN. It seems to me that whatever consideration applies to the present Bill would apply to the other. Parliament has already legislated twice with regard to this institution, and I suppose that those who are coming to us now for legislation might very well say that inasmuch as that legislation has not been questioned from the time it was enacted by this parliament up to the present, they are justified in coming to us for legislation which manifestly does alter the status of the university as established by two previous Acts of this parliament. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice has submitted considerations on account of which he considers that we are justified in proceeding with this legislation, and it seems to me we shall be equally entitled to deal with the other measure in the same way.

Section agreed to.

On section 3,

Mr. BICKERDIKE. With a view to meeting the views of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice and the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle), I would suggest that sections 3 and 20 stand over in order that we may try to agree on something that will not be offensive or insulting to any of the minorities in this country and will at the same time carry out the wishes of the university.

Mr. NICKLE. Would my hon. friend be satisfied to strike out the following words:

And it shall be National and non-denominational in its character and management.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I would much prefer to have the word 'National' struck out and leave the word 'non-denominational' in.

Mr. NICKLE. The clause would then read as follows:

The management and discipline of the university shall be in every respect free from denominational restrictions.

Would that meet the hon. member's approval?

Mr. BICKERDIKE. It will satisfy me as far as section 3 is concerned.

Mr. NICKLE. Will it satisfy you in toto?

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I might say, Mr. Chairman, it does not satisfy the hon. member from Kingston.

Mr. NICKLE. I have tried to make myself perfectly clear to the House and to the hon. gentleman. I have told him that clause 20 did not meet with my approval—

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Then withdraw it.

Mr. NICKLE. The hon. gentleman terms me a persecutor of the Jews. I want to again make my position perfectly clear, I am not in favour of that test clause.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Strike it out then.

Mr. NICKLE. The hon. gentleman says strike it out. This is Private Bill legislation, which has the ratification of the Presbyterian church and Queen's university, Kingston, and I have no more right to strike that provision out, or to change even a comma, than I have to change the constitution of Canada.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I want to correct the hon. gentleman. When he states this legislation has the endorsation of the Presbyterian church, he is going a little too far. It has nothing of the kind.

Mr. NICKLE. This Bill has been endorsed by three committees. First, a committee of Queen's university; second a cooperating committee of the Presbyterian church, nominated by the Moderator at the general assembly held either at Halifax or Ottawa, I forget which; and third, a committee nominated by the Moderator, with the concurrence and sanction of the General Assembly of the church to look after the interests of the Theological Faculty. The Chairman of the first church committee is Dr. Ramsay, of Ottawa. The chairman of the university committee, is Mr. D. B. McLennan, of Cornwall, and the name of the chairman of the third committee, is Dr. Love, of Quebec. These committees were duly appointed, they have placed this Bill in my hands, and they tell me that as member for Kingston, I cannot vary it one jot or tittle. I have told this House, and I have told the

member for St. Lawrence (Mr. Bickerdike) in private conversation, that I do not believe in test oaths. I believe the effect of this Bill will be that the scamp may have access to the professoriate of Queen's university, and the scholar may be excluded. I believe the man who has no principle may say he is a Christian, while the man of integrity, who may happen to be a Jew, will say, that even for the sake of the professorial chair, he will not abandon his religious convictions. When the men who have drafted this Bill tell me that I cannot change one jot or one tittle, I say it is unfair for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bickerdike) to brand me as a persecutor of the Jews. The Jews of my own constituency know where I stand in this matter. It is not a question of politics, it is a big question which touches Canada from one end to the other, and which the Presbyterian church feels, touches her to the very foundation. The men who control the destinies of the Presbyterian church maintain that Christianity is the foundation of the common law of this country, and if the issue has been raised, they, as the representatives of that church, insist that that great principle be maintained, that Christianity is part of the common law of Canada, part of the common law of England, and they rely on the enunciation of that principle by the late Minister of Justice. What right have I as a commoner of this House, and as a young lawyer without power and without reputation, to set my judgment up as against the judgment of men who sit on the Bench in England and who occupy the Woolsack in Canada, and have represented this Canada of ours as Ministers of Justice in former parliaments? Why should I be branded as a persecutor of the Jews because I take this stand? It is not fair politics and I resent it. I do not want to read the member for St. Lawrence a lecture, but we have heard enough about the east as against the west, about Roman Catholic as against Protestant. Are we going to set Jew against Gentile in this country by striking at the very foundation of the Christianity we revere?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall clause 3 be adopted?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto.) I move that the section be amended by dropping all the words after the word 'restrictions.'

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think notice should be given of such an amendment.

Mr. SHARPE (North Ontario). When this Bill was being considered in the Private Bills Committee, as has been so very ably and lucidly pointed out by the member for Kingston, representatives of the different bodies composing the Presbyterian church, appeared before that committee and presented this measure as the basis of their agreement. In other words the present Bill represents the conclusions come to by the various bodies in the Presbyterian church, and one of the statements made by them was rather than have the measure changed they would prefer to have it withdrawn. Looking at it in that light to my mind it seems a small matter to not allow this institution to be called National and undenominational. Its operations will extend from the Atlantic to the Pacific by the way of extension lectures; it draws its students from the various provinces; and what harm is there in calling it a National institution, I think it would be in the nature of a breach of trust on the part of this parliament to change the provisions of the Bill in any vital way. I hope the Bill will pass in the way in which it has been presented by the representatives of the Presbyterian church. The Presbyterian church and its members are handing over this private property to the nation as a National asset. Why then should we do anything to diminish the rights and privileges which they possess? I do not think we have any right when they are giving that National asset to this country to vary the terms upon which these interests had agreed in the past. In other words it would be a breach of agreement as between these various parties if we vary or change in any way the restrictions and rights which the Bill provides for, and therefore I hope that the Bill will be passed in the condition in which it now is.

Mr. BORDEN. I move that we proceed to clause 20.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I cannot agree to clause 3 standing unless clause 20 stands also. Both clauses should stand together, seeing that one is a direct contradiction of the other. If these two clauses are allowed to stand we may get a section drafted that will be satisfactory both to the persecuted and to the persecutors. I throw out that suggestion to my good friend the Minister of Justice.

Mr. NICKLE. Where is the contradiction between clause 3, as amended, and clause 20?

Mr. BICKERDIKE. You say it is not amended, and that it stands.

Mr. BORDEN. It cannot be amended without notice.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Then assuming that clause 3 stands, clause 20 should stand as well. I still entertain the hope that the Minister of Justice will draft some clause that will satisfy the Jews as well as the university authorities.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Does not the hon. gentleman think that if clause 3 were amended by striking out everything after the word 'restrictions,' the ground of objection to clause 20 disappears?

Mr. BICKERDIKE. No, I think still that clause 20 should be amended.

I think that section 20 should be amended. The amending of section 3 does not have the same effect. Even with section 3 amended, there should be an amendment in section 20, unless you wish——

Mr. BORDEN. What amendment is suggested in section 20?

Mr. BICKERDIKE. To strike out the words 'save the profession of Christianity.' The section would then read:

The university shall continue distinctively Christian, but no religious test or qualification shall be required of or appointed for any officer, trustee, member of council, or official of the university. Laymen shall be eligible to any position therein.

I think that the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle), would probably agree to that.

Mr. DOHERTY. I could quite understand the objection to these words in section 20, if we had left section 3 to stand as it was. But now that section 3 has been amended, it simply comes down to a question of whether parliament shall incorporate a Christian university.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. You are legalizing a test.

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes. But, if our Hebrew friends came to us and asked for the incorporation of a Hebrew university, desiring to keep the teaching in their own hands, surely we would not refuse so long as the corporation called itself what it distinctively was. I have had the pleasure of hearing the observations of many of our Hebrew friends upon this Bill, and, unless I entirely misapprehend them, they do not object to this institution making a profession of that kind, provided it is clearly and distinctly a Christian institution, and is not given the title 'National' or 'undenominational.' I am, perhaps, as anxious to meet the desires of these gentlemen as is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bickerdike), and that is what I understand them to desire.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Perhaps I am taking up too much time, but I want to point out that you are making a law that will not allow this university to employ a Jew in any capacity, even as a janitor. Why pass a law declaring that the great Queen's University shall be debarred from employing a Hebrew in any capacity?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). If the university wants it that way, what is the objection?

Mr. NICKLE. Let me tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bickerdike) this: You are a Presbyterian; so am I. The committee of your church say to the university: We have a string around your waist, and we will not cut the string and free you, unless you agree to certain conditions. The university must agree to the conditions. I have told the House frankly that the university as such did not want these words, but that the church, which is the master of the situation, says that unless these words go in you cannot be free. And the university wants freedom.

Mr. BICKERDIKE.—Then, I say, take out the words. I will not be dictated to even by the Presbyterian church.

Mr. STEELE. Not many minutes ago the hon. member for St. Lawrence (Mr. Bickerdike) stated that notwithstanding this Bill was arranged jointly by three committees one of which was selected by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church, it did not represent the Presbyterian church. Yet we have the suggestion that he and two or three of this House should get together and amend this Bill and arrange it to suit their ideas, upon the basis, I assume, that they represent the Presbyterian church.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I would draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) does not represent the Presbyterian church.

Mr. STEELE. I believe that the expressions of the Minister of Justice represent the opinion of the Presbyterian church much closer than do those of the hon. member for St. Lawrence. I think we should consider this Bill as a far more important matter than the promotion of the political interests of any hon. member of this House, and that this Bill, which is made not with a view to furthering a political purpose, should not be treated by any member in that way. This is a Bill brought in at the request of the Presbyterian church to deal with one of the great educational institutions of this country. And whether we leave in the word 'National' or not, every Canadian must admit that the great Queen's University is national in its scope, its efforts and the work it is doing. We may ask that the word 'National' be deleted, but we cannot delete the sentiment which prevails regarding this university. We cannot destroy the National influence which the university is having in Canada. We must not forget that this university, ever since its incorporation has been under the control of the Presbyterian church; and if the church is willing at this time to broaden it and to have its charter amended

in such a way as to remove it from the direct influence of the Presbyterian church, I think we should readily assent, on the ground that the Presbyterian church has some right to say on what terms the university shall be handed over to an independent body.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. What does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Steele) mean by saying 'remove it from the direct influence of the Presbyterian Church'?

Mr. STEELE. It has been under the direct control of the Presbyterian Church; it has been a Presbyterian body——

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Where is it going now?

Mr. STEELE. It is now being put in the hands of a body that is undenominational.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. In which no church will have control?

Mr. STEELE. No one church. A vote was taken of the graduates of this university, and out of 1,562 voting on the question, 1,430 voted in favour of the change. And on the strength of that vote this broad Bill is brought in. I say we must not forget that, that church has had, in the past, full control of it. They are willing that it should be handed over to an undenominational body to be controlled in the future. But because they are willing to do that, I do not know that we should demand that the church should assent to all reference to Christianity being cut out of the Bill.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Will the hon. gentleman excuse me a moment? Is it not the intention to make this an entirely state institution?

Mr. STEELE. No. It is the intention of the church, I have no doubt, simply to carry out the practice in the past, that the intention is that the students attending the university shall be under Christian influences, that there shall be no professor of the university who is not a professed Christian. It is simply the desire of the church that the university shall uphold the great Christian religion, and that it shall not get into the hands of those who are opponents of the Christian religion. The university has been supported largely by the members of the Presbyterian church; they have endowed it in the past; and I think it is a very slight request that they make when they ask that the university shall continue distinctively Christian and that every teacher in it shall be a professor of Christianity.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I hope my suggestion will be adopted in the spirit in which it has been offered, otherwise I should strongly oppose the adoption of section 20. My hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Nickle) the other day quoted largely from Sir John Thompson, a man whose memory we all respect. But the hon. gentleman forgot to say that Sir John Thompson was the man who declared that wherever minorities were found they should be treated not only justly but generously. Now, I ask him if it is just or generous to some half a million good, loyal inhabitants of this country, loyal to the Union Jack, to pass section 20 of this Bill, which is an insult to them, and specially to single them out as unworthy to enjoy equal rights with their fellow citizens in Canada. And here we are asked to legalize that insult. I hope this House will never agree to adopt section 20. We should be very careful in this country how we deal with minorities. Although these men are Jews, they have souls just as well as my hon. friend who has just taken his seat, and why should we single them out for unfair treatment? Why, even a negro, much to his credit, can be a professor in Queen's College, while a Jew cannot. A Jew cannot even be a janitor, cannot even be an employee in that institution; and here you are asking us to pass a law that for all time to come will exclude Jews from Queen's University. A Jew may be one of the best educated men in this country, he may have all the qualifications requisite to make an excellent professor, and yet you impose upon him here a test that he cannot take. England, at a former time, made just such unjust distinctions against Jews. My hon. friend has the evidence by him, and he knows that three universities combined to strike out those religious tests. I think that the secret of England's greatness is the fact that she has always dealt justly and generously by minorities. Is Canada going to do any less? Why should Canada pass a law shutting Jews out from any university in this country? Why should Canada pass a law that would prevent a Jew even from sweeping the streets in front of this university? I think it is an outrage, and on reflection I do not think this House will consent to it. I acquiesced in the opinion of the Minister of Justice on the constitutional question, because he was the Minister of Justice, and believed he was right, although I think he was wrong. I have always taken the ground that educational matters belong exclusively to provincial jurisdiction. Why should this Bill undertake to say that we have jurisdiction here under the British North America Act? I think I have heard my good friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) argue several times that educational matters belong specially to the jurisdiction of provincial legislatures. For my part, I am strongly opposed to section 20,

and I move in amendment to strike out these words 'save the profession of Christianity.' I want to strike out this religious test, and I appeal to hon. members of this House to assist me. The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) suggested that a man who wants to become a professor could easily profess the doctrine of Christianity; he said that some men might do so, but he did not think the Jews would, I suppose he meant that they could not. What harm will it do to strike out these words, which are an insult to a large number of loyal Canadians? I see no necessity for them whatever. The hon. member for Kingston himself admits that it would be right to strike them out, but he does not wish to do so because the university authorities wish them to remain in. I think, however, that we should follow our own judgment and strike out these words.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not, as a rule, agree with the hon. member for St. Lawrence Division, Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike), but on this occasion I am obliged to agree with him. It seems to me this amendment he has offered ought to be adopted by this committee. I cannot approach this matter without reminding myself that this House might properly be called Cæsar's court. We have no business, as I understand our constitution, to make any distinction between one man and another on the ground of his religion. We are called upon in parliament to legislate only for the welfare of loyal British subjects, and I cannot understand why we should indirectly insult a man who is a good, loyal British subject, as this Bill would do without this amendment. On the other hand, I cannot understand why we should put a premium upon any man joining the Christian religion. I do not think Christianity would be served by exercising any such compulsory powers. This is coercion, and this House ought not to exercise coercion on anybody, no matter to what church or sect he may belong, so long as he is a loyal subject to King George. We are here asked to give sanction to this legislation. We must do it either because the institution is denominational or because it is national. If this is a denominational institution, which has certain rights as such, that is one thing; but to say here that we are going to exclude by Act of parliament, or to sanction the exclusion of certain people from this university because they are not Christians, it seems to me is striking a blow at their citizenship which we ought not to do. Let me remind this House that an atheist, who is further removed from Christianity than a Jew, is perfectly competent to sit in this House, he is just as competent to exercise the franchise as a Christian or anybody else. He has all rights co-equal with any one of us, whether we are Jews or Christians. Why, Sir, under our constitution the Prime Minister of this country might be an atheist, and competent to advise His Excellency on all matters, and an atheist is even further removed from Christianity than a Jew. We cannot forget that a former Prime Minister of Great Britain Benjamin Disraeli, who became Lord Beaconsfield, was a Jew. I personally feel that I ought not to give a silent vote on this matter or allow the measure to pass without some such amendment as that moved by the hon. member (Mr. Bickerdike). To properly represent my constituency I must declare for full rights of citizenship for every one without putting any impediment in the way of any citizen, without any attempt to restrict his liberties either by persuasion or coercion in any legislation and I cannot vote that any institution wanting state legislation should be allowed to pick or choose between Jew and Christian.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). The last speaker (Mr. Lancaster) and also the hon. member for St. Lawrence (Mr. Bickerdike) are apparently arguing on the assumption that this is public legislation; on the contrary it is private legislation, asked by private individuals. I agree with the hon. member for Lincoln that we should not place a bann upon any one by any public legislation, but we have here certain private individuals asking us to pass an Act that is private legislation. They ask for this legislation which is the result of an agreement. The amendment proposed would destroy that agreement among the parties. We would be guilty of breach of faith if we accepted this amendment.

Mr. LANCASTER. Where is the difference in our function? It matters not whether it be a public or a private Bill, parliament is asked to sanction this. If we adopt it we advise His Royal Highness the Governor General to approve a certain Act of parliament and I see no difference in regard to our function between a public and a private Bill. For my part I cannot advise His Royal Highness to sanction any such Bill as this.

Mr. DEVLIN. As I shall be called upon to vote on this amendment, I do not wish to give a silent vote and shall explain briefly why I propose to support the amendment of the hon. member for St. Lawrence division (Mr. Bickerdike). I am of opinion first that this legislation should come under the provincial legislature, that section 93 of the British North America Act without doubt places educational matters under the legislatures, and that is the reason why I do not see that this

educational Act should be asked from this parliament. But there is another and a graver reason. The hon. member for St. Lawrence is perfectly right in saying that this is offering an insult to a religious sect in this country. The Jews are very, very respectable people and as was pointed out a moment ago by my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) Benjamin Disraeli, one of the ablest men in the history of Great Britain, belonged to the Jewish faith. I know from experience that McGill, one of the greatest universities in Canada, does not exclude any man of any faith from a chair in that university. I know that the Minister of Justice, who does not profess the Presbyterian faith with which McGill is very closely allied, occupied for a great many years a professor's chair in that university, in fact I had the honour to be a student of the university when the minister was giving a course of lectures. I speak in favour of the Jews being recognized in this country not from any political point of view, because, to the best of my knowledge, I have not a Jewish voter in Wright. I think if we are going to lay it down as a principle in this country that there shall be no coercion, the Presbyterians should not ask us to sanction an Act which will involve coercion of the Jews, any more than the members of any other faith should ask us to coerce, for instance, the province of Manitoba.

I hardly think it can be argued in this House, that any particular religious body can ask the Canadian parliament to establish any set rule in the educational system, we will say again, in the province of Manitoba, which would exclude either Protestants or Roman Catholics. If we are not going to recognize any established church in this country, and if the universities we charter are to be undenominational, why should not Jews, who believe in God, be recognized just as well as any other religious body? I am very sorry to have to take part in a discussion which does not concern the religious family to which I belong, but since it becomes my duty to vote on this measure, I want to say that I recognize no established church in Canada, and I cannot vote to insult a most respectable element in our community, namely the Jews.

Mr. OLIVER. I generally like to agree with my friends, but I must say that I believe a word should be said on behalf of the Presbyterian church in connection with this matter. I happen to be an adherent of that church, and I must protest most strongly against the idea that the Presbyterian church, in connection with this university, has any intention of insulting anybody or doing anything to interfere with anybody's religion. If there is one religious body in the world, against whom that charge cannot be successfully maintained, it is the Presbyterian body, for, if the Presbyterian church has ever stood for anything in this world, it is for toleration, and for education. I am absolutely unable to appreciate the view of my hon. friend (Mr. Bickerdike), when he suggests that the legislation before the House is an insult, or is intended to be an insult to any section of the people of Canada. I protest against such an assertion. There is no such intention on the face of the legislation and there is no such intention behind the legislation, in any way, shape or manner. I am not responsible for the legislation in any way, but I cannot sit silent and hear such suggestions made in this House. My understanding of the matter is that the adherents of the Presbyterian church have at stupendous cost and sacrifice to themselves established an educational institution known as Queen's University, which has done great work in the cause of education, and, if you like, in the cause of Christianity. I do not know that the time has yet come when anybody needs to apologize for his adherence to the Christian creed; at any rate I do not feel like doing so. I do not think that the Presbyterian body, or the body that is behind Queen's university, has any reason to apologise for the fact that they have established this educational institution as a Christian institution. The adherents of the Presbyterian church in Canada have, as I said, at great cost and sacrifice to themselves, built up an educational establishment, which, for some reason, they now desire to have declared undenominational. They come to this parliament for legislation, perhaps they should have gone to some other legislative body. I do not know anything about that. However, it seems to me, that if there is to be any transfer of property or of jurisdiction or of authority of any kind, surely the people at whose cost the establishment has been created and maintained, are the people to say under what conditions that transfer of authority or of jurisdiction shall be made. I say that if the Presbyterian church, having come to this parliament and asked for this legislation, this parliament does not see fit to grant the legislation as asked for, on the terms asked for, then, let parliament refuse to sanction the proposal, and let the condition remain as it is. But, as an adherent of the Presbyterian church, and having some slight interest in the welfare of that body, and the educational organizations under it, I would certainly protest against this parliament amending the proposal that has come from the owners of that property. The duty of this House is either to accept the proposal

as it is made, or to refuse it, for reasons which should be given. I understand there is some difference of opinion in the Presbyterian church itself as to the advisability of this step, but, it would be absolutely unfair to amend this legislation, without giving the Presbyterian body who applied for it, an opportunity to say whether they would agree to the amendment or not.

Mr. DEVLIN. I wish to make my position clear on this question. If this university is to continue under the Presbyterian church, I can understand that they might object to any religious denominations having the right to occupy a chair in the university, but if it is going to be undenominational, I do not think they should impose such a restriction as is here suggested. For instance, if a body of Catholics, sold a Catholic church to a body of Presbyterians, the Catholics would not have the right to put in a clause that the Methodists should be excluded from worship in that church. That is the view I take. I do not want to interfere in the domestic matters of the Presbyterian church, but if the Presbyterians are handing over this university as an undenominational institution, I say this parliament cannot sanction a clause excluding any religious sect.

Mr. OLIVER. I quite agree that if the institution is to become national, it certainly should not be in any sense sectarian, but the point I am trying to submit is that assuming the Presbyterian church to be the proprietor of this university, if they wish to have a change of status with respect to it, then let the House accord in the change asked for, or else absolutely refuse, but do not let us amend it so that the Presbyterian church, in dealing with this valuable educational institution, shall be forced by the supreme authority of this parliament, to accept legislation that the Presbyterian church does not want.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I confess that I can not see what my hon. friend (Mr. Bickerdike) finds in this Bill to insult the Jews. It has often happened that we have found it necessary to incorporate an institution connected with some particular church, and this legislation is going only a little wider and incorporating an institution connected with all the Christian churches of the country. I find on the order paper Bill No. 70, which is entitled 'An Act to Incorporate the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Keewatin,' and in that Bill it is provided that all property, real and personal, churches, schools, colleges and so on, possessed or enjoyed by the Right Rev. D. Charlebois, or the church in communion with the Church of Rome, are declared to be vested in a corporation. Well, there is no one who would take any objection to that.

Mr. DEVLIN. That is denominational.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes, but it is not an insult to the Jews, although it excludes them, and it is not an insult to the Presbyterians or the Methodists, although it excludes them also. In this Bill, respecting Queen's university, the applicants are applying for legislation that will apply to all Christian churches alike. We are not excluding anybody, but we are providing for the education of people belonging to all the Christian churches of this country, and I do not think there is any ground whatever for saying that that is an insult to anybody. The Jews do not pretend that they have put any of their money in this institution.

I have not heard that the public are going to put any money into it. The money is contributed by private individuals who are interested in education; and should it not be in the power of these people to say, we want our money devoted to Christian education—not to Jewish, pagan or any other than Christian education? I think that is a fair proposition in a free country like this, and I do not see any good reason for the attitude taken by my hon. friend from Montreal.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does my hon. friend think that we in parliament have any right to say that because a man has not in the past put money into an institution, he shall not avail himself of it to get an education, be he Jew or Christian?

Mr. NICKLE. This does not stop him.

Mr. LANCASTER. It indirectly stops him by putting a ban upon him, by making him believe that he is going where he is not wanted. I suppose I am as much wedded to the Christian religion as any other man in this House, but I consider that anyone who tries to convert a Jew by depriving him of his state rights is doing a very un-Christian thing. We have no right to put a mark against a Jew, or even an atheist, in this matter. It is not entirely a matter of the Presbyterian church. The Presbyterian church is not able to do what it wants to do without the legislation of this parliament, and it comes here and asks us to approve of what it is doing, and to give it a greater strength than it could have without that legislation; and it wants us to draw a line between the Jew and the Christian as to education. This is a place where we render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's. We have no business here to do anything towards the salvation of souls. The man who says that he is in this House for the purpose of doing the work of the churches is mistaken upon the constitution and is very nearly a hypocrite. We have no

business to attempt to affect prejudicially or otherwise the religion or non-religion of anyone who is a loyal citizen of King George. Therefore, I cannot vote for this, and I think we ought to be very careful before we establish any such precedent.

Mr. NICKLE. The hon. member for Lincoln evidently misapprehends the scope of the measure. The original charter of the university made it distinctly clear that no religious test should be required of any student who entered the walls of Queen's, vested the control of the university in 27 trustees, of whom 12 were to be ministers of the Presbyterian church and 15 laymen in full communion with such church. In 1889 and again in 1906 a widening power was obtained from this parliament, by which the graduates and the members of the council obtained the right of electing ten members to the board of trustees. The attitude of the church at the present moment is as follows: They say that the Presbyterian church through our 27 trustees have control of the university and of its funds. The church says we raised $800,000 as an endowment of that university, and we are quite willing to turn it over to the board of trustees of the university to be elected by the benefactors and the graduates. We desire that those who are going to fill the professors' chairs shall be men who profess Christianity. As I have explained to the House, I do not agree with the Presbyterian church or that branch of it which contends for this provision; but I do agree with the contention that the Presbyterian church, in handing over $800,000 and a university has a right to say into what hands that work shall be entrusted. I do not think it ever crossed the mind of the Presbyterian church or the representatives of the university that this would give offence to the Jews. If I catch correctly the spirit of the Presbyterian church, this was aimed not at the Jew, but at the agnostic and the atheist, because the Presbyterian church desires to maintain this great educational institution Christian, require those set to educate the youth of Canada to be Christians, to believe in the divinity of Christ. It is ridiculous to construe this as an insult to the Jews or to any other class of people. If the Jews came to-morrow and desired to incorporate a university confined to the adherents of their faith, I would vote for it as readily as I do for this Bill, recognizing as I do the right of all religious sects to educate their people in the faith of their fathers. The hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) will see that the word 'non-denominational' is used. That word is not as broad as 'non-sectarian.' 'Non-denominational' includes the branches of the Christian churches. 'Non-sectarian' would be inconsistent with the purpose of the Bill. Under the Bill, all branches of the Christian church are welcomed to its board, and to its professors' chairs, but only those who profess Christianity shall be entitled to occupy those positions; and, as the ex-Minister of the Interior says, why should not the Presbyterian church be allowed to give this great gift to the nation, and to widen the sphere of its influence?

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the hon. gentleman say that we are justified in being sectarian and not in being denominational?

Mr. NICKLE. I think it is within the sphere of parliament, so far as the objects are good, to incorporate any body of men to carry out a benevolent or charitable purpose, and in the carrying out of that work, it has a right to say that the members of the board of management shall be members of their own faith. That is the principle on which this legislation is founded. It is non-sectarian, it offers no insult to any person, but it says you cannot take advantage of our gifts unless you are members of our faith. I say that it is consistent on the part of the Presbyterian church, although I do not agree with the premises from which they reason.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. My hon. friend the ex-Minister of the Interior stood up very strongly for the Presbyterian church, and I was very pleased to see him get so religious all of a sudden.

Now my hon. friend from Guysborough said it was really Christianity versus something else. In my opinion that is not a correct statement. The other denominations are opposing this legislation as well as the Jews.

Mr. SHARPE (North Ontario). What denominations?

Mr. BICKERDIKE. The Baptists are opposing it. Let me read what the official organ of the Baptists says about this Bill. I am about to quote from the 'Canadian Baptist,' which is the mouthpiece of the Baptish Church of Canada. The article says:

> There was passed, without amendment, by the Private Bills Committee of the House of Commons at Ottawa, on Friday last, the Queen's College Bill, and it will now come before the House itself. Before the Private Bills Committee, a strenuous protest was made by certain Hebrew bodies, who feel that the Bill as proposed shuts them out from privileges which should be theirs as citizens of the Dominion of Canada.

I would like my hon. friend the ex-Minister of the Interior to remember that the Jews are citizens of Canada, that

they are decent people, and loyal British subjects.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like the hon. member for St. Lawrence to remember that I have suggested no idea that the people of the Jewish race are any other than he has said, and the Presbyterian body has never had any such idea in mind as he suggests, in bringing forward this legislation.

Mr. LANCASTER. Now get the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) to admit that they have rights as citizens.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Will you admit the Jews have rights as citizen?

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. gentleman's question is absolutely uncalled for, and I object entirely to the suggestion contained in his remarks.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I have not yet made any remarks on the question.

Mr. OLIVER. I object entirely to such a question. There has been no suggestion made to the House by myself, or any other member, that any person of the Jewish religion or race, is any other than the equal of any person of another race or religion, and I object to the hon. gentleman making it and coupling my name with it.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I think we will get the hon. gentleman right after a little while. Now I want to let my hon. friend know a little more as to what the Baptists say:

> And we believe that the Hebrews are in the right in their protest, and that they should be joined in their contention by Baptists and others who believe that a 'National' university foregoes the right to place a religious test on any citizen who may seek to have entrance into its halls or into its professoriate. If Queen's College, now becoming Queen's University, cuts itself loose from the bonds of denominationalism, and of its own accord beomes a National or State institution, it should be willing to shoulder any supposed disabilities, and not seek legislation that contravenes either in spirit or fact the domocratic position of separation of Church and State.

That is what the Baptists say, and I think they are men of very broad views. I do not think the Baptists would want to have any such clause enacted as the one in question as regards any of their universities. Neither is this proposed legislation in accord with Anglicanism; the Anglicans are too broad-minded to adopt such a position. I cannot say that it is even Presbyterianism, for I believe many Presbyterians in this country are opposed tc any such legislation as is here proposed.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I understand that up to this time the Presbyterian Board had had the sole directorate and management of Queen's University. Is it the hon. gentleman's argument or opinion that that has constituted an insult to the Jewish faith?

Mr. BICKERDIKE. No. Clause 20 is the one that I have in mind.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It seems to me that the amendment is of a most important nature, and under the rules notice of it must be given.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. If the Chairman says that I must give notice then clause 20 will have to stand.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Rule 112 says:

> No important amendment may be proposed to any private Bill in Committee of the Whole House, or at the third reading of the Bill, unless one day's notice of the same has been given.

Now it seems to me that this proposed amendment is quite important.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I quite agree with you, Mr. Chairman, but when you accept amendments moved by the other side, and allow them to go through, I felt I was justified in moving an amendment also.

Mr. LANCASTER. I think in all fairness that the Bill should stand in order that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bickerdike) may give notice of his amendment, as it would be very unfair under the circumstances to prevent the hon. gentleman from having a vote on that amendment. The Bill should stand and come up again to-morrow.

Mr. NICKLE. As far as I am concerned I am perfectly willing that the Bill should stand, because I do not want any snap verdict. I would rather have the hon. gentleman feel that he had received the fairest possible treatment from the committee. I willingly agree so far as I am concerned to the amendment being moved and the matter threshed out now.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. If the hon. gentleman is willing to accept the amendment I think we might get through with the Bill.

Mr. NICKLE. I consent to the amendment being moved now, but that is not exactly the hon. gentleman's construction of my statement.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I still feel that I am going against rule 112.

Mr. BORDEN. A vote can be taken on the amendment with the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Very well then, if the committee is unanimous.

Amendment (Mr. Bickerdike) negatived. Yeas 7; Nays 70.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I understand that clause 3 stands.

Mr. BORDEN. Yes, but we will take the amendment now if the hon. gentleman has no objection.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I have no objection.

Mr. OLIVER. Is this amendment in accordance with the expressed wish of the authorities who are supporting the college or university?

Mr. NICKLE. It is not in accordance with the expressed wish of those who are promoting this Bill, but it removes from the measure the sting that the Jews are singled out as not being part of the nation. If the committee passes the amendment, as seems to be its spirit now, I will write to the promoters of the Bill setting out how the matter stands, and if they object to the Bill going on in that form it will have to be withdrawn.

Section as amended agreed to.

Bill reported.

Bill (No. 69) to incorporate Queen's Theological College—(Mr. Nickle)—was considered in committee and reported as amended.

ROYAL ASSENT.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following communication from the secretary of His Royal Highness the Governor General:

Ottawa, March 11, 1912.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that the Right Hon. the Chief Justice of Canada, acting as deputy of His Royal Highness the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber on the 12th instant at four o'clock for the purpose of giving the Royal Assent to certain Bills which have passed the Senate and the House of Commons during the present session.

I have the honour, to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Signed) H. C. LOWTHER,
Lieut.-Col.
Governor General's Secretary.

To the Hon. the Speaker
of the House of Commons.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. BORDEN.

COUNTY OF MASKINONGE, ELECTION EXPENSES.

* Mr. BELLEMARE:

1. Have the election expenses of the county of Maskinonge been settled?
2. If not, will the government see to it as soon as possible?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. The election expenses for the county of Maskinonge were settled by a cheque dated the 17th of October last.
2. A certain portion of the claims for services of constables, rent of polling booths and mileage of the deputies and clerks were put in suspense, owing to the fact that the returning officer did not supply vouchers signed by the persons to whom the money was due, and apparently, appointed deputies and clerks in his own home town and sent them to distant parts of the county, when there does not appear to have been any reason why suitable persons could not have been obtained in the various polling places.

Explanations have been received from the returning officer, but as they were not accompanied by the vouchers asked for, and did not satisfactorily explain why he caused so much mileage for the deputies and clerks, no further payment has been made.

PELAGIC SEALING.

Mr. KYTE:

1. Is it the intention of the government to provide a sufficient sum during the present session to compensate those engaged in the sealing industry of British Columbia for the cessation of sealing under the recent treaty?
2. Will the government appoint a commissioner to determine the amount of compensation to be paid to each Canadian sealer, in consequence of the discontinuance of that industry, by virtue of the treaty prohibiting pelagic sealing for fifteen years?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. No. The Pelagic Sealing Treaty of July 7, 1911, provides for an advance payment of $200,000 by the United States to Great Britain on account of fur seal skins it will be entitled to under the treaty. When this money is received it may be used in such connection.
2. As the advance payment has not yet been received, the method of dealing with claims has not been decided upon.

RATES ON PARCEL POST.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

What is the rate on parcel post from Montreal to Paris, France, from Montreal to London, England, and from Montreal to Toronto, Canada?

Mr. PELLETIER:

(a) The rate on outgoing parcels, via England to France has been, is now, and will continue to be at so much per pound, the rates being: 1 lb. 40c., 2 lb. 48c., 3 lb. 56c., 4 lb. 74c., 5 lb. 82c., 6 lb. 90c., 7 lb. 98c., 8 lb. $1.16, 9 lb. $1.24, 10 lb. $1.32, 11 lb. $1.40.

Under the new arrangement the rates will be very much reduced, being: 1 lb. 18c., 2 lb. 26c., 3 lb. 34c, 4 lb. 42c., 5 lb. 50c., 6 lb. 58c., 7 lb. 66c., 8 lb. 74c., 9 lb. 82c., 10 lb. 90c., 11 lb. 98c.

The convention for the direct service has been signed by both Canada and France, and will go into operation as soon as the French office has made its final arrangements.

(b) The rate on outgoing parcels to the United Kingdom is 12 cents per pound.

(c) There is no arrangement in Canada for the transmission of closed parcels in the mails except at letter rate. Parcels, the contents of which must be open to inspection, may, however, be sent to places in Canada at the 4th class matter rate of postage, 1 cent per ounce.

REPAIRING MAIL BAGS.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

What persons or firms are engaged in repairing mail bags, and at what places and the rates?

Mr. PELLETIER:

(a) At Montreal, Quebec, Martel & Dumouchel, Montreal Tent and Awning Company; at Quebec, Quebec, E. Tremblay, Beauport, C. Gingras, Indian Lorette; at Ottawa, Ontario, A. W. Chester, J. B. & E. Roy, F. Montgomery, D. Choquette, Wm. Morel; at Toronto, Geo. Lugsdin & Company; Wm. Hanna, Hector McLean; at Newmarket, Ontario, Thos. Fardy; at King, Ontario, Jas, McClement, Walter Rolling; at Aurora, Ontario, Wm. Hastings, A. E. Conover; at London, Ontario, J. Jones, J. Dun.

(b) The rates are as follows: For repairing, inclusive of furnishing and attaching fittings to letter bags, 42c. each; for fitting metal bars to letter bags, 5c. each; for fitting metal rings to letter bags, 5c. each; for patching, only, letter bags and newspaper sacks, 25c. each; for repairing newspaper sacks and fitting with cords, &c., 41c. each; for fitting cords only to newspaper sacks, 9c. each.

GOVERNMENT LOANS.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax):

1. What is the amount of the last Canadian government loan, the rate of interest, the amount realized, and where placed?

2. If the said sum was a refund of an outstanding debt or loan, what was the amount of the same and the date of borrowing?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds).

A loan of £5,000,000 bearing 3½ per cent, due 1st July, 1950, with option to redeem on or after 1st July, 1930, on six months notice, was recently placed on the London market to replace a 3¾ per cent loan of £5,000,000 issued in June, 1908. Of the latter loan £4,681,870 12s. 4d. is now outstanding and redeemable 1st May next.

The final payment on the new loan will not be made until 29th April next. It was underwritten and issued at 98.

TENDERS FOR ENGRAVING DOMINION NOTES.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. How many tenders did the government receive for engraving, printing, furnishing and delivering Dominion notes, postal and Inland Revenue supplies, and what were the prices in each case?

2. Who is the lowest tenderer?

3. Has the contract been awarded? If so, to whom?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds).

Tenders have been received and are now under consideration by the government. Until the matter is finally dealt with no statement can be made.

MAIL CONTRACT, VAL DES EBOULIS AND RIGAUD.

Mr. BOYER:

1. On what date was granted to William Robert the contract for carrying the mail between Val des Eboulis and Rigaud?

2. What was the amount of this contract?

3. When was the contract annulled?

Mr. PELLETIER.

1, 2 and 3. The department has never granted a contract to William Robert.

DRAINAGE AT POINT AUX ANGLAIS.

Mr. ETHIER:

1. Does the government intend to do drainage work at Point aux Anglais, on the River Ottawa, for the purpose of facilitating the access of boats to the wharf at that place?

2. If so, what amount will be expended to that end?

Mr. MONK.

1. There is no application for drainage work at Point aux Anglais, but there is an application for dredging. The distribution of work under the dredging appropriation has not yet been made.

2. This work would cost $3,973.

ORIENTAL IMMIGRATION.

Mr. STEVENS:

1. What is the total number of Chinese that have entered Canada through ports of British Columbia up to date?

2. How many Japanese?
3. How many Chinese during last year?
4. How many Japanese during last year?
5. How many Hindus have entered Canada?
6. How many Hindus during last year?
7. Has the department any record of the arrival of Dr. Sundar Singh?
8. Was any order issued for his deportation? If so, was it executed?
9. Did the said Sundar Singh comply with the immigration regulations?

Mr. ROGERS.

1. 16,902.
2. 13,764.
3. (Fiscal year), 5,254.
4. (Fiscal year), 436.
5. 5,142.
6. (Fiscal year), 1.
7. Record shows that Dr. Sundar Singh arrived at Halifax, N.S., March 12th, 1909, per S.S. 'Virginian' of the Allan line.
8. Yes, not yet executed. Still pending.
9. No.

DISMISSALS.

Mr. CARDIN:

1. Has Mr. Alfred Lalonde, warehouseman in the government yards at St. Joseph de Sorel, been dismissed?
2. If so, why, and who asked for his dismissal?
3. Were complaints made against Mr. Lalonde? If so, by whom?
4. Has proof been given in support of these complaints? If so, by whom?
5. Who is Mr. Lalonde's successor, and who recommended him?

Mr. MONK:

1. Yes.
2, 3 and 4. Charges of political partisanship were preferred against him by J. A. Barrette, M.P..
5. Hylas Yergeau, Messrs. Barrette and Mondou.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

Has Mr. Yule, customs house officer at Aurora, been dismissed? If so, for what reason?

Mr. REID (Grenville). On the report of the inspectors, Mr. Andrew Yule, sub-collector of Customs at Aurora, has been granted leave of absence, with pay until July 1, 1812, after which his case will be considered. The reports show him to be in bad health and it is necessary to have an officer in charge able to perform the duties of the office.

Mr. BOYER:

1. Have complaints been made against William Brown, postmaster at Point Fortune?
2. If so, what is the nature of these complaints and by whom were they made?
3. Who asked for his dismissal?
4. Who is to be his successor, and by whom is he recommended?

Mr. STEVENS.

Mr. PELLETIER:

1, 2 and 3. Charges were made and proved, on investigation, to be well founded.
4. His successor has not yet been recommended.

Mr. BOYER:

1. Have any complaints against the postmaster at Mont Oscar been made to the government?
2. Who asked for the dismissal of Isidore Chevrier, the postmaster of that place?
3. Who is to be his successor and by whom was he recommended?

Mr. PELLETIER. 1, 2 and 3. The postmaster has to be dismissed as a result of the investigation held about this case.

Mr. CARVELL:

1. Has D. I. Mundle been dismissed from the office of sub-collector of customs at Richibucto, N.B.?
2. If so, for what reasons, on whose recommendations, and was the charge against him, if any, investigated, and by whom?
3. What was his salary, when was he actually dismissed from the position, and to what date was he paid?
4. Will the amount which he has paid into the superannuation fund be repaid him?

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1 and 2. D. I. Mundle, preventive officer of customs at Richibucto, has been dismissed from the customs service for political partisanship, by order in council on the recommendation of the Minister of Customs, based on charges made in the usual course by the member of parliament for the constituency.
2. Mr. Mundle's salary was $400 a year. The notice of dismissal was mailed on 26th February, 1912. His salary has been or will be paid up to the time when he received notice of dismissal.
3. The amount contributed by him to the retirement fund will be repaid. He did not contribute to the superannuation fund.

Mr. CARVELL:

1. Has W. S. McLean, acting preventive officer at L'Etang, Charlotte county, N.B., been dismissed from office?
2. If so, for what reason, on whose recommendation, and was he accorded an investigation?
3. Was George Chubb appointed in his place?
4. Is this the same George Chubb who was said to have been dismissed from office in 1906 for a violation of the Canada Temperance Act?
5. What is his age and salary at the present time?

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1 and 2. The services of Mr. W. S. McLean, acting preventive officer of customs at L'Etang or Back Bay, New Brunswick,

have been dispensed with on account of political partisanship, by order of the Minister of Customs, based upon charges made in the usual course by the member of parliament for the constituency.

3. Yes.

4. This is the same George Chubb who was dismissed from office in 1906 and deprived of his superannuation contributions to make room for Mr. W. S. McLean, a political partisan. It appears that Mr. Chubb did pay a fine under the Scott Act, on account of three bottles of whisky ordered by his son about Christmas time for some neighbours, one of whom describes himself as a Liberal.

5. His age is 70 years. His salary is $150 a year, as this is a preventive station only, with little revenue collected.

MOTION AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all papers, documents, correspondence, &c., between the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway, or any other railway, and the government, or any minister thereof, in reference to the guarantee of securities, and to the time and manner of the issue of such guaranteed securities, made under chapter 6 of the Statutes of Canada, 1911.—Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

For a copy of all letters, telegrams and other papers in connection with complaints of whatever nature against commission agents for placing farm labourers in Ontario, also officials connected with any agency in Ontario, during the year 1910 and 1911.—Mr. Sutherland.

For a copy of all documents, letters, petitions, requests or reports, respecting the dismissal of L. Tréfflé Délisle of Trois Pistoles, as captain of the lighthouse boat of Ile Rouge; and, of all documents, letters, petitions, requests and reports respecting the request to reinstate Mr. L. Tréfflé Délisle in his former position.—Mr. Gauvreau.

For a copy of all charges against Arthur Brymer, fishery officer at L'Ardoise, N.S., and of all telegrams and other communications between the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, or any other officer of his department, and any other persons having reference to the same and in relation to the appointment of his successor.—Mr. Kyte.

For a opy of all charges against Lawrence G. Power, superintendent of the lobster hatchery at Arichat, N.S., and of all letters, telegrams and other communications between the Minister of Marine and Fisheries or any officer in his department, and any other person having referene to the same and in relation to the appointment of his successor.—Mr. Kyte.

For a copy of all papers, telegrams, letters, petitions, &c., concerning the proposed construction of a public building at Weedon, Quebec.—Mr. Tobin.

For a copy of all documents, letters, papers, requests, inquiries and reports respecting the dismissal of Mr. Joseph Cloutier, postmaster of St. Adolphe de Dudswell.—Mr. Tobin.

For a copy of all papers, letters, requests, resolutions of municipal councils, &c., asking for the construction of a wharf at Grathby, on Lake Aylmer, from 1904-5 to this date.—Mr. Tobin.

For a copy of all letters, requests, complaints, depositions, reports of inquiry and of every other document in the possession of the Post Office Department relating to the dismissal of Doctor H. Dupré as postmaster of St. Robert, county of Richelieu, and to the appointment of a new postmaster.—Mr. Cardin.

For a copy of all letters, requests, complaints, depositions, reports of inquiry and of every other document in the possession of the Post Office Department relating to the dismissal of Madam, the widow of Antoine St. Martin as postmistress at St. Louis de Bonsecours, county of Richelieu, and to the appointment of a new postmaster.—Mr. Cardin.

For a copy of all letters requests, complaints, depositions, reports of inquiry and every other document whatever, relating to the dismissal of Mr. J. O. Dauphinais as postmaster of Sorel, county of Richelieu, and also of all letters, requests, or other documents relating to the appointment of the new postmaster at Sorel.—Mr. Cardin.

For a copy of all letters, requests, memorandums, tenders and other documents in the possession of the Post Office Department relating to the calling for tenders and the granting of the contract now in force for the carrying of the mail between Sorel and Ste. Victorie, county of Richelieu.—Mr. Cardin.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 106) to amend the Civil Service Act.—Mr. Pelletier—read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

On section 1,

Mr. LEMIEUX. Will the hon. gentleman please explain?

Mr. PELLETIER. The general tenor of this clause is to deal with the classifications in the post office outside service. It dispenses with senior and junior, and created classes with Grade A and B. It does away with the class known as stampers and sorters; with what was known as the fourth class and also with the junior third class. The stampers and sorters, the fourth class, and the junior third class, become third class. Grade B stampers and sorters under the existing law receive $500 and go up to $600 with increments of $50 a year. The fourth class commences with $500 and goes to $700 with increases of $100 a year; the junior third class goes from $700 to $800. All these are replaced by third class Grade B, and the officers in this class will receive $500 on appointment, and will go to $800 with annual increases

of $100. What is now the senior third class and the junior second will become third class Grade A. At present a senior third class clerk receives from $800 to $900, increasing by $50 a year, and the junior second commences at $900 and goes to $1,000 by two increases of $50 a year each. These two become third class Grade B with a salary of $800 to begin at and the maximum will be $1,000 by increases of $50 per annum. Senior second class clerks now receive $1,000 per year and they will in future have $1,200 as a maximum. It is divided into two grades: second class Grade B, the salary of which begins at $1,000 and goes to $1,200, and second class Grade A, the salary of which begins at $1,200 and goes to $1,400, which is $200 more than the present maximum of the second class. The first class, which at present ranges in salary from $1,200 to $1,500, and in which there was no junior or senior grade, will be subdivided into two grades: one, class Grade B beginning at $1,400 and going to $1,600, and the other class Grade A, beginning at $1,600 and going to $1,800; an increase of $200 on the minimum and $300 on the present maximum. This Bill introduces a class called chief clerks in post offices with an annual revenue of $500,000 or over, and there will be one chief clerk for every two hundred employees.

This will for the moment apply solely to the three largest post offices—Toronto, Montreal and Winnipeg. The salary of the chief clerk will begin at $1,800 and go to $2,200. The salary of the superintendent will begin at $1,800, the present salary, and will go up to $2,500. This is the general purport of the Bill. Most of these clauses were in the Bill which was presented to the House last year by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), but which was prevented from passing by the arrival of the Sergeant-at-Arms at the door; therefore, I suppose my hon. friend will concur with me in finding this a good measure.

Mr. LEMIEUX. On general lines I commend this legislation. The Bill is similar to the one which was introduced last year, and which was on the eve of receiving consideration from this House, but was unfortunately prevented from passing on account of the visit of the Black Rod. The increases and changes which are made are certainly most desirable. I can only emphasize the fact that the time has come I believe, when we should dispense with all this phraseology, and as far as possible bring the outside service under the Civil Service Act. In fact, the Bill of last year was prepared with that end in view, and I suppose the amounts mentioned in this Bill have reference to the classification which we find in the inside service, so that when the change takes place and the outside service is brought under the Commission, there will be no difficulty in classifying the various offices.

On section 7—limitation in employment temporary clerks,

Mr. PELLETIER. I propose that this clause be dropped entirely, because this matter is provided for in the other clauses.

Mr. BELAND. I see that temporary clerks are to be paid $2.50. What salary are these employees receiving now?

Mr. PELLETIER. $1.60. The cost of living has very much increased.

Mr. BELAND. It is all right, I do not object to it.

Motion agreed to.

On section 8—eligibility for employment,

Mr. PELLETIER. It is proposed to drop from the section the words 'or box collector.' In many cases the box collections are made by a company, and there might be some difficulty with the Auditor General in regard to this.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Who is the box collector at Quebec?

Mr. PELLETIER. A Mr. Gagnier.

On section 9—permanent appointment temporary employees,

Mr. PELLETIER. The words 'for an increase' in the last line do not carry the idea sufficiently well. I have been over this clause with the staff of the department, and they have come to the conclusion that the words mentioned ought to be replaced by the words 'a higher salary than the maximum of the class in which he may be placed under this Act.' This means that the employees referred to can go up to $1,000.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 11—mileage to sorters,

Mr. PELLETIER. I propose to add after the words 'railway mail clerks' in the first line of the paragraph the words 'and other post office employees when employed as sorters in the postal cars.'

Amendment agreed to.

On section 12—salaries of inspector, assistant inspector or superintendent.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Will the minister explain in how many cases this increase will be given?

Mr. PELLETIER. This will affect inspectors and superintendents of the railway mail service as follows: Mr. W. E. Maclellan, Nova Scotia, will get $200; at

present he is receiving $2,800. Mr. Colter of New Brunswick, if the Governor in Council consents, may get as high an increase as $700. He is now receiving $2,800.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The $700 would bring him up to the maximum.

Mr. PELLETIER. Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX. And the minister will judge according to circumstances in granting the increases?

Mr. PELLETIER. The increase will be granted on merit.

Mr. LEMIEUX. He might receive an increase of $300, or $400, or $500, or $700?

Mr. PELLETIER. The Governor in Council will decide that. I am sorry to say that we cannot take advantage of this provision in the case of Mr. Green, of Quebec, but we are going to try and provide for him in some other way. Mr. Green has been moved here and there, in order that his services might be made effective, and that fact has caused his appointment to date only from the 4th of May, 1910.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What is the maximum now?

Mr. PELLETIER. $2,500.

Mr. LEMIEUX. And this gentleman cannot get any higher at present? I think the minister would be warranted in granting an increase.

Mr. PELLETIER. I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman say that because Mr. Green is a most efficient officer.

Mr. BELAND. Will Mr. Larue get the increase?

Mr. PELLETIER. Yes. Mr. Goudet of Montreal is in the same position as Mr. Green. Mr. Bolduc may receive $700, if the Governor in Council so decides, like Mr. Colter.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The ablest man you have in the service.

Mr. BELAND. What is Mr. Bolduc's salary?

Mr. PELLETIER. It is $2,800. I will recommend that he get his maximum at once. As the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) says, he is perhaps the best inspector we have in the department.

Mr. BELAND. Certainly a first-class man.

Mr. PELLETIER. Now we come to Mr. Merrick of Kingston. He is in the same position as Mr. Bolduc. Then there is Mr. Limoges of North Bay, whose present salary is $2,600; Mr. Sutherland, of Toronto, who is in the same position as Mr. Greene of Quebec. Mr. Campbell, of London now receives $2,800, and by virtue of this Bill he can get an increase up to $200. Mr. McLeod, of Winnipeg was in a position to get the increase of $700 but he has retired since this Bill was prepared. Mr. Wilson, of Moosejaw has recently deceased and has been succeeded by Mr. McNaughton, who has made his mark sufficiently to take charge of the new position. Mr. Chamard, of Saskatoon, now receives $2,600, and may get an increase up to $200, Mr. Bruce, of Calgary, who now receives $2,600, will receive an increase up to $200. He is a good officer. Mr. Cairns, of Edmonton, now receives $2,800, and he may receive an increase under the Bill up to $300. At Vancouver, is Mr. Greenfield, whose salary is $2,800, and who may also receive an increase up to $300. Mr. Fletcher, of Victoria, is one of those who may receive an increase as high as $700. I have the details here, with regard to the inferior officers, but I will not go into that unless the hon. gentleman desires it.

Mr. BELAND. I would like to know about Mr. Larue, assistant inspector at Quebec.

Mr. PELLETIER. His salary at present is $1,700, and his increase may go to $400.

Mr. BELAND. I am glad to hear it, he is a very good officer, and has been long in the service.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I desire to read a letter I have received.

In looking over Bill No. 106 that has been introduced in the House of Commons, I find that so far as second-class clerks in the post office are concerned, it contains a very unfair discrimination. Frequent representations have been made, as you know, for a general increase in the salaries of post office clerks without the least suggestion of political discrimination. But the Bill that has been introduced makes discrimination in favour of those who were appointed by Conservative governments.

In referring to the second-class clerks, page 3, line 25, you will see that those who have had less than 15 years service, temporary or permanent, are placed in grade B; again at line 32 on the same page, any one who has had fifteen years' service or over, whether temporary or permanent, goes into grade A. This practically means that there will be no increase in salary for second-class clerks appointed during the Liberal term of office. While the Bill does not say that these differerences shall date from July of 1896, by putting the period at twelve years, it practically and very effectively gives the preference to those who were appointed by a Conservative government as against those who have been appointed since. I am satisfied that a question in the House as to the number of persons that were affected as appointees before and after the fifteen years' limit with the dates of their appointment, would show the large

preponderance of Conservatives whom this Act will beneficially affect.

I am told that employees who were letter carriers from Conservative appointment prior to 1896 were in many cases advanced to clerkships with a large increase in salary. This Bill would displace clerks at present (from seniors by reason of the efficient discharge of their duties) who have not had fifteen years' service, but who held clerkships before the others reached that rank in the service. In addition to the matter to which I refer, it is suggested that the fair application of the benefits of the Bill to all parties will be obtained by striking out in line 28, page 3 the following words: 'and he was a senior second-class prior to the 1st day of October, 1909"; and in the 33rd line by striking out the words 'temporary and permanent" and substituting the words 'in that case.'

My hon. friend (Mr. Pelletier) will read these remarks in 'Hansard' and I am sure he will give them consideration. This is a private matter, but I will hand it to my hon. friend; I am sure he means to be fair to every one. I hope he will look into this matter fully.

Mr. PELLETIER. I will consider it.

Bill reported.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 124) respecting the Civil Service (Mr. Pelletier) read the second time, considered in committee, read the third time and passed.

Bill (No. 116) to amend the Civil Service Act.—Mr. Reid (Grenville).

THE GRAIN ACT.

On order for third reading of Bill (No. 32) respecting grain.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I move that the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to Committee of the Whole in order to make certain amendments.

Motion agreed to, and House went again into committee on the Bill.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The chief reason for taking this Bill back into Committee of the Whole is because that, in the printing of it, certain omissions have been made, and some inconsistencies remain to be cleared up. In section 230 I move to insert the words 'upon the recommendation of the board.'

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). In section 107, after the words 'No. 1 Canada Western barley shall be plump, bright, sound, clean and free from other grain.' I move to add after the word 'grain,' 'and shall weigh not less than 48 pounds to the bushel.'

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Then in the last line but one—we had some discussion over the weight of No. 3 Canada western barley, the weight of which we reduced from 45 pounds to 44 pounds. I propose to change the weight back to 45 pounds. It was put down at 44 chiefly from representations from the west; but subsequent representations led me to believe that if we made it as low as 44 pounds it would destroy its value as a malting barley. 45 pounds puts it on a par with the nomenclature in the United States.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Section 121—when we went over this section we changed (a) (b) by putting in 'in the western and eastern inspection divisions,' so as to include both divisions. However these do not appear in the re-print, and I now propose to make it of the same sense as before.

Motion agreed to.

On section 156, rules and regulations,

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I beg to move the addition of subsection 4. This was really agreed to in committee but seems not to have been embodied in the bill:

Such rules and regulations shall be laid before both Houses of parliament within 30 days from commencement of each session.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto) moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. CRUISE. I beg to move:

That the Bill be not now read a third time but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole to amend it by striking out subsection (e) of section 207.

I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that the farmers throughout Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta, object very strongly to this subsection (e) of the Bill, and consequently I believe that it is my duty to move that it be stricken out. Should this subsection become law, many abuses would arise which would be detrimental to the farmers of the west, and these abuses I shall briefly point out. My contention is that this subsection (e) gives to the Board of Commissioners altogether too much power, and that it will place the farmers in practically the same position as they were ten years ago, when they were forced to load through the elevators and were refused the privilege of loading over the platforms into the cars. It will not, of course, work out to the detri-

ment of the farmers shipping at divisional points, but take for example Ochre river, on the south side of Dauphin, where there are two elevators, and a large settlement on each side of the town. Now, when the farmers begin to thresh, there are seven or eight threshing machines, we will say, ready for operation, and the farmers put their names on the order-book and order their cars to be ready when they commence threshing. Then, when they haul their grain in, the probability is that the cars will not be placed there for them, and the railroad people will send some excuse, and the result is that they will be forced to ship their grain through the elevators. This may continue for three or four days, and the elevators become full. Then the elevator operator reports to the Board of Commissioners that his elevator is full and he asks for cars and the board immediately order cars to be sent out to relieve that elevator. Then, as the farmers come in, they are still refused the cars for the purpose of loading their grain over the platform, and they are in this way constantly forced to load their grain through the elevators.

This shows that if the clause I propose to have stricken from the Bill is retained, it will be detrimental to the interests of the farmers. Now, I have never been able to ascertain who it was that asked for the insertion of this clause (e) in the Bill. I have already stated in committee that the farmers did not ask for it, and although the Minister of Trade and Commerce answered that the clause was inserted for the benefit of the small farmer, I hold that I am representing the feelings of the smaller farmers in the west when I ask to have it stricken out. At the present time, the small farmer who ships one car is on the same footing as the large farmer who ships ten, twelve or fifteen cars of wheat and there is no complaint. From my constituency, and indeed from all over the west, I have received protests against the car distribution clause being interfered with in any way. I shall read, for the benefit of the House, the following telegram sent by Mr. Roderick McKenzie, secretary of the Grain Growers' Association of Manitoba:

Over hundred farmers Portage constituency yesterday passed following resolution:—

Whereas, under subsection (e), section two hundred seven Grain Bill, railroads can create congestion wherever and whenever they please, thereby indirectly control distribution cars any point where they desire; therefore, resolved that members Portage District Association Manitoba Grain Growers' Association disapprove of proposed change as it can be used to destroy the usefulness of the most important portion of Grain Act and urge that said clause be struck out of Bill before finally passed.

R. McKENZIE.
Winnipeg, Man., March 2, 1912.

I have also a list of the following thirty different branches of the Grain Growers' Association of Manitoba, protesting against any change in the present law in this respect:—Rosser G. G. A., Seeburn G. G. A., Holland G. G. A., Miami G. G. A., Strathclair G. G. A., District Convention Manitoba G. G., Goodlands G. G. A., Kenton G. G. A., Bethany G. G. A., Elm Creek G. G. A., Airdrie G. G. A., Shadeland G. G. A., Stephenfield G. G. A., Franklin G. G. A., Reston G. G. A., Carroll G. G. A., Lenore G. G. A., Havelock G. G. A., Baycentre G. G. A., Minitonas G. G. A., Benito G. G. A., Barnsley G. G. A., Edwin G. G. A., Holmfield G. G. A., Beaver G. G. A., Valley River, Ashville, Ochre River, Gilbert Plains, Dauphin, Sunnydale, Macleod-Howe Branch W. F. A.

These are all grain growers' associaciations, and they strongly protest against any change being made in the car-distribution clause. They have asked different members of this House to insist on subsection E of section 207 being struck out. We are told by the Minister of Trade and Commerce that this subsection was inserted purely and simply to assist the small farmers. I have given this matter a great deal of study, and in my humble judgment it is not going to be of any benefit whatever to the small farmer, but is going to put him practically where he was ten years ago. For that reason I object to this clause and move this amendment.

Mr. DAVID WARNOCK (Macleod). Mr. Speaker, in rising to second the motion of the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Cruise), I wish again to register my protest against the passing of section 207. These amendments have created a widespread alarm in the west, and meetings have been held day after day to register protests against the proposal to deprive the farmers of the privileges they have enjoyed for a number of years under the provisions of the Manitoba Grain Act. In my opinion section 207 as now amended is completely emasculated in so far as affording any protection to the farmers; and this is the opinion of a great many farmers in the west. I wish to read a letter which has been written by Mr. E. J. Fream, secretary of the United Farmers' Association of Alberta to the hon. member for Edmonton:

Calgary, Alta., Feb. 27, 1912.

The Hon. F. Oliver,
House of Commons,
Ottawa.

Sir,—At the annual meeting of the Can-

adian Council of Agriculture held a few days ago, the question of the new Grain Bill was up for discussion and the following resolution was unanimously adopted:—

That this council endorse the action of the delegates to Ottawa, representing the three western provinces and consisting of Messrs. Henders, McKenzie, Hopkins, Green and Fream, and the views submitted by them to the government, and again place on record our firm belief that nothing short of government operation and control, either by lease or purchase, of all terminal and transfer elevator facilities through an independent commission will ever relieve the adverse conditions now existing; further that it is essential that no change shall be made in the clauses of the Grain Bill relating to the distribution of cars as any tampering with the rights pertaining to the producers in this direction will work a great hardship upon these producers and will not tend to relieve the car shortage, which shortage can be traced to the inability of the railway companies to handle business consigned to them; further it is our opinion that if any change is contemplated in this direction it will be better to drop the Grain Bill entirely and continue to administer the grain business through the provisions of the Manitoba Grain Act as it now reads.

We have viewed with alarm the proposals made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce in connection with the Grain Bill, and we can only see calamity in sight if same becomes law with all the proposed amendments as is now proposed.

We are convinced that nothing short of government operation and control of all terminal facilities will ever give us what we require, and think that the proposal to take over two or three of the terminals as an experiment is nothing more or less than a desire to ruin the whole plan of government ownership, as such a scheme must of necessity be dependent on the private interests, and will therefore be at their mercy when the grain is handled.

We are greatly alarmed at the proposed amendments to section 207 and are appealing to you to assist us in protecting our rights and retaining that which we won only after the hardest kind of a battle. You are fully conversant with all these details, and we are therefore simply asking you to assist us as far as possible and to remind you that we would prefer to see the whole Grain Bill defeated rather than to have our rights interfered with by the destruction through many amendments of the saving principles embodied in the car distribution clauses of the Grain Act.

Thanking you in anticipation of your favourable consideration and assistance.

Yours truly,
EDWARD J. FREAM, Secretary.

The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce is inclined to think that the makers of the resolutions which have been sent to members on both sides of the House do not represent a very large proportion of the grain growers of the west; but I know that in southern Alberta they represent 100 per cent of the grain-growing farmers. Of course, there are some farmers not largely interested in grain to whom the matter is of very little importance; but the grain-growing farmers are united on this question. Resolutions along these lines have come from grain-growers' associations at Strathcona, Pincher Creek, Wheatland Centre, Sullivan lake, Botha, Gadsby, Cairns, Granum, Iron springs, Agricola, Trout creek, Oxoway, Chauvin, Lewisville, Warner, Acme, Galahad, Fairgrove, Spruce grove, Sunnydale and Macleod (Howe Branch). These resolutions are arriving by every mail, and in a few days we shall have a great many more of them. Most of the resolutions embody another resolution to which I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. This is one from the Howe Branch of the United Farmers' Association at Macleod:

Resolved that the western outlet for our grain should be taken up immediately, and that the Dominion government should provide terminal elevator facilities at the Pacific coast at once.

I should like to recommend that to the consideration of the hon. minister.

I protest against the passing of section 207 as amended, and would ask that it be passed as it stood in the Manitoba Grain Act.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Cruise.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Béland,	Loggie,
Bickerdike,	Lovell,
Boivin,	MacNutt,
Brouillard,	McCraney,
Brown,	McLean (Sunbury),
Carroll,	McMillan,
Cash,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Chisholm (Antigonish),	Marcile (Bagot),
Chisholm (Inverness),	Martin (Regina),
Clark (Red Deer),	Michaud,
Cruise,	Molloy,
Demers,	Pacaud,
Douglas,	Papineau,
Ethier,	Robb,
Fortier,	Schaffner,
Gauthier (St. Hyacinthe),	Seguin,
Gauvreau,	Sharpe (Lisgar),
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Sinclair,
Kay,	Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Knowles,	Tobin,
Lanctot,	Turgeon,
Lapointe (Kamouraska),	Verville,
Lemieux,	Warnock and White (Victoria, Alta.)—47.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Achim,	Lennox,
Alguire,	Lesperance,

Ames,	Lewis,
Armstrong (Lambton),	Macdonell,
Armstrong (York, O.),	McKay,
Arthurs,	McLean (Queen's,
Baker,	P.E.I.),
Ball,	Meighen,
Barker,	Merner,
Barnard,	Mondou,
Barrette,	Monk,
Bennett (Calgary),	Morphy,
Bennett (Simcoe),	Munson,
Best,	Nantel,
Blain,	Nicholson,
Blondin,	Nickle,
Borden,	Osler (Sir Edmund),
Boulay,	Paquet,
Bowman,	Paul,
Brabazon,	Pelletier,
Bradbury,	Porter,
Broder,	Rainville,
Burnham,	Reid (Grenville),
Burrell,	Roche,
Clare,	Sexsmith,
Clark (Bruce),	Sharpe (Ontario),
Clarke (Wellington),	Shepherd,
Clements,	Staples,
Cockshutt,	Steele,
Crocket,	Stevens,
Crothers,	Stewart (Hamilton),
Davidson,	Stewart (Lunenburg)
Doherty,	Sutherland,
Elliot,	Taylor,
Elson,	Thoburn,
Fisher,	Thompson (Yukon),
Foster (Toronto, N.),	Thornton,
Guilbault,	Walker,
Hartt,	Wallace,
Hazen,	Webster,
Henderson,	Weichel,
Jameson,	White (Renfrew),
Kidd,	Wilcox and
Lancaster,	Wilson
Lavallée,	(Wentworth).—89.

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Messieurs	
Stanfield,	Pardee,
Carrick,	Lapointe (Montreal),
White (Leeds),	Emmerson,
Haggart,	Gordon,
Rhodes,	Macdonald,
Fowler,	Pugsley,
Bristol,	Charlton,
McCurdy,	McLean Halifax),
Smyth,	Clarke (Essex),
Middlebro,	Nesbitt,
Robidoux,	Carvell,
Edwards,	Turriff,
Marshall,	McCoig,
Rogers,	Oliver,
Goodeve,	Ross,
Perley,	McKenzie,
Kemp,	Boyer,
Tremain,	Buchanan,
Aitkins,	Bureau,
Boyce,	Richards,
Cochrane,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Hughes,	Proulx,
Lamarche,	Champagne,
Foster (Kings),	Kyte,
Currie,	Neely,
Beattie,	Guthrie,
Donnelly,	McCrea,
Hepburn,	German,
Lalor,	Devlin,
Northrup.	Murphy.
Forget	Wilson (Laval)
Sevigny	Lachance

Amendment (Mr. Cruise) negatived.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle) I wish to move:

That the Bill be not now read a third time but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of amendment by striking out subsection 2 of section 57 and substituting therefore the following:

Notwithstanding any provisions in this Act that may conflict therewith, sample markets may be established under such rules and regulations as shall be recommended by the board and approved by the Governor in Council, in the city of Winnipeg, and such other point or points as shall be selected by the board with the approval of the Governor in Council.

The change which would be effected by this amendment, if adopted, would be in the first place, that instead of as at present providing for three points for sample markets—that is Winnipeg, Fort William and Calgary—a market would be established at Winnipeg and such other point or points as shall be selected by the board, with the approval of the Governor in Council. At present, I believe, the only place at which people generally appear to have asked for a sample market is Winnipeg. There is no objection, to a sample market being established there, but I think it would be necessary to have sample markets at other points. I do not think it is well to limit the places at which these markets may be established. They may be necessary at Calgary and Fort William, but they are just as likely to be necessary at other points. This is a matter which might well be left in the hands of the board with the approval of the Governor in Council, because circumstances may arise which might make it advisable to establish sample markets at other points. For instance, a considerable quantity of grain is being shipped to the United States. The grain from the western part of Saskatchewan, and parts of Alberta is being shipped to that country, and it will go over the Soo line. Therefore, it would be advisable to have a sample market at Moosejaw or North Portal or some such place. This amendment will leave the board free to select such points as they may deem advisable. My chief reason for moving this amendment is because of the provision which permits the mixing of grain. There are two or three things that seem to the farmers of the west to be very important in connection with the grain trade. One of these has been dealt with in connection with car distribution. Another equally im-

portant question is that of the mixing of grain. The western farmers rightly or wrongly, and I believe rightly, deem it to be very important to them that mixing should not be allowed. I do not think they would seriously object to mixing provided all terminal elevators were operated by the government. But we must remember that we have not any positive promise from the Minister of Trade and Commerce that such a policy will be carried out. He merely says that he proposes to try the experiment with one or two elevators, or possibly more, and there is no reason to suppose government control of terminal elevators generally will be carried out. On that account, the western farmers are utterly dissatisfied with the provision to which I have referred. I fear the Minister looks on the grain growers as spoiled children who have had too much of their own way in the past. It is true that a great many amendments have been made to the Manitoba Grain Act at their request since it was first put in force, but I think if the Minister of Trade and Commerce will look into the recommendations of the western grain growers asking for amendment to that Act, he will find that they have been for the benefit of the country at large, and not merely in the interest of the grain growers themselves. Everybody must recognize that the great growth of Canada in late years, has been caused by the development of the west and the increase in the amount of grain which has been grown and exported from that country. To allow mixing to take place is bound to be one of the most serious blows that can be struck at the western farmer.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In seconding the amendment, I merely wish to state that the amendment is in the interest of the grain growers of the west to a large extent. Since this Bill first came before the House I in common with other members, have received a great many communications dealing with this Bill in its various stages, and among the clauses which have received the condemnation of the grain growers as a whole, is the one which allows the mixing of grain in terminal elevators. That section has caused a great deal of dissatisfaction among grain growers. In my judgment the clause has been inserted largely for the benefit of the grain dealers, as against the interest of the grain growers. The object of the latter in past years has been to prevent the bad practice of mixing, which has prevailed at the terminal elevators. If these elevators were owned and operated by the government, I believe this evil might be controlled to a very large extent, but under the provisions of the Bill only one or two such elevators are going to be run by the government. Consequently the farmers view with a great deal of alarm the fact that other elevators which are privately owned, may continue to go on mixing the grain in the same nefarious manner in which it has been done in the past, which practice it has been the object of the Manitoba Grain Act to overcome in every possible way. For these reasons I very gladly second the amendment which has been moved by my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I do not want hon. gentlemen opposite to think that because I did not answer the arguments of the gentlemen who moved and seconded the former amendment that I treated that amendment otherwise than it should have been treated. I did not make any answer because the arguments advanced, so far as I can judge, were practicaly the arguments that had been already adduced, and that were thoroughly threshed out as we went through committee, and I did not consider it necessary to take up the time of the House in repeating arguments in rebuttal. The same thing applies to the present amendment, and yet I think it is well for me to take a moment or two in dealing with this amendment especially. There is not, I think, very much difference between the mover of this amendment and myself as the sponsor for the Bill. He argues, and wishes to make effective, that the selection of sample markets shall be left with the Board of Commissioners and subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. The Bill states three principal places at which sample markets, not necessarily shall, but may be established. It does not seem to me that sample markets in the west, or anywhere else, are, like the measles and small-pox, breaking out at unexpected moments.

We meet here every year and we have a chance to legislate each year, and I think that no interest will suffer in the interim between sessions, and no sudden and unexpected development is likely to take place which would mark out a certain place which had not been provided for in the Act as a necessary place for a sample market. I think we should go gradually in fixing sample market places in the west and that the growth should not be over rapid. When you make your provision for Calgary for a sample market, for instance, that does not say that it will be a sample market this year, or next year, or the year after. This Bill, when it becomes law, does not establish a sample market anywhere, but simply makes it possible for a sample market to be established at that place; but the co-operation of other factors than the government and other conditions than those for which the government can be responsible, are necessary before a sample market can be established. Now, as the spot upon which

we are all agreed for a sample market if there is one at all, we take Winnipeg. There is no cavil about that. I think that it has been demonstrated that Fort William is another place where a fairly good sample market could be established. It is unique in its position at the head of lake navigation and in connection with the rail transport of grain; and, with the press of cars from Winnipeg and the time that elapses between their being sampled and graded at Winnipeg and their arrival at Fort William, there are conditions that may arise that will make Fort William a good place for a sample market. It is not improbable, also, that Fort William will become a large milling centre in the course of time. It has a good location in that respect. For these reasons it is a likely place for a sample market. The same is true of Calgary, far remote from these other two. If it ever does become a sample market, it will be because of the western export of the grain by the Pacific ocean. That may develop pretty rapidly. I would not take the responsibility of saying that we should not make provision this year for Calgary as a point for a sample market, because, with the great production of grain and the necessary congestion which is physically unmovable towards the east, it is not out of probability that next year may see a very large efflux of grain from the prairie provinces, especially from Alberta and part of Saskatchewan, towards the Pacific ocean; if not next year, then certainly the year after.

So that, I think, we have covered all the present possible points for a successful sample market in the three places we have named in the Act. If, when we come here next year, it is found that Edmonton, or Prince Rupert, or Moosejaw, or some other place has developed towards the point where successful markets can be established, we can make provision therefor. But I think we shall all agree that to endeavour to have a large number of small sample markets, would be rather against having a successful sample market at all. The success of the sample market depends on the large number of buyers and the large aggregation of sellers, coming together in a certain place, together with other conditions which Winnipeg and Fort William at present, and Calgary in the near future, pretty well fulfil. So, I do not think there is much difference in fact and in reality between my hon, friend (Mr. Thomson, Qu'Appelle) and myself.

Now, with reference to mixing: What is it that the farmers dreaded and dread to day, in mixing? I have had the pleasure of reading about it in the Grain Growers' Guide—and I read that journal very regularly, and have appreciated much that it contains, though I do not agree with everything it says. It is not for me to offer advice to the grain growers on the conduct of their paper; but if I were running a paper in the west, on agricultural lines, I would try to be more hopeful, I would try to inculcate through the columns of the paper some friendly advice, some kindly suggestion, some enumeration of the advantages of the country, some suggestions of the better and newer methods. I would not paint the whole situation black; I would have a reasonable portion of clear and lively colour. But I am not running the 'Grain Growers' Guide.' The grain growers who run the 'Grain Growers' Guide' put one leg upon the mixing and another leg upon the government-owned elevators, and they say: Mixing is horrible, but we are willing to embrace it if we have only honest conduct of the elevators. Well, honest conduct of the elevators is what this government is going to see is carried out. It is going to do it by the added machinery, which this Bill is to put into their hands. It is going to do it by the nomination of a first-class grain commission which has no interested sympathy with elevator companies or with railroad corporations, but which has first and mainly the farmers' interest in view and will use both elevators and railway companies as very helpful means to aid the farmers in quick and proper despatch of their grain to the markets of the world. Now, I defy any one to read the discussion in the Grain Growers' Guide upon the sample market without coming to the conclusion that if there is not a preponderance of sentiment in favour of the sample market with mixing, there is at least a fairly even division of opinion. I would invite my hon. friend to read the last, or the next to the last, number of the Grain Growers' Guide and the resolutions and discussions upon these resolutions, and he will see that they are in favour of a sample market absolutely, provided they have honest conduct of the elevators at the terminal points. These gentlemen want,—they ask for, and have a right to ask for,—a certain thing, and the government is in duty bound to give what they ask for. But, the government and the House have a perfect right to use its judgment as to how that thing shall be brought about. Mr. Fream and Mr. McKenzie say it cannot be brought about except by government-owned elevators. The government believe that with the machinery that is provided in this Bill, they can bring it about; and I am willing to stake my reputation and the reputation of the government on the fact that it will be brought about in the administration of this Act during this and the succeeding years. If they get the thing they want, honest mixing with a sample market, what

is the trouble that they need fear. I do not find fault with the farmers in the west for fearing. But that which they fear is based upon suspicion and not upon actual facts. 'Once bitten, twice shy.' The farmers in olden times were bitten, bitten by the elevator men and bitten by the railroad men. But the legislation of 1905-6 revolutionized the matter of transportation of grain in that country. This Act and the administration of this Act, and the government behind this Act, does not mean to take away one iota of the privileges which the farmers of the west have for the proper disposal of their grain. If they can help them in any way they will do it. Why should I, or why should the government, collude with the elevator men or with the railroad men as against the farmers of the west?

The whole argument of my hon. friends opposite sink to the ground, disappear utterly, unless you can prove that there would be collusion between three parties; the elevator men, the railway men and the grain commission. Now, I do not believe that the grain commission is going to collude with either the elevator men or the railroad men to the detriment of the farmers; it is going to aid both the elevators and the railroad companies, and I believe, with their consent and with their co-operation, to do everything that possibly can be done for the speedy marketing of the farmers' grain. Now, I would not ask that this Bill be passed if I thought it was going to do what Mr. Fream fears it will do. He says: You had better knock the Bill out entirely rather than have these going to have that effect I would be just added clauses in it. If I thought it was as much against that clause as Mr. Fream or Mr. McKenzie. We all have a right to our opinions. I do not judge any one as not being honest and straight in the opinion he holds of what might take place. But it cannot be a well based opinion yet, it is nothing more than a fear or a suspicion; and I think he will find that the fear is groundless, and that the suspicion will not eventuate in fact.

Mr. KNOWLES. I must congratulate my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Thomson) on having succeeded in waking up the minister at last. During the last day or so that we have been dealing with this Bill the minister has either ignored our criticisms, or given them scant courtesy. He has entered into a more or less general discussion of the matter, defending the commission that is going to be appointed. Now he has one great advantage over us, he has some sort of an idea whom he is going to appoint on the commission, whereas we do not know at all what men the government have in their minds. Nor do we know, when they come to bring down supplementary estimates, how much money they will ask parliament to vote for the purpose of securing the control and operation of government elevators at the head of the lakes. The minister's whole argument is that he would not ask parliament to put this measure through if he did not believe it was a good one. He speaks of 'My commission' and says it is going to be so immaculate and perfect that it should have the confidence of every member of this committee, as if we ought to vote without hesitation any legislation the minister proposes. For my part I do not propose to accept any legislation merely because the minister asks us to do so. We might just as well go home if we are going to vote for a certain piece of legislation just because the minister says he would not present it to the House if his motives were not good in proposing it. I think the minister will see that while we are not reflecting upon his bona fides in the matter, he cannot bring us to the conviction by simply saying that he would not do it if he did not think he was perfectly right. But he has gone beyond the mere amendment in your hands, and has spoken about the Bill being so satisfactory, and when it is passed there are going to be such safeguards surrounding the handling of grain at the head of the lakes, and such a fine commission to handle it, that he has no doubt at all everything will be satisfactory to the farmers. It is a remarkable thing that when this Bill was before the House last May, hon. gentlemen opposite declared they could not support it because it did not suit them, and now we find them throwing up their hats in support of a Bill of the very same tenor.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would remind the hon. gentleman that, under a similar ruling, it is scarcely permissible to refer to anything that is not before the House. I do not think it would be wise to wander far away from the present amendment.

Mr. KNOWLES. When I rose to my feet I proposed to speak particularly on that part of my hon. friend's amendment, and to his suggestion that the minister might take to the board power to establish sample markets at any place that the government or the board might deem proper. I think that is a suggestion the minister might take into consideration, even at this late hour. I speak of this more particularly from the view point of the town I have the honour to represent. From the city of Moosejaw there have gone south this year, into the American market, car load after car load, train load after train load, of wheat, after paying the duty. I have seen reports from the Minneapolis, St. Paul and Sault Ste. Marie railroad saying that their traffic was congested with wheat from the Canadian west. That is an illustration of

what may occur which would make it desirable that the government should have in its hands power to adjust the administration of this Act according to changing circumstances from time to time. There have gone from the city of Moosejaw possibly millions of bushels of wheat, going down south by the Minneapolis, St. Paul and Sault Ste. Marie railway, which leaves the main line of the Canadian Pacific railway at Moosejaw. Another year some other set of circumstances might arise. We have been told during the late election campaign that we should not encourage reciprocity, because the Americans would take off the duty anyway. Let us suppose that they did remove their duty from our cereals and admit the product of our soil free of duty, there would be such a demand from the United States that our cereals would go south in immense quantities. I say to the Minister of Trade and Commerce that the American people prefer to purchase in a sample market. Practically all their buying is done in Minnesota and other places by sample in a sample market, and if a sample market would be popular for any purchasers it would be with American purchasers. Therefore I suggest that the minister should take to himself power in this Act to establish sample markets wherever the government and the board might think it well to do so. More than that, one of the important customers of the sample market is the mill. We know that the great mills of Minneapolis are the greatest customers of the sample market in Minnesota. In the city of Moosejaw there is a greater demand for wheat for milling purposes than there is in the city of Calgary; there are more milling facilities in the city of Moosejaw than in the city of Calgary. Therefore, I say there is a much stronger reason for making Moosejaw a sample market than Calgary. I do not propose that the name of Moosejaw be put in the Bill, but I propose that the minister take power to establish as many sample markets as circumstances may render desirable.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yeas and nays.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the 'Nays' have it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Same division.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). I would not like to have the same division recorded. If this division should take place I would vote against the amendment. I do not wish to be recorded as voting the same way.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Thomson, Qu'Appelle.).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Béland,	Lemieux,
Bickerdike,	Loggie,
Boivin,	Lovell,
Brouillard,	Maclean (Halifax),
Brown,	MacNutt,
Carroll,	McCraney,
Cash,	McLean (Sunbury),
Chisholm (Antigonish),	McMillan,
Chisholm (Inverness),	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Clark (Red Deer),	Marcile (Bagot),
Cruise,	Martin (Regina),
Demers,	Michaud,
Douglas,	Molloy,
Ethier,	Pacaud,
Fortier,	Papineau,
Gauthier (St. Hyacinthe),	Robb,
	Seguin,
Gauvreau,	Sinclair,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
	Tobin,
Kay,	Turgeon
Knowles,	Verville,
Lanctot,	Warnock and
Lapointe (Kamouraska),	White (Victoria, Alta.)—46

NAYS:

Messieurs

Achim,	Lennox,
Alguire,	Lesperance,
Ames,	Lewis,
Armstrong (Lambton),	Macdonnell,
Armstrong (York), O),	McCurdy,
Arthurs,	McKay,
Baker,	McLean (Queen's, P.E.I.),
Ball,	
Barker,	Meighen,
Barnard,	Merner,
Barrette,	Mondou,
Bennett (Calgary),	Monk,
Bennett (Simcoe),	Morphy,
Best,	Munson,
Blain,	Nantel,
Blondin,	Nicholson,
Borden,	Nickle,
Bowman,	Osler (Sir Edmund),
Boyce,	Paquet,
Brabazon,	Paul,
Bradbury,	Pelletier,
Broder,	Porter,
Burnham,	Rainville,
Burrell,	Reid (Grenville),
Clare,	Roche,
Clark (Bruce),	Schaffner,
Clarke (Wellington),	Sexsmith,
Clements,	Sharpe (Lisgar),
Cockshutt,	Shepherd,
Coderre,	Staples,
Crocket,	Steele,
Cromwell,	Stevens,
Crothers,	Stewart (Hamilton),
Davidson,	Stewart (Lunenburg),
Doherty,	Sutherland,
Elliot,	Taylor,
Elson,	Thoburn,
Fisher,	Thompson (Yukon)
Foster (Toronto, N.),	Thornton,
Guilbault,	Walker,
Hartt,	Wallace,
Hazen,	Webster,

Henderson,	Weichel,
Jameson,	White (Renfrew).
Kidd,	Wilcox and
Lamarche,	Wilson
Lancaster.	(Wentworth).—92.

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	Opposition.
	Messieurs
Stanfield,	Pardee,
Carrick,	Lapointe (Montreal),
White (Leeds),	Emmerson,
Haggart,	Gordon,
Rhodes,	Macdonald,
Fowler,	Pugsley,
Bristol,	Charlton,
Smyth,	Clarke (Essex),
Middlebro,	Nesbitt,
Robidoux,	Carvell,
Edwards,	Turriff,
Marshall,	McCoig,
Rogers	Oliver,
Goodeve,	Ross,
Perley,	McKenzie,
Kemp,	Boyer,
Tremain,	Buchanan,
Aikins,	Bureau,
Cochrane,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Hughes,	Proulx,
Lamarche,	Champagne,
Foster, (Kings, P.E.I.),	Kyte,
Currie,	Neely,
Beattie,	Guthrie,
Donnelly,	McCrea,
Hepburn,	German,
Lalor,	Devlin,
Northrup,	Murphy,
Fripp,	Richards.
Forget,	Wilson (Laval),
Sevigny,	Lachance,

Amendment (Mr. Thomson, Qu'Appelle), negatived.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) did not vote.

Mr. OLIVER. I am paired with the Minister of the Interior, otherwise I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. McCRANEY (Saskatoon). I move, seconded by Mr. MacNutt:

That the Bill be not now read a third time but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with instructions to amend subclause 2 of clause 57 by inserting after the words 'in connection therewith' the words following: 'in elevators operated by the board.'

The effect of this amendment if passed would permit the mixing of grain to be carried on only in government owned elevators. The clause would then read as follows:

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act that may conflict therewith, sample markets may be erected in the cities of Winnipeg, Fort William and Calgary, and the mixing of grain permitted in connection therewith in elevators operated by the board under such rules and regulations as are recommended by the board and approved by the Governor in Council.

Amendment, (Mr. McCraney) negatived on the same division as the last.

Mr. W. E. KNOWLES (Moosejaw). I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Martin, of Regina:

That the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, for the purpose of amendment by striking out section 124, and substituting therefor the following:—

123. No person owning, managing, operating, or in any way interested in, any public or terminal elevator, shall buy or sell or be in any way interested in, the buying or selling of grain, at any point in the western inspection division.

(2) Subsection 1 hereof shall not apply to any person who owns or is in any way interested in the ownership of any terminal elevator.

(a) Which with the approval of the Governor in Council has been leased to the board for operation, or has been leased to any person for operation with the approval of the board.

(b) Which is used or operated in connection with any flour mill, situate at the same terminal point as such elevator, provided, however, that such elevator shall be subject to such restrictions and regulations as are imposed by the board with the approval of the Governor in Council.

(3) Subsection 1 of this section shall not apply to any person by reason only of the fact that he is the owner or holder of stock or shares in a railway company, which owns or operates a terminal elevator which does not as a business buy or sell grain.

(4) If the person mentioned in subsection 2 hereof owns, manages, operates or is in any way interested in any terminal elevator other than a terminal elevator or elevators coming under the provisions of subsection 2 hereof, he shall not be exempt from the provisions of subsection 1 hereof.

In proposing this amendment, I do so for the purpose of placing before the House in this formal way, the same issue which I placed before the Committee of the Whole some two weeks ago. My contention is that the Bill as proposed by the government has absolutely no meaning, and is absolutely ineffective. This Bill, more or less makes a pretense of forbidding men who operate terminal elevators, from, at the same time, buying and selling grain, but, when it comes to be studied, it makes only a pretense of that because it does not in any way effectively attain that result. It distinctly says that any person who manages a leased elevator, where the lease is approved by the board, may buy or sell grain. I need not go further into the question than to show that that one feature of it makes the section absolutely useless. If a person wishes to be put in possession of an elevator and to have control, of the management

and operation of it, all he has to do is to become a lessee of it or to become a member of a company which is a lessee of it, or be in any way associated with the leasing of such an elevator, and then he may buy and sell grain to his heart's content. I submit that once the Minister of Trade and Commerce grants that, and he cannot deny it, he must agree with me that the whole clause is absolutely useless. The Minister of Trade and Commerce, in reply to a question I put him this afternoon, assured me that the farmers were safe in the hands of the government. That is a fragile basis to put this legislation on. The farmers do not hold that view. The Minister of Trade and Commerce implied, although he did not say it, that the representations that have been read in this chamber coming from the Association of Grain Growers, and coming from the secretaries of the different provincial associations which group together the district associations; that they did not represent the people in any full measure. The Minister of Trade and Commerce did not use these words, but he made the remark that there was a great part of the farming community that was not making its voice heard when we spoke, and when we read these resolutions that we have read in the House from time to time. I read to him, and I will place it again on 'Hansard', a telegram I received this morning from Mr. Fred. W. Greene, secretary of the Saskatchewan Grain Growers' Association, a gentleman holding the very responsible position of secretary for a group of all the Grain Growers' Associations of the greatest grain growing province in the Dominion. If you could concentrate in the expression of one man anything that is worthy of attention, I say the attention of the House and of the minister should be given to a communication from the Secretary of the Grain Growers' Association in the great wheat province of Saskatchewan. This is what he says:

> Farmers are fearful that through the influence of elevator and transportation companies at Ottawa, farmers' friends will be handicapped and their interests sacrificed. Our association is ready to send delegation if in your opinion their cause may be assisted.
>
> (Sgd.) F. W. GREENE.
> Secretary Grain Growers' Association.

I was in hopes there might be time given to these men to come down here and state their case, and they can state it better than any of us in this House can state it, try as we may and repeat as we may at times, our arguments to the wearying of the minister and of hon. gentlemen opposite, a great many of whom do not belong to the west and do not understand details. I say now, and I pledge my word, that the farmers of the west are not satisfied with this legislation. They feel they are getting a gold brick from the government, in this present Grain Act; that it is not bringing about any improvement in their position, but that on the contrary they would be better with things as they are now. The minister has great confidence in the Bill. I asked him the other day to follow me in my remarks with regard to section 123, and he never took the trouble to so much as say whether he saw the point I tried to make or not, and if he did see it, to try and explain it away. I do not think he can deny what I have said with regard to the flimsiness and the inefficiency of section 123. The farmers are afraid of this legislation on a great many scores and there is nothing they are more afraid of than the manipulating of the grades. We have heard the accusation in the House and on the hustings and in the press and in the resolutions of the Grain Growers' Associations everywhere, that the manipulation of our grain is being affected in the terminal elevators at Fort William.

The minister has not yet taken the trouble to show us how this most important clause is going to stop the lessee of an elevator from buying and selling grain and still going scot free. If he admits that it is not intended to do that, we shall know how to deal with it; but if he admits that does not stop that practice, he admits that it is a farce. I hope the minister will even at this late hour, take into consideration the people most concerned in this matter, will see the error of his ways, and agree to admit what I suggest.

Amendment negatived on the same division as the last.

Mr. OLIVER. I beg to move

> That the Bill be not now read a third time, but be referred back to the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of amendment by striking out section 246.

This section reads as follows:

> The expenses of the administration of this Act shall be paid by the imposition of such fees as are necessary for that purpose, and the board, with the approval of the Governor in Council, may fix such fees and determine how and by whom they shall be paid.

In support of the amendment I desire to say, that in my humble judgment, the purport of this section is to authorize the board, with the approval of the Governor in Council, to levy taxation and to make expenditure without the vote of parliament, and that the first part of the section authorizes the board, with the approval of the Governor in Council, to incur expenditure at their own will. Such a provision, I submit, is objectionable under our system of government, and does not make for good government or economical or efficient administration.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I do not wish to detain the House, but I do not think it would be right to let this motion pass without saying one word. From the very inception of this system and the administration of it, I have not heard a word of protest, nor have I seen a word of protest from the farmers, the grain growers, the grain operators, or anybody else in the west against what was their promise at first, and what has been their promise ever since, that they were quite willing to pay all the expenses of the administration of this system. They have paid them largely up to the present time—and I think our hon. friends opposite, are estopped from questioning any further or going at all beyond that—so great is their faith. In fact, the grain growers' delegates this year said to me in my office, and said it before a mixed delegation, that they were perfectly willing to pay all the expenses of the administration of the system, and that if the government went further and adopted a system of government-owned and operated elevators, they were quite willing that all the expenses and a sufficient amount to reimburse the capital expenditure over a series of years should be imposed upon the product itself. Now my hon. friend with all this adverse testimony against him, proposes that this parliament shall go back upon what is really an agreement which has existed for a number of years, an agreement not forced or compelled, but entered into voluntarily and with perfectly free accord. The expense of administering this Act last year was $198,732. This is made up by a charge of 50 cents a carload, a carload of wheat consisting of 1,075 bushels and a carload of oats consisting of 2,000 bushels. That is a mere bagatelle on a carload, but it wipes out an expense which would otherwise come on the general public, an amount of money which could be devoted to much better purposes. That being the case it does not seem to me that my hon. friend has any argument for asking parliament to go back upon a practice and an agreement of the past for the very small reason that he gave in moving his amendment with the consent of the House. As this may be the last opportunity on the Bill, I would like to read a few figures which are illustrative of the quantity of wheat which has been moved this year as compared with the preceeding year.

I make no comment, I merely give the figures. I find that for the month of February, 1912, 19,156,825 bushels of grain have been moved, and in the six months ending February 29th, 1912, a total of 128,846,050 bushels. Comparing that with last year, the six months of 1911 showed a movement of 73,590,100. There has been an increase in the wheat over the same period of 1911, of 38,485,550 bushels, an increase in all grains of 55,255,950, and an increase in cars hauled of 45,111 cars. Considering the difficulties of the season, that I think is a mighty good record for wheat movement during the past six months

Mr. MARTIN (Regina.) With respect to section 246, to which an amendment has been moved, I would like to call the attention of the minister to the fact that we are not objecting, as far as I understand the amendment, to the grain trade carrying the cost of the administration of this Act. What we do object to is that the board is given power to fix such fees as it may deem necessary without any reference whatever to parliament, and in that way the board may possibly swell the cost to any extra extent it likes, and still it has the power to fix the fees to meet that expenditure. The minister may say the fees are subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. Personally I would object to that equally as strongly, because I submit that is giving to the board and to the Governor in Council practically the power to levy taxes on certain parts of this country, and I submit that parliament is the only body that should have that power.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Parliament has in the ultimate analysis the power.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I submit not according to this Bill.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Parliament delegates that authority to the Board of Grain Commissioners and to the Governor in Council, which is the executive whilst parliament is out of session. It is done only and by virtue of an Act which parliament in both Houses approves.

Amendment (Mr. Oliver) negatived on the same division as the last.

Mr. CASH moved:

That the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be read this day six months.

He said: My reason for making this motion is that the western Liberal members have honestly tried to have this Bill put in such shape that it would accomplish that for which the grain growers have been striving for years, and which I think is essential to an honest and fair conduct of the grain business, and they have tried to do this without regard to politics. I cannot say as much for the Conservative members from the west, as it seems to me that their efforts have been directed more towards supporting the minister than to advancing the interests of the grain growers. The House was assured early in this debate by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, that his endeavours would be along

the same lines as outlined above, but what has developed? Why that the minister is playing the game in the interests of the manipulators and not in the interests of the grain growers? I do not think it will take many words to demonstrate this. There are three very essential things the farmers contend it is necessary to have in this Bill in order for them to get a square deal. These are: complete separation of the interests of the grain dealers from that of the terminal and transfer elevators. No mixing of grain whatever after government grading, and equal distribution of cars; and third, the distribution of cars.

I am aware that Bill (Q) of the Senate had its origin with the late government. We all recognized, however, that it was a long way from being perfect and required amendment, which we proposed to make when in Committee of the Whole. The opposition at that time, however, refused to allow us to get into committee with the Bill.

The most objectionable features of that Bill are embodied in the present Bill, and yet the minister refuses to allow us to amend the measure. I refer now to clauses 57, 123 and 207. Amendments to these three sections were suggested by the hon. members from Qu'Appelle, Moosejaw and Dauphin. I am particularly afraid of this Bill, as so much depends upon the sentiment of those who administer the law. We had a sample of this in the case of lumber. A government that is friendly to the grain growers interests would probably interpret this Bill so that it would not injure the grain growers, but in the case of lumber, we find that where there was any excuse to interpret that Bill to benefit the western settler, that it was so interpreted by the Liberal government, but now that the Conservative government is in power, we find that interpretation changed so that at present it is construed and administered in favour of the lumbermen. Therefore I think we should be very careful as to the form in which the Bill is allowed to pass, more especially as the present Bill is so full of opportunities to construe it in favour of the manipulator of grain. I think that it would be safer for the grain growers to have the former Act in force than the present one. I think this Bill should have been made short, plain and effective to protect the interests of the grain growers, upon whose success the prosperity of Canada depends, instead of being cumbersome, ambiguous, and in some instances plainly in favour of the manipulator.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Order

Mr. CASH. I therefore am compelled to move this amendment. If this Bill were to be placed in the hands of a Liberal government to administer, we should not be so much afraid of it. Western grain growers and that class of people, feel that a Liberal government would treat them in a liberal manner and would administer the law with a view to the protection of their interests.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Do I understand that hon. member (Mr. Cash) to say that if this Bill were being put through by a Liberal government the Grain Growers' Association would favour it?

Mr. CASH. I have stated the case as I see it, and I think hon. members should have no difficulty in understanding what I say. This Bill is full of opportunities for the kind of thing I have indicated. It is an ambiguous Bill, full of imperfections. I think the Bill should have been made much shorter so that an ordinary man reading it could understand it. But you take a Bill so long as this and with one clause leading to and depending upon another, the ordinary man cannot understand it. It requires very careful handling. It has been brought down prematurely; it should not have been placed before the House until it had been made more perfect than it is. I believe that is the view of the grain growers of the west —that this Bill is not what they want or what they ought to have. Therefore, I am constrained to move the six months' hoist.

Mr. MACNUTT. I have no hesitation in seconding the motion of the hon. member for McKenzie (Mr. Cash), believing with him that the Bill, as amended, is not so perfect as the old Bill 2 or Bill 32. The farmers for many years have been agitating for government ownership and operation which, they believe, is the only method to prevent fixing prices on the minimum quality of certain grades rather than on the average quality. And until recently hon. members on the other side, including the Prime Minister, believed in the same thing. Let me read a resolution brought down on the 13th of February last by the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) bearing out this idea. The hon. gentleman on that occasion made some remarks, in the course of which he said:

> I do not think there is any diversity of opinion among the grain growers as to how the terminal elevators should be operated in the best interests of the producers. Other methods have been tried but we have all come to the conclusion that the warehousemen must not have an interest in grain.

The hon. gentleman also said:

> I have already said that we had been trying to solve problems connected with the line elevators. But even if we solved those problems in the most successful manner, of what advantage would it be to us if the terminal elevators are left in the hands of people who treat the producer unfairly, who, in fact,

for the last number of years—and the term is none too strong—have been stealing their wheat? (There is absolutely no question about it, because it has been proven by government officers.)

About the time this resolution was before the House, the Bill known as No. Q was going through the Senate. The Bill was distributed among the members and came before this House. It was violently opposed because there was a clause in it with regard to government ownership which was not mandatory. It was found in Bill 32 as section 16 and appears in this Bill as section 13, copied without change. There is nothing in it to indicate that the government intends to operate the terminal elevators. We have had a statement from the Minister of Trade and Commerce on which we rely— rely to a greater extent than the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) appears to have relied upon a statement made by the then Minister of the Interior last summer—that he will experiment with one, two or three of the terminal elevators. That, however, is not government ownership and operation. Let me read some further remarks of the hon. member for Souris, and remarks of other hon. members as well. Hon. gentlemen opposite were blocking Bill No. Q. The hon. member for Souris said:

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I say the chief demand of our farmers is that the government should operate these terminal elevators, and that is denied them. Hon. gentlemen opposite who want to assist the government in getting out of a hole and in neglecting their duty, and the 'Grain Growers' Guide,' may be satisfied with this Bill, but I am not; and if the 'Grain Growers' Guide,' is satisfied then it is not true to the arguments it has used in the last few years in connection with terminal elevators. The farmers of the west have asked for government operation principally; they have asked for government ownership, but to my mind it is not so important who owns the terminal elevators as it is who operates them, and there is absolutely nothing in the Bill that grants government operation. Will the Minister of the Interior answer this straight question: Is it the intention of the government at this session to provide in the estimates for money to buy or lease these terminal elevators and to operate them entirely by the government? If the Minister of the Interior answers that question in the affirmative I will admit there is something in clause 16 of the Bill to meet the demands of the farmers.

The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), then Minister of the Interior said:

Mr. OLIVER. I am not authorized to speak for the government, but I would like to make the bargain with my hon. friend, that if he will let this Bill pass now we may possibly be able to get a sum in the estimates to enable the Bill to be operated in that way.

This, be it remembered, was the second reading of the Bill. The House was not then considering estimates. The hon. member for Edmonton said further:

Mr. OLIVER. I said that if the hon. gentleman and his friends will allow the Bill to pass there would be some object in the government providing a sum in the estimates, but until the Bill passes there is no warrant for the government putting a sum in the estimates.

Another remark of the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) was as follows:

If the minister and the government want to meet the demands of the farmers they have it in their power to do so. This commission business has been on trial for a great many years——

And is evidently going to continue to be on trial for years to come.

—and the farmers have come to the conclusion that it does not meet the case. The farmers refuse to accept or experiment with that system any longer. I shall oppose this Bill until I have some promise from the government that they will this session place in the estimates a sum of money for the acquisition or control of these elevators.

And Mr. Campbell, then member for Dauphin, had this to say:

The farmers for years and years have been asking a certain thing. They sent a large deputation here, and the most important thing they asked for was the government control of terminal elevators. That request was the most strongly urged of any. The matter was discussed at that meeting by the farmers, the grain buyers and the millers, all of whom voiced the opinion that it was an absolute necessity for the grain trade of the west that the government should control the terminal elevators.

And the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) said:

The question is whether the government should own these elevators or not. I hold that they should. I would therefore urge the Minister of the Interior to consult his colleagues and see if it is not possible for him to make a definite statement to-day to the effect that he will provide the means for the government to take the absolute control of these elevators. . . This Bill does not meet the demands of the farmers.

Mr. Lake, then the member for Qu'Appelle, spoke along the same lines. Practically all the Conservative members were in favour of complete government ownership and operation. I allude also to the absolute promises made by the Prime Minister last summer to the farmers of the west. He did not say that they would experiment with regard to government-owned and operated terminal elevators, he said that the time for experiment had passed, and he pledged his government if returned to power to complete ownership and control of the terminal elevators. We do not find in this Bill anything dif-

ferent from the Bill of last year in this respect; we have to rely entirely upon the statement made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce that there will be something in the estimates to purchase one, or two, or possibly three, terminal elevators; but I think he means that is to be an experiment. It is more necessary than ever now that the government should operate these terminal elevators, because the government is actually, under certain rules and conditions of which we know nothing, allowing mixing to take place after inspection, the very thing the farmers have been protesting against for all these years, and almost the only reason why they desire government operation and control. Many Conservative votes were given in the west last year on the strength of the promise made by the Prime Minister, there is no doubt about that. There is another feature that renders the Bill very objectionable, and that is the clause referring to the distribution of cars. This is something that the farmers have been fighting for during many years, and they have now obtained a fair system of distributing cars. Under this Bill, however, as amended and reprinted—because the Bill as it came down in the first place was not so objectionable—it says that the board may in its discretion, order cars to be supplied wherever, after due examination, the board considers it necessary and advisable in order to relieve congestion and facilitate the dispatch of grain. It is left entirely to the option of the commission where the cars shall be sent. Let me give an example to show how it might work out. We will suppose there are half-a-dozen farmers who apply for a car each.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is going a little too far into an analysis of the working of the Act. I think it is permissible only to give reasons why the Bill should be read this day six months instead of now.

Mr. OLIVER. Might I ask that my hon. friend be allowed to give reasons why he does not wish to vote for the third reading of the Bill? He is explaining how the Act as amended does not work in the interest that it was supposed to serve.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member is going over the Bill again, and giving examples of what may happen; I do not think it is permissible to go into an analysis of the Bill in that way on a motion to read the Bill this day six months. But it is permissible to give direct reasons why it should be read this this day six months instead of now.

Mr. MACNUTT. I would like with your permission to read some opinions with regard to this Bill, because the people are taking a great interest in it and are watching it in the west. This is what I find in one of the local papers:

A change in the Grain Act fathered by the Hon. Geo. E. Foster will not meet with much favour in the west. It stipulates that the car distribution be placed in the hands of the Railway Commission instead of as present when cars must be allotted by the agent in order as the names are placed on the order book, except the warehouse commissioner order otherwise in case of emergency.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Will the hon. gentleman not say that he knows the quotation he is reading is absolutely false when it says that the car distribution is left in the hands of the Railway Commission?

Mr. MACNUTT. I am reading what I find in one of the local papers, I am not reading my opinion.

Mr. MEIGHEN. It is untrue to say that the car distribution is placed in the hands of the Railway Commission.

Mr. OLIVER. Is the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) in order when he suggests that my hon. friend from Saltcoats (Mr. MacNutt) is reading some thing that he knows to be false? I submit that is not according to the rules of parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is not according to the rules of parliament to say that an hon. member is reading something which he knows to be false or untrue.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I did not say that.

Mr. MACNUTT. I do not know that this is false.

Mr. MEIGHEN. It is not the Board of Railway Commissioners who has the distribution of cars, the hon. gentleman knows that, but that is what the quotation says.

Mr. MACNUTT. No doubt that is a misprint, it means the Grain Commission instead of the Railway Commission. I will continue reading:

The change will mean that the elevators, railways and banks, in other words the big interests, are given at one swoop all the advantage that the farmers have gained through years of endeavour, and that these said interests working through their agent the Railway Commission——

Here again, there is a mis-print, it should be the Grain Commission.

—will secure concessions to the disadvantage of the producing farmer.

Mr. STEVENS. Will the hon. gentleman state what he is reading from? I think we are entitled to know what paper he is reading from.

Mr. MACNUTT. It is from a paper called the 'Abernethan,' printed in Abernethy, in the district of Saltcoats, and dated the 28th of February last. It has evidently made a couple of misprints, mentioning the Railway Commission instead of the Grain Commission.

The sum total of grain moved will be no greater, but the advantages will be in favour of the interests. Of the western members Sharpe voted with the opposition and Schaffner absented himself.

I think this Bill ought to be read this day six months becouse it is a retrograde measure. Had the Bill gone through as it appeared in the first place, with some minor amendments, I think we would have supported it on this side of the House; but it has been mangled and mutilated so much in committee that I, for one, will not feel like supporting it. It is only a half-hearted measure with regard to government ownership, which is only to be adopted under certain conditions. It permits mixing after inspection. It is also objectionable in regard to the very important matter of car distribution.

Mr. McCRANEY. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) spoke as though there was quite a division of opinion throughout the west with regard to this Bill, and I understood him to say, this with reference to section 207, subsection (e), giving discretion to the Grain Board with regard to the distribution of cars.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I think my hon. friend mistook the point of my remark. I did not hazard an opinion as to whether there was unanimity on that; but I did say that with reference to the sample market there was this division of opinion.

Mr. McCRANEY. There is no doubt that the farmers of the west were convinced that when this government came into power they were going to get government-owned elevators. They had a right to rely on the promises of the Prime Minister, and I hope they will not be disappointed. With government-owned elevators this question of the mixing of grain would not be important because the conditions under which mixing would be permitted would be the most favourable possible. As my hon. friend from Saltcoats has pointed out——

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman is starting on an argument that would carry him a long way from the point. It would be arguing the question over again. I think it would be permissible to argue that on account of provisions with regard to the providing of cars or the mixing of grain being in the Bill, the six months' hoist should be moved, but that would not justify the hon. member in going over the arguments already placed before the House, and on which the House has already expressed its judgment more than once.

Mr. McCRANEY. I, of course, bow to your ruling. One of my reasons for wishing to vote for the six months' hoist is that there is no provision for government ownership, and there is a provision for the mixing of grain at the discretion of the board which is appointed under the Bill. There is also in this Bill no protection against the very point which has been prominent before the grain growers for so many years, namely the unity of interest on the part of those who are interested in line or interior elevators and in terminal elevators. Government ownership would dispose of that question which is a most important one, and I think the greatest danger in this Bill is the provision with regard to the distribution of cars. I have received a number of letters and resolutions from different portions of my riding none of them favouring such provisions as are in the Bill giving the board discretionary powers; they are all opposed to it. I think the farmers of the west believed that this question had been settled some years ago, and now they will be surprised to find that this parliament has practically revoked the protection which they formerly had and has given a discretion which may be very much abused by the board. I have letters from grain growers' associations in my riding at Hanley, Elbow, Aberdeen, Warman, Hawarden, Haleyonia, Ardath and Floral. I believe they represent the sentiments of the grain growers, and it would be their wish, as it is my judgment, that this Bill should be defeated rather than put into force, and that they rely on the provision of the Manitoba Grain Act as it now stands.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). One thing occurs to me in connection with the matter. For the last two or three years, in the House of Commons and throughout western Canada we were promised by the Conservative party government ownership and operation of terminal elevators, and were also promised the control of our natural resources if the Conservative party got into power. In fact the only thing that saved the Conservative party in Saskatchewan and Alberta from complete extinction was the promise made to the electors of government ownership and the return of the natural resources to these provinces. The government has had an opportunity to restore the natural resources to one province, but they have not fulfilled this promise. They had an opportunity to-day when dealing with the Grain Act to give us government ownership and operation of terminal elevators, but we have now in this Bill absolutely nothing more than was in Bill (Q) of the Senate, which was before

the House of Commons in 1910-11. When I look at the hon. members from Manitoba, the member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples), the member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury), the member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner), the member for Lisgar (Mr. Sharpe)—I do not think the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) committed himself to government ownership and operation of terminal elevators—and read their speeches of last year I begin to wonder if they are the same men who were here last session. The resolution moved by the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) on February 13, 1911, which has already been read to the House by the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. MacNutt) favoured government ownership and operation of terminal elevators. The hon. member for Souris said this was absolutely the only remedy. If I had time I could read quotations from the speeches of the hon. member for Macdonald last year in which he said he would not allow this Grain Bill to go through because it did not provide for government ownership and operation of terminal elevators. The hon. members for Selkirk and Lisgar said the same thing, yet what do we find to-day, every one of these gentlemen is supporting practically every clause of the Bill as brought forward by the hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) and not one provision beyond what was contained in Bill (Q) of last year, in favour of government ownership. How do they reconcile their position of to-day with that of the last few years?

Mr. MEIGHEN. Did the hon. member vote for or against that resolution himself?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). The Secretary of State was in Regina last summer and addressing a meeting in the interest of the Conservative candidate said that I voted against government ownership and operation of terminal elevators. He knows, that if he made that statement it was absolutely untrue. I did not vote against government ownership and operation of terminal elevators in this House. My position was stated on a resolution moved by the hon. member for Souris in March or April, 1909. That resolution favoured government ownership. I said then, if I remember correctly, that legislation had been passed in 1908 which had not yet been given a fair trial, and I favoured giving it a fair trial until we could determine whether it was effective or not. In 1911 I took the position when I moved a resolution that that legislation had been given a fair trial and had proved a failure and that some other legislation was desirable. I expressed the opinion then as now that no system other than government ownership would eventually prove effective in handling the grain of the western producer.

Mr. MEIGHEN. But you voted against a resolution.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I did not vote against government ownership and operation of terminal elevators in this House.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Did not you vote against the resolution of the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner)?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). The hon. member need not imagine that he is cross-questioning a witness. I told the hon. member I did not vote against the government ownership and operation of terminal elevators. If he wishes by means of quibbles, to say I did, he is quite welcome to his opinion; no one else will say it, except himself.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is permissible for the hon. member to give reasons why he is in favour of the six months' hoist, but it is not in order that he should branch off from the subject before the Chair as he is now doing.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). The only reason I digressed was because the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) asked me questions, and if I cannot answer them, then do not allow the hon. member to ask them. One of my reasons for voting for the six months' hoist is, that the Bill does not give what the farmers of western Canada want, with regard to government ownership of the terminal elevators.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). Where do you stand on that now?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). If the hon. member (Mr. Sharpe) has not grasped the situation, I cannot enlighten him. I would like to know where he and some hon. members opposite stand on that question now. When I was interrupted in such an unkind way, I was about to refer to what was said by the present leader of the government in respect to that matter, not longer ago than the month of May, 1911, as reported in Volume V. 'Hansard,' 1910-11, page 9515. I presume the right hon. gentleman spoke for the Conservative party, when he then said:

> The declaration of the Minister of the Interior is contained in a very long sentence which is accompanied with a great many qualifications. It does not seem to be very direct or to the point. He speaks of further information. Considering the extent to which these grievances have prevailed in the past and that the government has been informed of these grievances, not only through the public press, and through actions in court, but through inquiry after inquiry, and by delegation after delegation of these men from the west who have come here to press their claims—and I know that delegations were here four or five years ago urging exactly the same thing—it would seem quite reason-

able, quite possible, quite necessary, that the government should have made itself acquainted with the facts and have come to its own conclusion upon these matters long ago. Why is it necessary, after all this investigation, after all these inquiries, after all these delegations, to appoint a board for the purpose of coming to a conclusion as to whether or not the facts are such that the government should embark on a certain policy.

In view of this language, will the hon. the Prime Minister tell me why it is necessary for him now to appoint a board in exactly the same way as the late government proposed to appoint a board in Bill letter Q of the Senate, to investigate whether it was necessary or not, in the interests of western Canada, to enter upon a system of government ownership and operation of terminal elevators. If the right hon. gentleman's argument was good then, it is much better now, because the government of this country have had a year longer to discover what the farmers in western Canada want. I wish to be guided by what the farmers in western Canada do want. I am not going to tell them, as the Minister of Trade and Commerce has told them, what kind of farming they should undertake, when they probably know better than the minister himself wherein their interests lie, and if they say they want the terminal elevators to be handled in a certain way, then, of course, they are the most deeply interested in the question, and we must be guided by the men who use these elevators, and who are producing from the soil of western Canada the millions of bushels of wheat that are exported every year.

I could refer also, to what was said last year when Bill letter Q of the Senate came before the House, by Mr. Haggart, then member for Winnipeg, by the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) by the hon. member for Selkirk——

Mr. SPEAKER. I must again remind the hon. member that he is wandering from the question at issue and it is not permissible for him under the rules to do so. The hon. member is directing his remarks to the past utterances of hon. members instead of giving direct reasons why he proposes voting in favour of this Bill being read six months hence.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). It seems to me that the reasons given by these hon. members in favour of government ownership should have some weight in considering this question now.

Mr. SPEAKER. The reasons which actuated hon. members last year, to a certain conclusion, have, in my opinion, nothing to do with the question now before the House.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I shall bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not further dwell on the inconsistency of the conduct of these hon. members last year as compared with their conduct this year. I believe this Bill, as it at present stands, will deprive the farmers of western Canada of many of the provisions which were contained in the former Bill for their protection. I need only refer to the change in the car distribution system, and to the provision which renders entirely inoperative the prohibition to elevator men to engage in the buying and selling of grain. The object of clause 123 in Bill (Q) of the Senate, was to divorce the warehouse business from the business of buying and selling grain, so as to give the farmers a square deal. But section 123 as it stands now, will not have that effect and it is only a pretence, in so far as it is alleged to have such an effect. As that clause is worded now the prohibition is inoperative, and it defeats the purpose of the Bill. Then, the provision to mix grain is also considered very detrimental to the producers of western Canada. In conclusion, I wish to say that there is so much power given to the Grain Commission, that you might just as well do away with this Grain Act altogether and pass a statue creating the same commission and giving them full power to do anything they like with the grain of western Canada. For these reasons, I will vote for the six months' hoist.

Mr. OLIVER. There is no doubt as to the very great importance of the motion now before the House. It is a most serious matter to move against the passage of a Bill which is an amendment to an Act that has been on the statute-book for a number of years, an Act which relates to the operation of the grain trade, which grain trade amounts to tens of millions of dollars a year, and the increase of which trade is the true foundation of Canada's wealth and prosperity at the present time, and its absolute hope for the future. When a number of the members of this House propose to vote against the passage of this Bill, it is a serious position to take, and, for my own part, it is not taken without due and full consideration. When the Bill was first submitted to the House this session, it was practically the Bill that was passed by the Senate and brought down to this House last session.

That Bill as it came before the House embodied a certain principle. That principle was the protection given by legislative authority to the rights and interests of the grain producer. It is because that principle of the Bill has been reversed by the amendments which have been made to

it during its passage through the committee, that it is desirable in the interest of the producers of grain, in the interest of those for whom the Act was framed, and for whom the Bill as it came before this House was framed, that this Bill should not now become law. It makes all the difference in the world which interest the Bill is intended to conserve. I listened with great attention to the lecture or sermon that was preached by my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce on the second reading of the Bill, or when it went into committee, when he told us of the desire which filled his bosom to have all classes of people who were interested in grain view each other's transactions with confidence, his idea being to promote harmony amongst all the different interests. Well, Mr. Speaker, we all like to see harmony; we all like to see everybody's interests protected; but, as I had occasion to say to him then, I take the liberty to repeat now, it has not yet been possible, in the history of this world, to protect at once the interest of the buyer and the interest of the seller, and it is simply a question of which side this legislation and this government are to be on. Are they going to protect the interest of the producer or the interest of the dealer in the product? That is the question, and it is the whole question; and the Bill as it is now before the House answers that question beyond any doubt. My hon. friend, by the amendments which he has introduced to this Bill in committee, has established the fact that from this time forward this Grain Act is to be in the interest of the grain dealer and in the interest of the grain transporter, and not in the interest of the grain producer. I wish to emphasize the shock and surprise that will be felt by the producers of the west when they realize the action which my hon. friend has seen fit to take. They have with great labour and pains, with the assistance of their representatives on both sides of the House, been successful in building up an Act which to them was satisfactory in large measure. Of course, there is nothing perfect in this world; there is nothing so good but it may be bettered; and in a country where conditions are changing from day to day, that which is perfect to-day may very easily be imperfect to-morrow. Therefore, the producers of grain in the west were asking from time to time for further amendments of the Grain Act and for further and further consideration of their interests, always believing that the mind of parliament on both sides was to give them adequate protection. But in the process of this Bill passing through committee, without due warning at the hands of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, the principle of the Bill has been reversed, and to-day the Bill, instead of standing in the interest of the producer, is standing distinctly in the interests of the grain dealer and the grain transporter. It is in the last degree regrettable that this should be the case. It is elementary that every cent that can be added in the value of the farmers' product to the farmer is a distinct gain to the business community of Canada in every line and in every section of the country. The same is not true in regard to the gain made out of the farmer's product by any of those who handle that product. The legislation that is to be placed on the statute book distinctly withdraws protection from the producer, distinctly and intentionally gives the advantage to the dealer.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must remind the hon. member that he is wandering from the question before the House. Abstract reasoning on economic principles I do not think, applies to the question before the House, which is whether this Bill shall be read to-night or six months hence.

Mr. OLIVER. I am, of course, willing, Mr. Speaker, to sit down, but I was desirous of putting as strongly as I could, the reasons for such an important vote being given, and it does seem to me that the fact that the principle of the Bill has been absolutely reversed in its progress through committee, is a reason sufficient to justify the vote that we propose to give. But I do not wish to trespass on the time of the House, and particularly I do not wish to do otherwise than submit to your ruling.

Mr. MEIGHEN. As the hon. member for Regina, not in the best of temper, referred to myself, when I asked him a question, I crave the indulgence of the House for a very few minutes, even at this late hour.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid the hon. member is about to start a discussion on a subject which cannot be discussed on the motion. I think it would be better to keep strictly within the rule of order.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Mr. Speaker, I certainly will not criticise your ruling as applied to our hon. friends opposite, although I did not invoke it in any way; but inasmuch as a great degree of latitude, in the fact of your ruling, was accorded to them, it seems unfair that we are not to be allowed to reply to the extent to which we are attacked.

Mr. OLIVER. May I interrupt the hon. gentleman to say that he precipitated any attack made upon him by his question?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I made no attack on the hon. member at all.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have only to say that I called the hon. member to order two or three times during the debate, in the

endeavour to bring him back to the subject, and I am only doing the same on both sides of the House.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Then perhaps I might ask the Chair to define the limits within which one may discuss the amendment of the hon. member for Mackenzie.

Mr. SPEAKER. In my judgment this Bill contains certain provisions, and there are other provisions which may not be in it but which it may be considered ought to have been there. The citation of provisions which some hon. gentlemen may think the Bill should have contained, but which are not embodied in it, would be a justifiable ground for speaking and voting against the Bill being read a third time now, or it would be in order giving reasons with respect to provisions which are in the Bill, but which do not fulfil the expectations that were entertained with regard, for instance, to the distribution of cars, the mixing of grain, or the ownership of terminal elevators. If it is considered that these are not proper provisions, that would be justifiable ground upon which to argue for voting for the six months' hoist, any remarks along the lines which I have mentioned would be quite in order and appropriate.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I appreciate the limits which you have laid down, Mr. Speaker, and I conceive them to be quite wide enough for my purpose. The Bill may be criticised and that criticism, I understand, may be made in respect to what the Bill contains and what it does not contain. I am sure no hon. member can complain of that latitude. Hon. gentlemen opposite ask that the Bill be not now read a third time, but that the third reading be given six months from now. They have advanced their reasons. They have been listened to by the hon. member for St. Lawrence division, by the hon. member from one of the constituencies of Quebec who is now asleep, and by the hon. member for Cape Breton, and I have wondered as I have sat and waited, what reason it was that most appealed to these hon. gentlemen from eastern Canada. It is criticised in the first place because it does not, to the satisfaction of hon. gentlemen opposite, provide for the total government operation of all the elevators at Fort William. Is that correct or is it not? It has been criticised by hon. gentlemen opposite from that point of view, and in support of their criticism they have referred to conduct in this House on the 13th of February last. The hon. gentlemen who now criticise this Bill because it does not go far enough to suit them, are the same hon. gentlemen who voted against the proposition which they are now advancing. I rise in my place to warn hon. members——

Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. gentleman within the rules of the House in making this reference, when I was ruled out of order for doing exactly the same a few minutes ago?

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman's introductory remarks would naturally lead him too far. To present to the House discussions which took place last year is, I think, going too far, and the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Martin) was violating the rules along the same line.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I bow to your ruling again, Mr. Speaker, and while I do not criticise the hon. members so much for violating the rules of order of this House as I do for violating the terms of 'Hansard' on the 13th of February, I will abandon the issue on this question. The issue so far raised, then, is whether or not this government is fulfilling its pledges to the people of Canada, by moving fairly, and in justice and equity, toward their fulfilment, sufficiently to warrant us in passing this Bill. In the first place, coming from the source whence it does, I do not think that this criticism will carry much weight among our western people. I think the plain ordinary western farmer looking fairly at this issue, as he does at all issues, will come to the conclusion that he will trust its solution to the party that went substantially towards the fulfilment of its pledges, the first session, rather than to the party that for fifteen years never moved at all to fulfil its pledges. What is the situation at Fort William? The seconder of the amendment endeavoured to show that unless we absolutely take over and own and operate all the elevators at Fort William we were violating our pledge. Now to my mind a pledge is best fulfilled that is fulfilled sanely.

Mr. OLIVER. Was that an insane pledge that was made?

Mr. MEIGHEN. No. A sane pledge is fulfilled sanely; an insane pledge is better not fulfilled at all.

Mr. OLIVER. I ask again was that an insane pledge that was made?

Mr. MEIGHEN. No. If the hon. member has an insane pledge in his mind he must be endeavouring to write an autobiography.

Mr. OLIVER. If that was a sane pledge it should have been fulfilled. If it was an insane pledge its fulfilment was not necessary.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The pledge was a sane one, and will be fulfilled in a sane way. When Bill letter Q was before the House in the last session of the last par-

liament, on the very day before parliament dissolved, it was urged to be put through by the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) who opposed——

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend will have to be veracious. It was not the day before parliament dissolved.

Mr. MEIGHEN. On the day before parliament dissolved——

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I understand it was.

Mr. LANCASTER. It was the very last day we sat in this House.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Yes, the very last day we sat in this House.

Mr. KNOWLES. I rise to a point of order. In the first place it was in the month of May, and parliament was not dissolved until July, but let that pass. The hon. gentleman is not in order in discussing a debate which occurred on that occasion on this matter according to your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I maintain I am distinctly in order according to your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have just been listening to discover how far the hon. gentleman would continue on this line. I am very much afraid that if the hon. gentleman continues in his present course, he will be out of order.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Mr. Speaker, I meant to check myself before transgressing. The Bill is criticised because there is not in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite, sufficient mandatory provision for government operation, but when a similar Bill was before this House, containing the same provision, it was asked to be rammed through on the last day that parliament sat before dissolution——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MEIGHEN. By the same hon. gentleman. Now the hon. member who seconded the amendment read from the speech made at that time by the present hon. member from Edmonton, then the Minister of the Interior, in which that hon. gentleman distinctly refused to commit the then government to government operation on any scale whatever. In that speech in answer to the challenge of the hon. member from Souris, he stated that he had no authority to commit the government of the day to government operation on any scale at all, and yet notwithstanding that statement, he wanted the Bill rammed through this House. In contradistinction to this position is the one taken by the government of the day on this occasion. And the hon. member for Edmonton supported his position, by arguing strongly on the previous day against the resolution of the hon. member for Souris, and against government operation. The hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) did the same, and all asked that the House wait and not launch itself upon the principle so ably argued for by the hon. member for Souris.

Mr. OLIVER. Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to read an extract from what I said on that occasion which will substantiate his statement?

Mr. MEIGHEN. With the utmost pleasure; I was afraid I would be out of order.

In my opinion——

says the Hon. Frank Oliver, who was then the Minister of the Interior:

—the government would be ill advised to rush unwittingly and slightly into such a responsibility as this resolution demands.

The hon. gentleman did not want to rush into the responsibility that this resolution demanded. What did the resolution demand?

That in the opinion of this House the present system of operating terminal and transfer elevators is detrimental to the interests of the western grain producers, and that the government should take immediate steps to operate terminal elevators at Fort William Port Arthur, and the transfer elevators between those terminals and the Atlantic seaboard.

To operate terminal elevators is the principle against which the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) called upon this House to vote; and the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Martin) obediently stood and voted.

Mr. OLIVER. The quotation read by the hon. member (Mr. Meighen) does not bear out his statement.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The hon. gentleman went on to state—and this is an answer to his question:

It is already pointed out that the system of government which has been followed so far, had not proved a failure, but rather a success.

That is what he was in favour of.

The fact that improprieties have been located and those guilty punished, is evidence that inspection does inspect and that the law is being enforced; and I have no doubt that that inspection and enforcement of the law will have due effect in the future management of elevators. However, the government is fully aware of the importance of the question and of the necessity to deal with it thoroughly; and the fact that legislation is in the course of preparation which will em-

body, as far as possible, every means for settling this question, is surely evidence that the government is willing and able to deal with it to the satisfaction of all interests concerned. The government, therefore, ask the support of the House to the policy which is embodied in the measure brought down.

And a part of the policy was to deny to this House that there should be government operation on any scale whatever. In contradistinction to that position, this government comes forward, and through its Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) declares for the government operation of terminal elevators in terms of the resolution of the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner), and states that in the first year, to the extent of one, two, or three elevators at Fort William or Port Arthur, the government will launch upon this principle and this practice. That is why I support the Bill and think that we had better vote for it now than six months hence as is proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite. I can understand these hon. gentlemen if they are true to the convictions expressed last session in this House, if they are true to their bitter antagonism to government elevators, would ask that this Bill be not read now, but that it be read six months or six years from now. That is because they have harked back to the first conviction of their souls; they want this defeated or want it delayed.

Mr. OLIVER. May I ask the hon. member a question? Will he read the section of the Bill that provides for government operation of elevators at Fort William?

Mr. MEIGHEN. I stated, in contradiction to the stand the hon. gentleman took last session, that the present Minister of Trade and Commerce announced as part of the government policy, government operation under the permissive provisions of the Bill. There is all the difference in the world.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). Did not the hon. gentleman hear the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) say to-night that the government expect to properly control the elevators without government ownership and operation?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). No, Sir, he did not.

Mr. MEIGHEN. If hon. gentlemen opposite would listen better and read better, 'Hansard' included, than they do, it would save them from many blunders. What is the situation at Fort William and Port Arthur? There are five railway elevators, that is elevators owned by the railway companies. These elevators, as I understand it, have not been altogether operated by these railway companies, but have been leased on occasion. It is the

policy of this government, as I understand it—and I would like to be contradicted if I am wrong—so far as is possible under existing circumstances to compel the railway companies to operate their own elevators. It is true that the company which is largely the creation of hon. gentlemen opposite, has bound itself by long-distance contracts in defiance of that; and it may be hard, therefore, to compel complete operation by railways of their own elevators; but, so far as practicable, it will be done. And there is no need under these circumstances, as I understand the farmers' demands, to ask that the government operate railway elevators.

Mr. OLIVER. Is that in the Bill?

Mr. MEIGHEN. Surely the hon. gentleman does not suggest that I am out of order.

Mr. OLIVER. Is it in the Bill?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Is the chicken in the egg?

Mr. OLIVER. Is the hon. member (Mr. Meighen) talking about the Bill, or is he talking about something else?

Mr. MEIGHEN. I am talking of the government policy to be applied by this Bill.

Mr. OLIVER. Has that anything to do with the third reading?

Mr. MEIGHEN. Of course it has. The hon. member (Mr. Oliver) is getting more nervous than he usually is at this stage of the night.

Mr. OLIVER. I was compelled to sit down when I had remarks to make as pertinent to the third reading, and more so, than those of the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Meighen).

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it scarcely proper to discuss the ruling of the Chair. The hon. member (Mr. Meighen) was going on a different line. I listened to several hon. members who gave as a reason why they proposed to vote for the six months hoist that the government would not control the elevators. But the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) was endeavouring to prove that they would control the elevators, or attempt to.

Mr. OLIVER. Might I suggest that the hon. member has not undertaken to prove that out of the Bill; he was not touching the Bill, when he undertook to say that, but was dealing with what he thought was going to be the policy of the government.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Surely, the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) as an old parliamentarian would not controvert the proposition that in order to decide whether or not we will vote for a measure that covers a policy, we must get light from that policy. Surely,

the principles of the policy are to be taken into consideration when we are asked to vote for or against the instrumentality by which that policy is to be carried into effect.

Mr. OLIVER. The ruling against me prevented me from making such statements.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I do not think the hon. gentleman is correct in that statement. There are at Fort William and Port Arthur, five private elevators. One of these is owned by the Ogilvie Milling company, and operated in connection with their flour mill; and to operate it without the flour mill would not be, to my mind, a business proposition; and I do not understand that hon. gentlemen opposite argue, or that it is argued, that elevators operated in connection with flour mills should be operated by the government. That would leave only four of the elevators at Fort William under private ownership. And this government is committed to purchase and operate in the first year one, two or three of these elevators. Surely, that is a fair and reasonable advance towards the application of this principle which the Conservative party adopted long previous to the election and which they are now proceeding to put into force and effect. It is argued by my hon. friend, who moved the amendment, and who asks us to wait for six months before passing the Bill, that it contains clauses which are hard to understand. I would like to know what those clauses are. They read to me quite clear, and I am sure that to the perspicuous mind of the hon. member, if he will read them, they will seem equally clear. Why does not he particularise and say what is obscure and ambiguous. He says that one clause conflicts with another. But he does not give instances, he does not give the House the benefit of the information in his mind as to what clause conflicts with some other clause. If he would do that, it is not too late even yet, for amendments. And he told the House, as a last resort, that there are too many clauses. But he did not take us into his confidence and say how many clauses he would permit in the Bill. If he would do that, we might undertake to boil it down to dimensions that, to his mind, would be ample. These are all the reasons advanced. We have sat here two hours and have been asked to defeat this great measure of reform for western Canada, to which these very gentlemen opposite committed themselves last parliament. Bill Q. which hon. gentlemen opposite brought in themselves last year, we are now asked to defeat, in defiance of a pledge of the government that they are going to put into operation the principle of government owned elevators. We are told that the Bill is not mandatory enough in the matter of government elevators, that it is too long, that the clauses are ambiguous and conflict with each other; but no instances are given. Now let us put this Bill into effect. As hon. gentlemen, the hon. gentlemen who moved the amendment said, while it may not be as welcome as many of the farmers would like, it might have some good points in it. I apprehend that after this Bill has been in operation two years it will be regarded by the western farmers as one of the most popular measures on the statute-book. It may be true that hon. gentlemen opposite are opposing it because it is a Conservative measure. I believe that is the secret of the whole thing, it is because it is not in the hands of their own friends that they are objecting to it. But the farmer of the west as he reads this Bill, and as he receives benefit from it, will give credit to this government who, true to its pledges, has put it into operation. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to give the Bill a fair trial, knowing as they do that the government is responsible for the measure and for its effects.

Mr. KNOWLES. The hon. gentleman has dealt with certain alleged objections to the acceptance of the amendment of my hon. friend from Mackenzie (Mr. Cash), but he has not said a word about the forcible objections against it, which have been raised on this side of the House. The hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) showed great agility in avoiding the points brought before the House by my hon. friend from Mackenzie. Why did he not tell us that one of the main points was because it would interfere with that very precious thing in the hands of the farmer, namely, a square deal in the distribution of cars? I read this afternoon a telegram saying that the grain growers of Saskatchewan are afraid that the elevator interests and the transportation interests have got the ear of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and that he is turning a deaf ear to the interest of the farmers. We affirm that any grain legislation along the line of clause (E) of section 207 is made at the bidding of the interests, and is contrary to the desires and interests of hundreds of thousands of farmers. But the member for Portage la Prairie did not touch that point at all. Last session he brought forward a resolution to remove the duty on agricultural implements, but since this government came into power he has maintained an absolute silence on that subject. Why does he not have the fairness to his constituents that the member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) and Lisgar (Mr. Sharpe) have shown? They are not afraid to get up and vote against the government, because

they know that their constituents desire that clause (E) should not be in this Bill. All credit to them, and I hope the day will come when we will find them voting with us on every question when we are voicing the views of the farmers. The member for Portage la Prairie says that we voted against government elevators at a certain time, and we are complaining to-day because government elevators are not provided for in this Bill, as if we were inconsistent. Our protest is made against the men who govern this country making promises before election day and then turning their backs on them after election day. I take the stand that when a Prime Minister goes through the country and makes the promise he did, he is in duty bound to fulfil it. In making that promise he no doubt saved a few seats in the prairie provinces; if he had not made it there would be much fewer hon. gentlemen here from Manitoba sitting on the government side. If the Prime Minister had not promised control and operation of elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur in the event of his party attaining power—

Mr. BRADBURY. We will have government ownership and operation of elevators.

Mr. KNOWLES. The hon. gentleman means to say that he thinks we will have, because I do not think any one else in the House is so foolish as to believe we will have.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. KNOWLES. Well, I will say unwise. Let us speak of these elevators, one, two, or at most, three. Let me read what the Prime Minister said while speaking in the district represented by the hon. member who has just taken his seat:

> I have arrived at the conclusion that the result can only be attained by state control and operation of the terminal elevators. We propose to carry out that policy without delay if returned to power.

Will my hon. friend say that that promise is carried out by a statement from the Minister of Trade and Commerce that there will be a vote in the supplementary estimates, after the government has been in power since the 10th of October? Is that carrying out the promise?

> We propose to carry out that policy without delay if returned to power.

What does 'without delay' mean? It means no delay. But there has been delay already in carrying out that promise. We have the estimates down here, two sets of them, and a great many things have been done. They brought down their Tariff Commission without delay.

Mr. KNOWLES.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. KNOWLES. I am illustrating what 'without delay' means. It means in the most speedy manner possible, the speedy attainment of that which has been promised by the Prime Minister. We had some resolution in favour of the speedy establishment of a navy.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. KNOWLES. And that I am right in saying that the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) can surely be scarcely sincere when he says that this same promise is being carried out sanely, when up to the present day we have nothing official from the government in the way of carrying out their promises. That is the quarrel I have with this government, that they have been elected and have got the support of many people in my riding, for instance, who would not have voted Conservative except for the promise of government ownership and operation of terminal elevators. Many people thus voted for hon. gentlemen opposite. Even the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) cannot deny that he got many a vote because he was in a sense the father of this policy of government ownership and operation of terminal elevators, and because the Prime Minister made that promise. I submit that this has been a legitimate criticism of the government, that they have not fulfilled that promise. Hon. gentlemen opposite gibe at any one asking the right hon. gentleman and his government to keep their promises. Let us see what the right hon. gentleman said he would do if he did not keep his promise. Speaking at Battleford he said:

> If it should be the will of the people of Canada to impose upon me the great responsibility of being called upon to form a government in Canada, and after that government has been formed the policy I have outlined will be carried out by the government as I have stated, or one man of the government will go out of public life.

Whatever may be his view to-day with regard to the promises he made, I submit that he then felt his promises were such that the people of Canada had a right to expect their fulfilment. I submit to my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie that he has not touched the two objections we have to the third reading. That in the first place we oppose any change in the distribution of cars to the grain growers in the west, and in the second place that we enter our protest against the action of the Prime Minister who promised before the elections that we would have government ownership and operation of elevators, but up to the present we see nothing official in the way of carrying out that promise.

House divided on amendment.—Mr. Cash.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Béland,	Loggie,
Bickerdike,	Lovell,
Boivin,	MacNutt,
Brouillard,	McCraney,
Brown,	McCrea,
Burrell,	McMillan,
Cardin,	Marcile (Bagot),
Carroll,	Martin (Montreal,
Cash,	Ste. Mary's),
Champagne,	Martin (Regina),
Chisholm (Antigonish),	Michaud,
Chisholm (Inverness),	Molloy,
Clark (Red Deer),	Neely,
Cruise,	Pacaud,
Delisle,	Papineau,
Demers,	Robb,
Douglas,	Seguin,
Fortier,	Sinclair,
Gauvreau,	Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Kay,	Tobin,
Knowles,	Turgeon,
Lapointe (Kamouraska),	Warnock and White (Victoria Alta.)—44.
Lapointe (Montreal, St. James),	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Achim,	Kidd,
Alguire,	Lennox,
Ames,	Lesperance,
Armstrong (Lambton),	Lewis,
Armstrong (York, O.),	McKay,
Arthurs,	McLean (Queen's,
Baker,	P.E.I.),
Ball,	Meighen,
Barker,	Merner,
Barrette,	Mondou,
Bellemare,	Monk,
Bennett (Calgary),	Morphy,
Bennett (Simcoe),	Munson,
Best,	Nicholson,
Blain,	Osler (Sir Edmund),
Blondin,	Paquet,
Borden,	Paul,
Boulay,	Porter,
Bowman,	Rainville,
Brabazon,	Reid (Grenville),
Bradbury,	Roche,
Broder,	Schaffner,
Burnham,	Sexsmith,
Clare,	Sharpe (Lisgar),
Clark (Bruce),	Shepherd,
Clarke (Wellington),	Staples,
Clements,	Steele,
Cockshutt,	Stevens,
Crocket,	Stewart (Hamilton),
Cromwell,	Stewart (Lunenburg),
Crothers,	Sutherland,
Davidson,	Taylor,
Doherty,	Thoburn,
Elliot,	Thomson (Yukon),
Elson,	Thornton,
Fisher,	Walker,
Foster (Toronto, N.),	Wallace,
Gauthier (Gaspé),	Webster,
Guilbault,	White (Renfrew),
Hartt,	Wilcox and
Hazen,	Wilson
Henderson,	(Wentworth).—86
Jameson,	

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Messieurs	
Stanfield,	Pardee,
Carrick,	Lapointe (Montreal),
White (Leeds),	Emmerson,
Haggart,	Gordon,
Rhodes,	Macdonald,
Fowler,	Pugsley,
Bristol,	Charlton,
Smyth,	Clarke (Essex),
Middlebro,	Nesbitt,
Robidoux,	Carvell,
Edwards,	Turriff,
Marshall,	McCoig,
Rogers,	Oliver,
Goodeve,	Ross,
Perley,	McKenzie,
Kemp,	Boyer,
Tremain,	Buchanan,
Aikins,	Bureau,
Cochrane,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Hughes,	Proulx,
Lamarche,	Champagne,
Foster (King's),	Kyte,
Currie,	Neely,
Beattie,	Guthrie,
Donnelly,	McCrea,
Hepburn,	German,
Lalor,	Devlin,
Northrup,	Murphy,
Boyce,	Richards,
Pelletier.	Lemieux.
Forget,	Wilson (Laval),
Sevigny,	Lachance.

Amendment—(Mr. Cash)—negatived.

Mr. BOIVIN. The hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Thoburn) and the hon. member for Nicolet (Mr. Lamarche) were not in the chamber when the amendment was read.

Mr. LAMARCHE. While, my hon. friend (Mr. Boivin) did not see me, I was on the stairs here and I heard everything of the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER. Did the hon. member for North Lanark hear the question put?

Mr. THOBURN. I was coming in the door when you put the question.

Mr. BOIVIN. I understand the rule of the House to be that an hon. member should be in his seat when the question is put.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is the duty of the Speaker to inquire if an hon. member heard the question put. It is for the hon. member to say 'yes' or 'no'. If he says 'yes', he has the right to vote.

Mr. OLIVER. May I inquire if the vote of the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Thoburn) is to be counted.

Mr. SPEAKER. If I understood the hon. member correctly, he said he was within the precincts of the House and heard the question put.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. SPEAKER. Did the hon. member for North Lanark hear the question put?

Mr. THOBURN. Yes sir.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time and passed.

Mr. BORDEN moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. OLIVER. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. BORDEN. We will take any of the Bills and resolutions on the order paper that are ready and then Supply.

Mr. BELAND. Will the Manitoba Boundary Bill come up to-morrow?

Mr. BORDEN. Yes, I believe that is first for consideration to-morrow and then we will go on with the other Bills and afterwards Supply.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.40 a. m., Tuesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 12, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Hon. G. P. Graham, member elect for the electoral district of South Renfrew was introduced by the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Duncan Ross.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 125) to incorporate the Western Dominion Railway Company.—Mr. Martin (Regina).

Bill (No. 126) to incorporate the Universal Eyesight Insurance Company.—Mr. McLean (Queens).

Bill (No. 127) to incorporate the Canadian Public Health Association. — Mr. Schaffner.

Bill (No. 128) to incorporate the Montreal Transcontinental Railway Company.—Mr. Coderre.

Bill (No. 129) respecting the Alberta, Peace River and Eastern Railway Company.—Mr. Chabot.

Bill (No. 130) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Currie.

Bill (No. 131) for the relief of Isobell Isaac.—Mr. MacNutt.

Bill (No. 132) respecting Mexican Interurban Electric Traction Company, Limited, and to change its name to 'Mexican Interurban Electric Railway Company, Limited.' —Mr. Macdonell.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. MURPHY. Before the orders of the day are called I would like to direct the attention of the Secretary of State, and that of also the Postmaster General, to a number of returns that are in arrears. I would like particularly to have a return relating to the Post Office Department brought down, the order for which was passed on the 12th of February. It stood in the name of the hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Kay), relating to certain contracts and orders given out by the Post Office Department, and asked for the names of companies, firms and individuals to whom payments had been made.

Mr. PELLETIER. I will make a note of it.

EXTENSION OF BOUNDARIES—MANITOBA.

On the order: Third reading of Bill (No. 115) to provide for the extension of the boundaries of the province of Manitoba.—Mr. Borden.

Rt. Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister). My hon. friend the member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), when the Bill was in committee the other day, pointed out to me what he understood to be an uncertainty about the description of the boundaries in one respect. I brought the matter to the attention of the Dominion geographer and also to the attention of the Dominion astronomer. They looked into the matter very carefully, and while they are inclined to think that the description as at present contained in the Bill is free from ambiguity, they have nevertheless suggested an alteration which, I think, will remove any possible doubt. For that reason I propose to send the Bill back to the committee for the purpose of making that correction. I desire to have it sent back for the purpose also of striking out section 7, which, after looking at the matter somewhat carefully, I believe to be unnecessary I will explain my reasons when we are in committee. I move:

That the order for the third reading of Bill (No. 115) be discharged and that the said Bill be referred back to Committee of the Whole House with power to amend the description of the boundaries set forth in the third section and with power to strike out the seventh section.

Motion agreed to, and House went again into committee on the Bill.

Mr. BORDEN. If my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) will direct his attention to section 3 and lines 19 and 20, he

will observe the words to which he alluded the other day 'to a certain monument thereon.' The hon. gentleman made the suggestion, to which I attached importance, that the monument was not in any way described. I find on consultation with the Dominion astronomer that the boundary at that point may be changed somewhat by the commission of which Dr. King is a member, to the advantage and convenience of both countries. My hon. friend will observe from the map I have sent him, that the boundary runs north, but it is not by any means in a straight line through the lake. I do not know for what reason that is, but I understand from the Dominion astronomer that the monument to which allusion has been made in the description may eventually, after the commission has reported, be placed at another point. Therefore, I move that the words 'to a certain monument thereon,' in the 19th and 20th lines be struck out and the words 'to the most northerly point thereof,' be substituted. With that amendment, according to the written report I have from the Dominion astronomer, the section will not be capable of misinterpretation.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If I understand the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) this would make that point the most northerly point of the boundary line?

Mr. BORDEN. The international boundary—yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, I think that will be sufficient.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We all understand what is meant by the language of the Bill which is to make the international boundary line the boundary of Manitoba. After having conferred with my right hon. friend and reading the Bill, it seems to me that it would have been quite easy to fix the point by a certain monument placed by a certain authority. But we agree upon what is meant and I think the language is sufficient.

Mr. BORDEN. I think the words should disappear, because that monument may be changed and located in another place on account of the slight rectification of the boundary line which, if it is made, I understand, will be of advantage and convenience to both countries. The map I handed to my hon. friend from St. John, indicates how the international boundary line runs. The point referred to is the most northerly point on the international boundary line. It seems to me that by continuing the line due north—that is the western boundary of Ontario and the eastern boundary of Manitoba—we cannot possibly have any confusion or misinterpretation.

Motion agreed to.

On section 7:

7. Nothing in this Act shall in any way prejudice or affect the rights or properties of the Hudson's Bay Company as contained in the conditions under which that company surrendered Rupert's Land to the Crown.

Mr. BORDEN. I beg to move that section 7 be struck out. The reason is that there is already included in the Manitoba Act, section 34, exactly the same words. I have looked into the question very carefully, and I find that on the three occasions on which the boundaries of a province have been extended, this section has never been introduced. In the Manitoba Act of 1877, which slightly extended the boundaries of the province, in the Manitoba Act of 1881 which extended the boundaries of the province, and in the Act of 1898, which extended the boundaries of the province of Quebec, no such provision was introduced; doubtless for the reason that I have already alluded to. Therefore, I move that the section be struck out.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think the amendment is well designed. There was no necessity to include that section at all, because, I believe the rights of the Hudson's Bay Company are reserved by Imperial statute. Therefore, this is surplusage. My right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) is not anxious to load his Bill with surplusage, and especially in view of certain other amendments to come later on.

Mr. BORDEN. Nothing unnecessary should be introduced in the Bill.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill as amended reported.

Mr. BORDEN moved third reading of the Bill.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, Prince Edward Island). Some days ago, when we were in committee, I drew the attention of the government to the case of Prince Edward Island, as regards this Bill, and I did so, relying on the business judgment and good sense of the Minister of Finance (Mr. White) and I hope also of the Prime Minister, that my representations would be heeded. But I have not yet received any assurance to that effect, and therefore, I beg to present my case again. Manitoba, under this Bill, is getting a large sum of money in lieu of her public lands, because she has no public lands, that amount is based upon the population of Manitoba, and will be increased from time to time as her population increases. Now Prince Edward Island stands on exactly the same basis in regard to that matter. That province has no public lands, and never had. This statement can be proved by referring to the statutes of 1873, and to the agreement under which that province came into con-

federation. Because she had no public lands, she was given a subsidy of $45,000 a year, which is less than 50 cents per head of the population of that province, while Manitoba is to get about $1.25 per head of her population. Therefore, I say in all fairness, the province of Prince Edward Island should be treated in the same way as any other province in the Dominion of Canada, which has no public lands. She stands on exactly the same basis as the three prairie provinces. It seems to me the case is so clear that it only needs to be stated to receive the consideration of the government and of parliament. If Prince Edward Island were treated on the same basis as Manitoba, instead of $45,000, she should receive $120,000. And inasmuch as Manitoba's subsidy is dated back to 1908, I claim in all fairness that the same treatment should be accorded to Prince Edward Island, and that she be given a subsidy dating back to 1908, in which case she would receive in arrears about $300,000. Now I would like to ask the government if they will deal with the case of Prince Edward Island during the present session. There is no reason in the world why her case should be postponed, and why it should not be dealt with at the same time as that of Manitoba. The fact that Manitoba is some 3,000 miles distant affords no reason why she should be dealt with immediately, and the case of Prince Edward Island should be postponed. I should be pleased indeed if the Prime Minister would give me an assurance that he will deal with the case of Prince Edward Island this session, and give her the same treatment that he is giving to Manitoba. And if not, why not?

Mr. MONDOU. I beg to move the following amendment, of which notice has been given:

That Bill (No. 115) be not now read a third time, but be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House in order that the following clause be inserted therein, after clause 7 of the said Bill:—

7a. Section 22 of the Manitoba Act, 1870, 33 Vic., chapter 3, shall apply to the territory added to the province under the provisions of this Act, with the substitution for paragraph 1 of said section 22, of the following paragraph:—

1. Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational or separate schools, which any class or persons have, at the date of the passing of this Act, by law or practice, in the territory added to the province under the provisions of this Act.

Mr. ETHIER. I ask that the amendment be read in French.

(The assistant clerk read the amendment in French).

Mr. HUGHES (Kings).

Mr. A. A. MONDOU (Yamaska). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, in moving this amendment, I don't intend to address the House at any length. The other evening I had the occasion in Committee of the Whole to make such remarks as in my opinion would justify this amendment. I now deem it preferable to allow a free discussion and to await the verdict of the House upon the amendment which it is my privilege to offer, hoping that the hon. members will acknowledge its importance and give it their approval.

Mr. P. E. LAMARCHE (Nicolet). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, there is a principle as to which I think every member of the House must agree; that is that we are in duty bound to see that the constitution of Manitoba shall apply not only to Manitoba as it is now, but to the whole province, including the new territory which is to be annexed.

The amendment which the hon. member from Yamaska has just moved proposes to render operative clause 22 of the constitution of Manitoba respecting the protection of educational rights.

The first objection in the part of some hon. members of this House will probably be that the constitution of Manitoba, as a whole, would be operative even in the absence of any clause to that effect.

As a principle, I grant that the very fact of annexing this new territory to Manitoba should put it under the constitution of 1870, and that all constitutional clauses applying to Manitoba should apply as well to the new territory to be added.

But, in this case, the operation of this principle becomes completely inefficient for the protection of educational rights, because subsection 1 of section 22 safeguarding the minority's rights acknowledges only those rights which existed at the time of confederation and within the proper limits of Manitoba. That section reads as follows:

Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law or practice in the province at the union.

Consequently, there is in that section two restrictions which render it impossible to enforce this statute in an efficient manner in the new territory which is to be added to the province.

The amendment offered by my hon. friend the member from Yamaska alters that section without changing its nature or meaning, so as to remedy those deficiencies, thus permitting the constitution of Manitoba to become operative in the new territory. Were it not for that necessary change, a resident of that part of Keewatin annexed to Manitoba would later on

come here and ask for the schools of that district the protection afforded by subsection 1 of section 22, and we would answer him: Section 22 affords you protection, because you had no rights at the time of the union nor in the former territory of Manitoba.

I may be asked whether the government of Canada is authorized to change or alter the constitution of Manitoba. Section 6 of the British North America Act, 1871, reads as follows:

Except as provided by the third section of this Act, it shall not be competent for the parliament of Canada to alter the provisions of the last mentioned Act of the said parliament of Canada, in so far as it relates to the province of Manitoba, or of any other Act hereafter establishing new provinces in the said Dominion, subject always to the right of the legislature of the province of Manitoba to alter from time to time the provisions of any law respecting the qualification of electors and member of the Legislative Assembly, and to make laws respecting elections in the said province.

There is no doubt that by that section the federal government is debarred from altering in any way the constitution of Manitoba. However, there is a restriction provided by the words 'except as provided by the third section of this Act.' Now the third section exactly covers the case with which we are dealing to-day, that is the increase in the area of a province and the operation of any such increase. Section 3 reads as follows:

3. The parliament of Canada may from time to time, with the consent of the legislature of any province of the said Dominion, increase, diminish, or otherwise alter the limits of such province, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the said legislature, and may, with the like consent, make provision respecting the effect and operation of any such increase, diminution or alteration of territory in relation to any province affected thereby.

So we have, Mr. Speaker, in section 3 which restricts section 6, the authority residing in the federal government of adding such a saving clause as my hon. friend from Yamaska suggests in his amendment; subject, however to the subsequent acceptation of the whole thing by the legislature of Manitoba.

It may be said that such a provision would be inconsistent with section 92 of the British North America Act, whose purpose is to determine the exclusive powers of provincial legislatures.

That objection would be well founded if what the present motion proposes was inconsistent with any provision of section 92 of the British North America Act. But there is nothing inconsistent with the powers of the province of Manitoba in the amendment of my hon. friend from Yamaska. The amendment embodies no new legislation. It merely renders legally operative a section of the constitution of Manitoba safeguarding the right to separate schools. Moreover, the right is acknowledged in the same manner and to the same extent by section 10 of the Northwest Territories Act which is now in force in the district of Keewatin.

The Canadian constitution itself, the British North America Act, also acknowledges the same principle by section 93. Consequently, there is no invasion upon the powers of the province of Manitoba. The laws of Manitoba are merely made operative to the furthest limits of its new territory.

The amendment of my hon. friend from Yamaska is only the legal chain necessary in order that those who live in the present territory of Keewatin shall not, at the same moment, be deprived of the protection given in section 10 of the Northwest Territories Act, which will no more exist when the annexation takes place, and shall not be deprived either of the protection mentioned in section 22 of the Manitoba Act. We must not place the population of this new territory between two legislations, one which is disappearing and the other which, without this amendment will be absolutely ineffective and useless.

It is claimed also that the federal law which governs recently the territories, will exist up to the time when a provincial law will be enacted in its place, and then, if the legislature of Manitoba, in this new legislation, does not respect section 22 of the constitution of the province, recourse might be had to the remedial bill.

To begin with, I do not admit that the present laws of Keewatin could continue to exist after the annexation. This principle is true according to the international law, when we deal with a conquered country; then the existing laws remain in force up to the time the new legislator enacts a positive law. But in the present case we must look at the constitutional theory. The laws that we have just discussed, the Keewatin laws, just as the Manitoba laws, are all territorial laws; and if we annex a portion of one territory to another, we at the same time free that portion from the legislative authority under which it was before to put it, without reservation, under the laws of the territory to which we annex it and which becomes thus the competent authority 'ratione loci.'

If it is true that this annexed portion of territory should continue to have the same laws as before the annexation, there would be thus two legislations in force in the same country; it would be a legal anomaly.

But even supposing that this theory is true, and that provincial legislation would be necessary to change the existing law, this provincial legislation would not in any way permit the remedial bill to apply to the annexed portion, for the good reason that without the present amendment, the constitution of Manitoba does not protect any minority rights in the new country, as already mentioned; and the Manitoba government would not be bound to protect the educational rights of the minorities in the Keewatin, because they are not included in the rights mention in section 22, as we find it presently in the statute.

The principle which is contained in the amendment of my hon. friend is not a new one. It has always been respected and protected by restrictive enactments since the confederation inclusively, up to the present time, when new territories were created or annexed. Let us read the first subsection of section 93 of the British North America Act:

(I) Nothing in any such laws shall prejudicially effect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law in the province at the union.

We find the same principle in section 22 of the Manitoba Act, when this province was created. It reads thus:

(I) Nothing in any such laws shall prejudicially effect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law in the province at the union.

We find the same principle in section 17 of the constitution of Alberta:

(17) Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially effect any right or privilege with respect to separate schools which any class of persons have at the date of the passing of this Act, under the terms of chapters 29 and 30 of the Ordinances of the Northwest Territories, passed in the year 1901, or with respect to religious instruction in any public or separate school as provided for in the said ordinances.

The same enactment is found also in article 17 of the constitution of the Saskatchewan:

(17) Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially effect any right or privilege with respect to separate schools which any class of persons have at the date of the passing of this Act, under the terms of chapters 29 and 30 of the Ordinances of the Northwest Territories, passed in the year 1901, or with respect to religious instruction in any public or separate school as provided for in the said ordinances.

The same principle is also enacted, though the terms differ in section 14 of the Yukon Act:

The Commissioner in Council shall pass all necessary ordinances in respect to education; but it shall therein always be provided that a majority of the ratepayers of any district or portion of the territory or of any less portion of subdivision thereof, by whatever name the same is known, may establish such schools therein as they think fit, and make the necessary assessment and collection of rates therefor; and also that the minority of the ratepayers therein, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish separate schools therein, and in such case, the ratepayers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic separate schools shall be liable only to assessments of such rates as they impose upon themselves in respect thereof.

This principle, Mr. Speaker, is the principle of equity and justice; it has always been respected since confederation in all our federal laws. The application of this principle, specially in the present case, could hardly be called coercion to a province of the confederation. On the contrary it is the principle which is consecrated in the very constitution of that province, and also in the territorial laws of the country which we are about to annex. We ask only from this House to put the necessary hyphen so that these two similar legislations should be as soldered together in such a way that they would be applied completely and uniformly to all the territory without distinction whatever.

If this House rejects this amendment, which I believe absolutely necessary, if we want to extend to the new territory the constitutional principle of the Manitoba Act in matters of education, then let us at the same time deprive it of the rights enacted in the law on the territories, which will no more exist; then we will have sanctioned the principle that for the first time we will have isolated a part of our national domain, without granting to it the benefit of uniform legislation which has always been followed up to the present time, and which protects all the minorities, whether Catholic or Protestant.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I do not rise for the purpose of discussing in detail the amendment proposed by my hon. friend from Nicolet (Mr. Lamarche), but I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) to a question that appears to me to require explanation in connection with this amendment. This Bill which has come out of committee does not contain any provision whatever with regard to the enactment of legislation which is to be in force in the province of Manitoba. I assume that the legislation in the greater Manitoba to be created under this Act will be made by the province under the powers which were conferred upon that province by the Act of 1870. That

being so, the province of Manitoba had the power, under section 22, to deal with education in the way in which the Act of 1870 provides. It is perhaps as well I should read this section in order that we may understand its object and effect. Section 22 of the Manitoba Act is as follows:

In and for the province, the said legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject and according to the following provisions:—

1. Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law or practice in the province at the union.

This is the section which my hon. friend proposes to amend by substituting the words which appear in the Votes and Proceedings of to-day as well as in the motion in the hands of Mr. Speaker. subsection 2 is as follows:

An appeal shall lie to the Governor General in Council from any Act or decision of the legislature of the province, or of any provincial authority, affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education.

Subsection 3, I need not read in detail because it contains in terms the power which is reserved to the federal parliament to entertain an appeal from the minority in the province in case it appears that their rights are prejudically affected, the section so well known on account of the fact that it was interpreted by the Privy Council in what has long been known as the Manitoba school case. It would appear to me that the amendment of my hon. friend from Nicolet is one which is entirely superfluous because, if this section 22 of the original Manitoba Act is the law in the province to-day and will, as I assume, be the law of that province when Keewatin is added to it, then the proposal of my hon. friend that we should pass a resolution declaring that section 22 of the Manitoba Act should apply to the added territory is entirely unnecessary. That seems to me to be the view which ought to be entertained. I rise for the purpose of asking the Minister of Justice to discuss this question which I think is one of very great importance, and I think the House is entitled to know what the opinion of the government is upon this question as well as on the matter contained in the resolution.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice). Mr. Speaker, replying first to the question put to me by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), I think I may say that I quite concur in his suggestion that the amendment moved is superfluous. Of course, if there do not to-day exist rights in the annexed territory susceptible of being protected by article 22 of the Manitoba Act, then the amendment can serve no practical purpose. If, on the other hand, there be rights in existence in the territory sought to be added to the province of Manitoba at the time of the coming into force of this Act, as described in article 22 of the Manitoba Act, for myself I would have no doubt that these rights would be protected by section 22 of the Manitoba Act. It is quite true that section 22 of the Manitoba Act, when it spoke of the time of the union, necessarily had in view the territory that constituted the province of Manitoba as then formed, and in speaking of the date of the union it was necessarily speaking of the day at which that new province of Manitoba as then formed became a member of the confederation. I do not think that it is susceptible of doubt that the Manitoba Act, the Act that creates and governs Manitoba to-day, will govern the Manitoba that shall be composed of the old territory, and of the added territory just as it governed the original territory. I do not think there can be any doubt that it will have application in the new territory as it had in the old and, that being so, you could only apply it, so far as the new territory is concerned, as the facts permit of its application. It manifestly is applied to this additional territory as from the passing of the Act for section 22 could have no possible application at the period of the original union, except to the originally constituted province to the territory comprised in it, at the original entry of the province into the Dominion. It, therefore, must either have no application throughout the territory of the extended province, the territory added to the province by its becoming extended, or it must apply to it as from the date when the extended or enlarged province comes into the union. The Bill which is submitted hereafter defining the limits of the extended territory of the province, adds:

All the land embraced by the said description not now within the province of Manitoba, shall, from and after the commencement of this Act, be added thereto and the whole shall, from and after the said commencement, form and be the province of Manitoba.

So that we have a starting point from which this increased territory embodied in the province of Manitoba first comes into the union, and, that being so, if there be rights in that portion of the territory such as are contemplated by section 22 of the statute—and it is only such rights that can be preserved as I understand it—those rights would be protected under section 22 just as fully and effectively as they

possibly could be protected under the amendment which is proposed. I think this fully answers the question of the hon. member for Pictou. It, moreover, affords in my judgment sufficient reason why the amendment of the hon. member for Yamaska should be rejected.

It is perhaps, however, proper that I should deal more fully with the question which that amendment raises.

I shall not weary the House by going over statutes that have already been cited. After all the question that presents itself in connection with this amendment and with the measure as a whole, so far as the existence of school rights are concerned in it, is purely and simply a question of law. Personally, I am in full and entire sympathy with the sentiment that stands behind the action of the gentlemen who have felt it their duty to move this amendment and to express themselves in connection with the school matter as opposed to the action of the government. Rights are very sacred things; they are sacred things when they are the rights of a majority, they are sacred things when they are the rights of a minority, they are sacred things when they are the rights of an individual. My hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) the other evening in a more or less sneering way attributed the action of my hon. friend the member for Nicolet, to some extent to promises which he suggested I had made that gentleman. I have made no promises to that gentleman or to anybody else, but with or without promises I would feel it just as much my duty to stand up here to speak in defence of rights of any class, be it large or small, of the people of this country as if I had pledged myself in the most emphatic way. The action of the government in this matter is not taken because the government does not recognize as incumbent on it the duty of protecting the constitutional rights of every class of people in this country. It is not a wise policy on the part of any class of people to raise an outcry for the protection of rights which they represent to be attacked without first ascertaining whether there are such rights and whether in consequence it is possible that there be such an attack, to be repelled. I know that many men in dealing with this subject have not been chary of expressing their most unqualified judgments on the motives of other men by reason of the course they took with regard to this particular question. I do not judge the motives of any man, I recognize the absolute sincerity of men who take very strong ground that there is a duty upon this government in this regard. I recognize their absolute sincerity even when I cannot admire the violence of their language. My own experience is that strong cases do not need strong language to support them and that weak cases never gather strength from it.

I have said that it is not good policy for any class in the community to start an outcry against an alleged attack on rights without first verifying the existence of the rights and the fact of their being attacked and put in danger. I have said that whether there are or are not rights to be protected in this territory is a pure question of law, because I quite understand that nobody is contending that unless there be constitutional rights vested by law in some portion of these territories, there is anything to be discussed. We are not here to discuss what may be our respective views with regard to the rights of people as an abstract question concerning the education of their children. If we were, I have no disguise to make of what my views are. I believe it is the natural, absolute right of every man to have his children educated in the method his conscience prescribes to him as the right method, and I have no doubt in my mind that there is a violation of natural right every time any man is hindered in the exercise of that right. I entertain the very strongest belief that wherever a man is taxed to support schools which his conscience forbids him to use, a grave injustice is done. But I am not here to discuss that, I do not want to open any discussion as to whether I am right or wrong in that regard. I know there are people who entertain the opinion that it is better that the state itself should establish one system of schools and that all children should follow that system of instruction. But that question does not arise in this connection in the slightest degree. The question that does arise, which has been the source of a very great deal of strong feeling and which has given to many of us who have a sense of responsibility much matter for careful thought is the question whether in this territory that is going to be annexed to Manitoba there are existing rights established by law and which would require for their protection the inclusion of some special provision in this legislation. To my mind there is an absolute misapprehension on the part of those who censure the course that this government has taken because of its failure to act in connection with the alleged constitutional rights existing in that territory as to the real effect of the statute, upon the dispositions of which they base their claim. Now, when one feels called upon to do a duty to the whole people of this country, or a duty to any particular class of the people who may have special claims upon him for in connection with their rights—

THE ROYAL ASSENT.

A message was received from His Honour the Deputy of His Royal Highness the Governor General by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod as follows:—

Mr. Speaker, His Honour the Deputy of His Royal Highness the Governor General, desires the immediate attendance of your hon. House in the Chamber of the hon. the Senate.

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

And having returned,

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

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

An Act to correct certain clerical errors in the French Version of the Revised Statutes, 1906.

An Act respecting the British Colonial Fire Insurance Company.

An Act to amend the Juvenile Delinquents Act, 1908.

An Act to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act.

An Act respecting the Erie, London and Tilsonburg Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Cape de la Madeleine Railway Company.

An Act respecting La Compagnie du Chemin de fer de Colonisation du Nord.

An Act respecting the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company.

An Act respecting the West Ontario Pacific Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Alberta Electric Railway Company, and to change its name to 'The Alberta Interurban Railway Company.'

An Act respecting the Algoma Eastern Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Calgary and Fernie Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Pacific and Atlantic Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Liverpool-Manitoba Assurance Company.

An Act to incorporate the Vancouver Life Insurance Company of Vancouver, B.C.

An Act to incorporate the Saskatchewan Life Insurance Company.

An Act respecting the Canadian Birkbeck Investment and Savings Company, and to change its name to the Canadian Mortgage Investment Company.

An Act respecting the Union Bank of Canada.

An Act respecting the Public Archives.

An Act respecting patents of Edmund F. Piper.

An Act respecting a patent of the Spirella Company of Canada, Limited.

An Act respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Kootenay and Alberta Railway Company.

An Act respecting the National Transcontinental Railway.

An Act for the relief of Edna Wells.

An Act respecting the Dominion Guarantee Company, Limited, and to change its name to 'The Dominion Gresham Guarantee and Casualty Company.'

An Act to incorporate the Premier Life Insurance Company.

An Act to incorporate the Sterling Life Assurance Company of Canada.

An Act to incorporate the Bank of Saskatchewan.

An Act to amend the Post Office Act.

An Act respecting Patents of Thomas Wadge.

An Act respecting certain patents of Thos. D. Rambaut.

An Act respecting The Trust and Loan Company of Canada.

An Act to amend the National Transcontinental Railway Act.

An Act to amend the Government Works Tolls Act.

An Act to provide for further advances to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.

An Act to authorize the payment of a subsidy to the Collingwood Shipbuilding Company, Limited.

An Act respecting the Security Life Insurance Company of Canada.

An Act respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Northern Territorial Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Interprovincial and James Bay Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Barcelona Traction, Light and Power Company, Limited.

An Act respecting the Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company.

An Act to incorporate the High River, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Vancouver Island and Eastern Railway Company.

An Act for the relief of Herbert Horsfall.

An Act for the relief of Kenneth Molson.

An Act for the relief of James Denny.

An Act to change the name of Ezra Butler Eddy Bessey.

An Act to amend the Inquiries Act.

EXTENSION OF BOUNDARIES—MANITOBA.

House resumed on motion for third reading of Bill (No. 115) to provide for the extension of the boundaries of the province of Manitoba.

Mr. DOHERTY. I was about to say when I was interrupted by the summons of a higher authority, that when one is called upon, or is expected and feels it his duty, to especially interest himself in the protection of the rights or the interests of any particular class of his fellow

countrymen, or feels a special call to protect some special general interest possibly of all his countrymen, he owes to them more than zeal and more than readiness to devote himself to those rights or interests, and more than willingness to make sacrifices if it be necessary. He owes to those fellow countrymen also the exercise of his very best judgment as to what is the best course to be pursued for the protection of the rights or the interests that may have been entrusted or confided to him. He owes to them likewise—whenever it may have happened that his own particular training may have put him in a position where he ought at all events to be able to form a sound judgment upon any particular question, by reason of its nature being such as to make the training he has received of some use perhaps in aiding a man to arrive at a just conclusion—that he should not shirk his duty, and should not draw back in the face of the conclusions that the exercise of that best judgment of his, aided by the training I have referred to, may lead him to upon that particular question. And he is not doing his duty to those who look to him to specially protect their rights or interests, if he thinks first of saying the thing that will please them, of saying the thing that he would be glad and happy if he were able to truthfully say. He owes it to those people to honestly tell them the result of his inquiries as to the nature or existence of the rights to which they lay claim, and he owes it to them, whether it pleases them at the moment or not, to adopt the course that his judgment tells him, in view of the conclusions that he has so reached, is the best and the wisest for the ultimate protection of those rights. I have endeavoured, Mr. Speaker, to remember those things in my dealing with this particular question. As I have said this is a question of law: Whether there are, or are not, the rights that are claimed to exist. We have the answer to that question to seek, not in the inspiration of our sentiments, but in the pages of our statute-books, and we have got to guard ourselves, in interpreting what those statute-books tell us, against allowing the wish to be father to the thought. I am afraid there are too many men expounding the law in the newspapers, and upon the public platforms of this country, to whom I have no greater reproach to make than that they have allowed their wish to be father to their thought. I have said that I would not worry this House by quoting all the statutes that bear upon this question. Most of them have been already dealt with, and dealt with in a manner that I think, to any fair-minded person, would justify the conclusion that they do not establish the existence of the legal rights which are claimed to exist. I cannot, however, refrain from making some mention of them. I will ask this House, and I will ask those who may do me the honour of reading what I have to say, to trust me in that I am not going to misrepresent them, and I am quite willing that any one, who feels sufficient interest, should verify whether I have or have not done so. We are told that there are rights in this particular territory, because by a statute of 1875 in an Act regarding the Northwest Territories, it was provided that when a system of taxation should be established in the Territories as governed by that Act, that then an officer to whom the government of that territory was committed, could, acting with a council, which the Governor in Council here might give to him, and which council, it was provided, should gradually, as the country grew, come to be an elective legislative assembly, make laws regarding education, and that in all of those laws it should in substance be provided that there should be recognized to any religious minority the right to establish a system of schools of its own, and that when it did so it should not be liable to be taxed for any general system. I am not pretending to give the precise words of the statute—I have no hesitation in saying I am giving the sense—but we are told in the first place that because of that provision there are rights to-day to separate schools in the territory that is about to be annexed. With regard to that I have nothing to say except that as concerns by far the larger portion of the territory to be annexed—some 128,000 square miles, I think, out of a total of 178,000 square miles—that statute never had any application. I am speaking now of that statute as originally enacted. Before that statute came into force another Act was passed providing for and setting aside as a separate district what was called the District of Keewatin. This Act refrained from enacting, as regards that district, any of the provisions of the Act applicable to the Northwest Territories generally, the Act of 1875, which contemplated there ever coming into existence representative institutions or contained any enactment regarding schools. This second Act, so far as this large portion of the territory to be annexed is concerned, remained in force without doubt and without possible question until 1905. I have no doubt that it remained in force until the 1st January, 1907, but I do not want to enter into discussion about debatable things; it is not necessary. To my mind the conclusion which I have not sought to reach but which has been forced upon me, is too clear to make it worth while to stop for possible debatable points

on the way—this Act so remaining in effect.

The statute of 1875, as I have said, never was in force in this portion of the territory. It certainly is not susceptible of being suggested that any portion of it had any force therein before the summer of 1905; and for my part, as I say, I have no doubt that no portion of it had any force therein at any time. I say that for this reason: That statute, save so much of it as was left in chap. 62 of the Revised Statutes of 1906, was repealed by the Act concerning the Revised Statutes of 1906, precisely in the same manner as stated by my hon. friend from Nicolet (Mr. Lamarche)—was repealed by the other Act I have mentioned, the Keewatin Act. He is quite right in that respect. That Act did repeal the Keewatin Act; and from the coming into force of the Revised Statutes in 1907, neither the Keewatin Act nor the Northwest Territories Act, as originally enacted in 1875, had the force of law anywhere.

But it is contended—and, I understand some weight ought to be attached to it as making some difference in the purpose of this amendment—that an order in council of July, 1905, annexed this territory of Keewatin to the Northwest Territories and thereby brought into force in Keewatin all the laws that were in force in the Northwest Territories at that time, this statute of 1875, so far as the law was concerned, and the ordinances enacted in the Northwest Territories under that law of 1875. Now, I quite agree with what was pointed out the other evening by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), that that order was on its face ultra vires. If you read it, you will see that it sets forth that whereas by a proviso in this Keewatin Act permission was given to the Governor in Council to detach a portion of Keewatin and annex it to the Northwest Territories, therefore the Governor in Council annexes the whole of Keewatin to the Northwest Territories. Now, I have seen it said since, as a triumphant answer on this point, that when the Governor in Council said he annexed the whole of Keewatin, it was entirely a mistake,—he was only annexing a portion of it. And the triumphant answer is this, —that the Governor in Council first, in 1886, under that power, did detach a portion of Keewatin and annexed it to the Northwest Territory; and therefore it is said, when he came in 1905 to annex—not to detach; you cannot detach a thing from itself—to annex the whole of Keewatin, he was only annexing a portion of Keewatin; it was annexed in two portions, and this was the second and remaining portion. So, we are told, the thing that the Governor in Council could not have done if he had done it at one stroke, was perfectly valid,—because he had made two bites of the cherry; he had annexed this territory bit by bit. To state that is a sufficient answer. But there is more. When this first portion was cut off the balance was the whole of Keewatin. In statutes afterwards enacted we have the Keewatin Act reproduced, still containing this proviso, that portions of the existing Keewatin might be cut off. But you will not find anywhere in any of these statutes authority by order in council to destroy Keewatin. So that, to my mind, it is perfectly clear that the only portion of this Northwest Territories Act which ever came into force in Keewatin, is the portion that remains to us in chapter 62 of the revised statutes of 1906. Because Keewatin, and what remained of the Northwest Territories were no doubt grouped together by that chapter, as constituting the Northwest Territories.

But by that time there had come a great change in this Act of 1875, a most noteworthy change, and particularly in this section about education. The original provision was that when there should be established a system of taxation in the Northwest Territories, then the Commissioner in Council, or the commissioner with the advice of the legislative assembly (when it grew to be a legislative assembly), might make these laws with regard to education, and these should be subject to the restriction provided. By 1880 that system of taxation had been established; and consequently, by the statute of 1885, parliament amended that section 11 by striking out the portion which said ' when a system of taxation shall be established,'—because that had been accomplished. And, because it had been accomplished already in 1880, parliament made that amendment take effect back in 1880. So that the law as it then stood was that the commissioner or the Lieutenant Governor, as it was then—the Lieutenant Governor in Council, or with the advice of the legislative assembly, could make these laws, or should make these laws, and they should be subject to the restriction I have referred to. That condition of affairs remained in the Northwest Territories practically until 1905, when out of the Northwest Territories were carved the two provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta. That left the residue of what had formerly been the territories and left standing Keewatin. In 1905, after the two new provinces had been carved out of the territory, then parliament did enact a law amending the Northwest Territories Act, and in that statute it altered the provisions with regard to education and altered them so as to limit the power of the commissioner to make laws about education at all to the case where he should be authorized to do it, that authorization to come from

the Governor in Council here. That provision was reproduced in the Northwest Territories Act, as it was reproduced in the revised statutes of 1906. And in 1906 Keewatin was taken into what constituted, under the statute of 1906, the Northwest Territories and was subject to that law which contained that provision. And that is the whole law—subject to the amendment of 1907, which is not material to the purpose of this question,—that is the whole law in which one can find what is called the constitution of what is to-day the Northwest Territories, including Keewatin, and including the entire territory which is to be annexed to Manitoba.

Now what is that law? There is one substantive, operative clause in that law, and only one—I wish to be understood as regards the method of government of the Northwest Territories; there are other dispositions that produce their effect, but we are concerned with the method of government and the laws to be made in the Northwest Territories. This is found in section 4, and that was amended by the statute of 1907:

> The executive powers vested by the Northwest Territories Act and amendments thereto in the Lieutenant Governor of the Northwest Territories, or in the Lieutenant Governor of the Northwest Territories in Council, on the 31st day of August 1905, shall be exercised by the commisionser, and the commissioner shall administer the government of the territories under instructions from time to time given him by the Governor in Council, or by the minister.

There are a number of other provisions, among them the provision to which I have already referred. All those provisions deal with powers which may be exercised by this commissioner who is to be named, with his council, when the Governor in Council shall have deemed it advisable to give him a council. Those powers extend to legislation with regard to such matters, roughly speaking, as are covered by provincial powers, and as may be designated to him by the Governor in Council; and there is the power to deal with this question of education when authorized so to do by the Governor in Council. Now I do not think that it requires any elaboration of argument to show that until the Governor in Council exercised that power of giving a council to this commissioner and authorizing him to legislate, there was no governing body with legislative power in existence in the territories. The commissioner was there, and he is there still; he was there with the executive powers which the original Northwest Territories Act had vested in the Lieutenant Governor, and that power, if one goes back to the Northwest Territories Act, was practically to act under instructions of the Governor in Council. Now no council was ever given to this commissioner, no authority was ever given to him to legislate about education or about anything else; and where there was no legislative power to legislate about education, there could not be a restriction of that power. The amendment to be found in chapter 32 of the statutes of 1907, does not refer to any practical question here concerned. Now, there is the whole of the operative constitution of these territories. The Governor in Council could have created a constitution, not a constitution providing for representative institutions, but a constitution under which these territories would have been legislated for and governed. The Governor in Council at no time did it. I am not saying that as criticising the action of past governments. If parliament contented itself by giving power to the Governor in Council to do this, and did not do it directly, it must have been simply because parliament felt that the time had not come to put that into operation; or whatever its reason was, it judged it wise not to put it into operation itself but simply to create this power in the Governor in Council.

If one looks back to the things that were said at the very beginning when the Act of 1875 and the Act of 1876 were enacted, I think one finds the explanation. We were referred the other evening to some remarks of the Hon. Edward Blake explanatory of what this legislation of 1875 was going to do, for the purpose of basing a claim that this was legislation to be of a perpetual character, and once for all settled the school question. Now, if one goes back to the debates on the Act of 1875, and the debates on the Act of 1876, he will find, I think, the explanation why parliament, in 1906, acted the way it did. It is to be found in the reasons given for the enactment of the Keewatin Act. The Hon. Edward Blake, in dealing with that Act, and explaining the differences between it and the Northwest Territories Act, pointed out—and this is important—that this educational clause in the Northwest Territories Act never could be effective until there was a system of taxation established. He went on to say that that of course implies a system of representative institutions, and that, therefore, they had given to the Northwest Territories a rudimentary system of representative institutions. As explaining the Keewatin Act, he went on to say that for the few people outside of these territories they did not deem it necessary to provide a constitution at present; and he added that the purpose of this legislation with regard to Keewatin was to preserve the status quo till she should come to have provincial rights. Now, there is no doubt that at that time it was believed

that in a very short time this very annexation would take place. That appears to be evident from the discussion which took place at that time. But I refer to that because I think there was the reason in 1905 or 1906, after the provinces had been carved out of the territories, not to consider that there was a necessity for putting into operation a system of government there, that is to say, for the few people that were living in this little section cut off from Saskatchewan and Alberta, and made one with Keewatin proper; there was no occasion to create a system of government or any legislative body. It remained simply with the commissioner, acting under the direction of the Governor in Council, or the Minister of the Interior.

Now, in that state of affairs this section about making laws with respect to education was not operative. If a constitution had ever been given to them, that would have been in it, but a constitution never was given to them. The time never came when the Governor in Council judged it necessary to give them a constitution—and as I said before, I am not criticising the actions of past governments in that respect. So far as I can ascertain, from the census of 1911, the actual total white population in the territory in question is in the neighbourhood of 600 people, scattered over this immense area.

I do not think that anybody could reasonably find fault with the government, because it did not consider it was desirable or necessary to establish a legislative body to make laws for a few people in that territory. The very same reasons that were given as regards Keewatin in 1876, existed equally for not putting into force and operation the provisions of this Act of 1906 and they never have been put into force. So that I can reach no other conclusion than that there is no constitution, no system of government in the Territories, except the government of the commissioner under instructions of the Governor in Council or of the Minister of the Interior. In so far as I have been able to find that statement seems to correspond with what has actually happened there. There are one or two orders in council, that I am not going to deal with at the present moment, but these do not deal with matters of this kind. So, I feel bound to say to people who, like myself, feel that, if there was a constitution in force in these Territories that gave a right to any minority for the establishment of a system of separate schools, that right ought to be protected. I have no recourse but to say that I, at all events, cannot find where that constitution exists. I have read much about a principle that was laid down. The principle that was laid down has my most hearty support. There is a principle involved in the section which provides for the making of laws as to education. But that section never came into operation, and the mere enunciation of a principle does not generate legal rights. If it were not for the very great respect I have for many, I may say all of the people who have fallen into this, in my judgment, error, I would say it is only living in a fool's paradise to flatter yourself with the contention that you can find in this Act the establishment of those rights.

Mr. PROULX. Is the minister aware of the opinion expressed by Mr. Cahan, the eminent lawyer of Montreal?

Mr. DOHERTY. I am very glad to join with my hon. friend (Mr. Proulx) in describing Mr. Cahan as an eminent lawyer of Montreal, but, lawyers' opinions, in the opinion of other lawyers, have been at times quite misaken. They say that doctors differ. The very condition of the existence of lawyers is that they should differ. Of course, I do not set myself up to be more competent to speak than another, but I do say that my duty is to act according to my judgment and with a realization of my share of the responsibility of those upon whom the people have laid the burden of governing this country. I shall not be frightened away from the doing of that duty even by the opinions of lawyers as eminent as my hon. friend recognizes Mr. Cahan to be, and still less shall I be frightened away from doing my duty by the lawyers who edit daily papers, the lawyers who write from the press gallery and the lawyers who talk from the public platform. Here, in this House, we should have, and I believe we all have, a realization of the fact that we are dealing with this question with the responsibility of the men who have to act and we are not afraid to live up to that responsibility. To my mind that is the common duty of this parliament. The governing system of those Territories was that they were governed by a commissioner under the direction of the Minister of the Interior. If a great many other things had happened there would have been a legislative power in these Territories, that legislative power could have made education laws and, if it had, these education laws would have had to contain the restriction I speak of.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). Although separate schools have not been established in these territories, is it not a fact that they have the right to separate schools—call it an inchoate right, if you like?

Mr. DOHERTY. If there had ever come to be a body answering the description here of the Commissioner in Council, then it would have had the power of making laws in regard to education, and everybody within the territories would have had the right to have a law providing for separate schools. But, I cannot myself see that anybody in the territories has the right to compel the putting into operation of that constitution. In other words, in my judgment, all those provisions which are described as a constitution are an unrealized project. The Keewatin Act, I must say, gave no such power at all, and we were told that it was introduced for the purpose of maintaining the status quo until that territory should become entitled to provincial rights. The purpose was not the establishment of a school system before Keewatin went into the territories, and I think it is pretty fairly conceded that there never were, up to the time of the alleged annexation, any rights in existence. That leaves me to deal with the situation which was created by this annexation or the joining of Keewatin, and the balance of the Northwest Territories. Whether by order in council, or whether under the revised statutes, it is laid down as not admitting of doubt that the effect of the bringing together of Keewatin and the balance of the territories was to bring into effective operation throughout both those territories, not only this Act that I have just referred to, but the ordinances that had been enacted in those territories before the provinces were carved out of them. I would like to believe that if I could. I see it stated as a quotation from the statute, I see it stated that the statute of 1906 said that every ordinance that ever had been passed by the legislative power of the territories was in force in the new Northwest Territories. That is cited in big type as the text of the statute. Now, what was the text of the statute? Section 13 reads:

All laws and ordinances in force in the territories, and not inconsistent with this Act, or repealed by the operation of the Act passed in the third year of His Majesty's reign, chapter sixty-one, and intituled, An Act respecting the Revised Statutes of Canada, shall remain in force until it is otherwise provided or ordered by the parliament of Canada, or by the Governor in Council or the Commissioner in Council.

It is claimed that under that section the old ordinances in the Northwest Territories in regard to education remained in force in that portion of the territories that was cut off and, being so in force in that portion of those territories, came into force in Keewatin. In regard to the annexation of Keewatin, if you could say that the order in council was valid, then I would be disposed to admit that in so far as this ordinance was in force in the balance of the territories after 1905, it is now in force in Keewatin. But, I do not think that order in council was valid.

By the statue of 1906 all that is declared is that those ordinances which are in force in the territories remained in force. Where they were not in force they could not remain in force, so that to my mind it is absolutely unquestionable that the ordinances were never in force in the territory called Keewatin. But I do not want to insist on that overmuch, because under that section of the Act, the education ordinances were manifestly not in force in the balance of the territories and even if you say that Keewatin was under the same ordinances as the balance of the territory the educational ordinance was not in force. And why? The reason is on the face of it, it was not consistent with the Act. Those ordinances were enacted by a legislative council which subsequently became a legislative assembly. They were and could be enacted only when there came to be in force in the territories a system of taxation; and as Mr. Blake said: That cannot be, until you have a system of representative institutions.

The ordinances enacted by the legislative council or assembly could only be carried out by a regularly constituted government. The department of instruction was to be administered by one of the ministers of the Territories, and his consent and intervention was necessary for the carrying out of these education ordinances. Then too, funds for the upkeep of such schools could only be provided by taxation levied by a legislative assembly and council. The Act, to which I have referred, abolished the assembly and council, in the Territories, and provided for the appointment of an executive officer in the Territories to be under the instructions of the Governor General in Council. The Act contains a clause to the effect that ordinances not inconsistent with it, shall remain in force. How can it be said under the circumstances which I have just explained that the school ordinances are not inconsistent with that Act? I have seen some references to people who had distorted statutes in order that they might hold portfolios. I am afraid there are some people who utterly misapprehend statutes because they are bound to find in them what they are looking for; and I do not blame them over much, because I am going to be honest and say that I started to look into these statutes looking for what they were looking for, but I did not find it. So I say there is your constitution in these Territories, there are your laws in force in these Territories, there are your rights by not protecting which we are said to have failed in our duty. We have failed in no duty in

not striving to safeguard what did not exist. All we have failed to do is to allow ourselves in a vain effort to protect what was not there to be protected, to be led to doing what it was a fact known to everybody would generate opposition and contention and strife. I am not afraid of opposition, contention or strife, when there is right at stake, which I can do something to protect. I shall be ready to take my share of it, but I am not of those who believe that, when your judgment tells you that you are asked to fight for something which has no real existence, you have the right to take the risk of creating turmoil and opposition and divergence of opinion among the people of this country. I say that from the point of view of the country as a whole, and from the point of view of the minority who are being persuaded that their rights are being taken from them under this legislation, and I say to them as one of them, as a man who sympathizes with their sentiments as profoundly as any man can: 'My friends, it is not wise to be crying wolf, wolf, all the time before you are sure the wolf is there. There is an old fable that tells the fate of the children who were given to that diversion. I would commend it to the consideration of those who, great as is my respect for their sincerity, I cannot help feeling have allowed themselves to be carried away by their sentiment, some of them perhaps, by if I would permit myself to say, an over-weening confidence in their own capacity to determine all questions that may affect the minority in this country. And to the gentlemen who sit in this House, and who share my feelings and share my sentiments I would appeal in the face of the possibility of their being called cowards and traitors to have the courage to stand up for the sake of the minority in this country, and not join in a movement that can only produce the result of placing that minority before their fellow countrymen in the position of having started a struggle and a contest and strife with no better basis than a mistaken notion of what the law of this country was.

I have said that if the view can be entertained that because there is a principle enacted in the provisions of that unrealized project of a constitution which recognizes the principle of the separate school, that constitutes a right in these territories, then I am prepared to say, and to say particularly to the mover and seconder of this resolution, and to all those with whom I stand in sympathy upon this question, that they have in the provision of the statutes of Manitoba, under whose control this new territory is going to pass, an absolute, an ample, a perfect protection for any right that actually exists within that territory, and I say that while we have a right to expect, and we do expect, from every man in this country that he shall recognize the constitutional rights of those from whom he differs, we have no right to ask, we have at least no right to demand more than recognition of our constitutional rights. And inasmuch as the constitution of Manitoba gives protection to such rights as may exist and are susceptible of constitutional protection I do not believe it is right that we should ask from those who differ from us with regard to what is desirable with reference to a system of schools, that they should join with us in adding something more than the constitution calls for. If, as I am convinced, the amendment sought to be made to this Bill means nothing more than the constitution of Manitoba means, then it is an absolutely useless procedure, and we all know that it is in human nature that every effort to impose express restrictions by one man on another is irritating, and provocative of discussion and retaliation and difficulties. That is not the way to induce a man to do the thing that you have no power to compel him to do, to make a vain effort to tell him that he must do it.

From that point of view I would ask my hon. friend who has proposed this amendment, and such hon. gentlemen as may feel disposed, because of their sharing the sentiments which I share, to support it, to withhold that support. And now I have nothing else to add. We who feel this way on this question may claim at all events that while we have striven to do and while we believe we have done our whole duty to those who share our feelings and our views on this educational question, we have also striven to make it clear to our friends in Manitoba that we have no desire to impose upon them any restriction that the constitution of this country does not impose upon them. I may perhaps venture to say to my friends from Manitoba that it would be a not unfitting recognition on their part if on some not distant day, giving thought to the situation in that province, they came to realize that those with whom those who have acted as we have acted especially sympathize, are not enjoying the full liberty which they are entitled to or to which they aspire, (not that we ask for any promise or any guarantee from them), they should, in dealing with that question, so act as to show themselves not less generous in recognizing the rights, or the claims, if you do not choose to call them rights, of the class of people with whom we are particularly in sympathy, than I think we may claim to have proved ourselves, in our present action in their regard.

Mr. D. O. LESPERANCE (Montmagny). Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to speak at length on the subject now before this House, but I feel it my duty to say a few words in explanation of the vote I am to give in favour of the adoption of the Bill providing for the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba.

I shall not dwell on the financial terms that have been agreed upon between the government of Manitoba and the federal government. These questions have been fully discussed by more experienced men than myself, on both sides of the House. I shall, therefore, confine my remarks to the clause, or rather, to the absence of the clause that, in the opinion of some of my esteemed colleagues on this side of the House, would safeguard the rights of the minority.

We have been told, Sir, because Manitoba had not lived up to the constitution granted to her in 1870 as regards the rights of the minority, in matters of education, that the time has come for us when we should be, in duty and honour bound to vote against the present Bill, unless some amendment is inserted therein, protecting these rights.

I wish to say right here, Sir, that if the province of Manitoba had at its head to-day the men who are responsible for the abolition of the separate schools in that province, I would hesitate to vote for the present Bill, if only as a protest, unless some guarantee were included therein providing for the future protection of the school rights of the minority in that territory to be annexed.

But what is the present situation? We have to-day in the men who govern Manitoba, and the men who form part of the federal administration, the very men, or the successors of them, who stood for the rights of the minority, who fought bravely and went down to defeat for those rights, while the hon. the leader of the opposition resorted to the famous tactics that gave him power, it is true, but at the expense of the rights and privileges of the minority in the province of Manitoba. In passing, I wish to say to the right hon. the leader of the opposition, with all due respect to his great personality, that history will pass a very different judgment on the result attained by the great English general and the result attained by the hon. the leader of the opposition. In fighting behind the lines of Torres Vedras the great Wellington was fighting for the very life of his country, while the right hon. gentleman was fighting to prevent the execution of a judgment rendered by the highest tribunal in the empire. Still 15 years after, we hear the hon. the leader of the opposition tell this House and the whole country, while the rights of minorities are being discussed in this parliament, that he is still sitting comfortably behind the lines of Torres Vedras. I wish to assure the right hon. gentleman that so far as we are concerned on this side of the House, he and his party may stay there for 15 years longer and more, if they so desire. But these tactics shall never again win them over the confidence of the people of Canada.

While voting with the government on this question, I do not wish my vote to be construed as a vote against the sacred rights of minorities in all that pertains to the education of the child. It is claimed by great constitutional lawyers that in the territory of Keewatin, now to be annexed to Manitoba, the minority has no established or vested rights. This may be true, from a legal standpoint. But, speaking here, as a British subject and a free citizen of this country, I trust, Sir, that I will be allowed to say that, text or no text, statutes or no statutes, there should not be in this broad Dominion of ours, where flies the flag of that empire we are so proud of, a single portion of territory, where the majority may justly ignore the fundamental spirit that prevailed in the building of this confederation. I shall never forget, Mr. Speaker, that the education I received was in one of these modest country separate schools, and, although unfortunate circumstances compelled me to enter this life's battle at the tender age of thirteen, the principles of honesty, integrity and honor which I was taught in that modest school, have been the chief instrument of whatever success I have since attained in business and politics.

I heard last week the very eloquent remarks of the right hon. the leader of the government, and the earnest appeal he made to all men of good will in this House and outside of this House, to live and let live. I wish to say here to the right hon. leader of the government that my mind was well made up even before I listened to his eloquent speech. But his utterances have further convinced me that my decision to vote in support of this Bill is in the best interest of every one concerned.

During the last election, pamphlets were issued by the anti-reciprocity league appealing to the citizens of Quebec to vote against reciprocity, not only on account of the pernicious effect such a measure would have had on the economical conditions of this country, but also pointing to the danger of annexation; in the advent of which, the pamphlet went on, the citizens of Quebec would lose the rights and privileges they were now enjoying under the British Crown. What effect, Mr. Speaker, would such appeals have, should the day ever come when the majority in this country would tread upon the rights and privileges of the minority? Let us not forget that we have to the south of us a very

powerful and ambitious neighbour. The question of reciprocity may be dead for the time being; but some day in the future it will loom up again in some form or other. The greatest safeguard against annexation will always reside in the just treatment accorded to all the citizens of this country whatever may be their race or creed or whatever may be the province or territory they inhabit.

In conclusion, I wish to say that I share entirely the right hon. leader of the government's views that the Roman Catholics of Manitoba, who form a large proportion of the whole population of that province, have in their own hands the only constitutional remedy which can be exercised to-day for the redress of the grievances they may have. It is admitted on all sides that, so far as the old province of Manitoba is concerned, interference by the federal authorities is to-day out of the question. I said at the beginning of these remarks that I had entire confidence in the men who govern Manitoba to-day; and in the men who represent that province in the federal cabinet. Imbued as they are with the principles of the founders of this confederation, they will make it a point, I have no doubt, to settle satisfactorily the just grievances of the minority in their province. By so doing, they will not only have accomplished a great act of justice and fair play, but they will have put an end to an agitation that can do no good to Manitoba or to the country as a whole.

Mr. J. H. RAINVILLE (Chambly and Vercheres). In rising to say a few words on the amendment, I cannot forget that up to 1908 I was a good Liberal. I fought with the Liberals and enjoyed the fights in which I participated, and I have no apologies to offer for my course up to that time. Before I conclude these remarks I shall have something to say on really the only speech, on this subject, which has been contributed by our friends on the other side of the House, that of the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) who did touch somewhat, I must admit, on the school question. In the year 1896 the Conservative party introduced the Remedial Bill, dealing with the grievances of the minority as regards separate schools in Manitoba. I have no reason to believe that that party has to-day changed its mind on that question, or that they are not as ready to grant justice to the minority as Sir Charles Tupper was prepared to do in 1896. In the elections of that year that distinguished statesman was defeated, especially in the province of Quebec, yet upon taking his place in the new House as leader of the opposition, the right hon. gentleman magnanimously spoke as follows:

Now, Sir, I do not intend to say more upon that subject upon the present occasion, but I will say this: that in the future as in the past the cardinal principle with the great party to which I have the honour to belong will be equal justice to all without respect to race or creed. I am glad to know that the responsibility of this question—an important question, although not so gravely important as I had supposed—I am glad to know that the responsibility rests no longer upon my shoulders, but upon those of the hon. gentleman who is now the first Minister of the Crown. I can only say that I trust and sincerely hope, that he will be most successful in obtaining such a settlement of this question as will do justice and give satisfaction to all parties. I can assure the hon. gentleman not only that he has my most cordial wishes for a happy, and early, and fair settlement of this important question, but that anything that I can contribute to that end will be at all times most cheerfully done.

Another statesman, defeated in the way Sir Charles Tupper had been, would not have been prepared to pay such a tribute nor to vouchsafe such encouragement to his political opponents, as the right hon. leader of the opposition did on that occasion. He would have remained silent and refrained from proffering assistance to his victorious opponents, but he did not do so. Of Sir Charles Tupper, Victor Hugo might well have said:

'There are moments when the best way of loving humanity is for one to love one's country.'

The Bill which we are now discussing contains a business proposition, but some of the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, doubtless very sincerely, find fault with it because it contains no mention of the school question. Let me endeavour briefly to deal with that question and for that purpose I find it necessary to refer to the legislation of the past. In that legislation the principle has been laid down, that the rights of minorities, whether they be Catholic or whether they be Protestant, shall be protected and safeguarded. I take first the Union Act of 1840, to go back no further, the Confederation Act of 1867, the Manitoba Act of 1870, and the Northwest Territories Act of 1875. The Union Act of 1840, of course, had to do with Upper and Lower Canada, although the principle to which I refer, and which is contained in all the other Acts referred to, is irrevocably set forth there. Now, Sir, is the district of Keewatin entitled to come under the terms of the British North America Act of 1867?

The statute bringing Keewatin into existence was passed only in 1875, and that district was organized in 1876. We must then

look to some other legislation than the British North America Act of 1867 to apply to Keewatin. Does the legislation of 1875 relating to the Northwest Territories apply to Keewatin? Keewatin was formed as a separate district on the same day as that on which the law regarding the Northwest Territories came into effect. No provision whatever for schools was made in the law relating to Keewatin, but such a provision was made in the law relating to the Northwest Territories. If we consult the report of the discussion upon these laws as they were in course of enactment in this parliament, we find that the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie himself admitted that the reason why no such reference was made in the law relating to Keewatin was that it was the intention to annex Keewatin to some other territory or even to the province of Manitoba, such territory or such province of Manitoba having its own constitution in which the provision for schools was clearly made. But, we could not say that the law of the Northwest Territories would apply to Keewatin until 1906 at any rate, but undoubtedly Keewatin automatically fell into the Northwest Territories, and I claim that since that date Keewatin was governed by the law of the Northwest Territories. And section 62 of the law of the Northwest Territories has already been so well explained in this House that I do not feel called upon to deal at any length with these two articles of the law. They are clear enough, because everybody admits that no step was taken either by the late government or by this government to put in force this law in the Northwest Territories as they are formed to-day. But we are called upon to-day to create a new province, as was the case in 1905 for Alberta and Saskatchewan, or to annex Keewatin to a province already organized and having a constitution of its own, the province of Manitoba, and what is the law in such a case?

I will give the two sections of the Imperial Act, 1871, under which this parliament is authorized to create new provinces or to extend the boundaries of a province:

2. The parliament of Canada may from time to time establish new provinces in any territories forming for the time being part of the Dominion of Canada, but not included in any province thereof, and may, at the time of such establishment, make provision for the constitution and admission of any such province and for the passing of laws for the peace, order and good government of such province, and for its representation in the said parliament.

3. The parliament of Canada may from time to time, with the consent of the legislature of any province of the said Dominion, increase, diminish or otherwise alter the limits of such province upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the said legislature, and may, with the like consent, make provision respecting the effect and operation of any such increase or diminution or alteration of territory in relation to any province affected thereby.

It is very clear that we are dealing with this last paragraph of the law, and we have no constitution to give Manitoba, who has such constitution of her own under Imperial legislation and we have no power to place constitutional limitations upon Manitoba or any other province under section 3 of the law. But, Sir, if we do annex Keewatin to Manitoba what will be the law in reference to the schools? To understand this let us consult article 22 of the Manitoba Act. I will quote the first paragraph only, to show that the schools are well protected by the laws of Manitoba:

Nothing in such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law or practice in the province at the union.

What is the law of the British North America Act, article 93:

Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law in the province at the Union.

The two articles are practically the same, and what they mean is protection for minorities and protection for the schools. I do not see how even the amendment which has been put before the House will strengthen this law. It is contended that, without this amendment, Keewatin would be between the law of 1875 and the Manitoba Act, and none would apply to it. I do not think, for my part, that this would be the case; and I do not think that any of us in this House would try to apply the law in such a way. The expression 'at the union,' of which some complain, I am sure would not be held by any judge to mean that it applied only to schools that were in existence at the time of the union in 1840 and that none others would have rights under this section. This was a principle for the future, and not a principle for 1840. The Fathers of Confederation, as well as those who passed this law of 1875, never had such an idea, and no judge would uphold such an interpretation of the law.

Now, if that was the case when Ontario and Quebec were formed into provinces and were given a constitution, do we not find in it the same words 'as at the union?' And can it be pretended that an addition of territory to Quebec would not fall under the general constitution of Quebec, even if there is in the constitution of Quebec the words 'as at the union?' Now, that is considered all over the province of

Quebec a well defined principle. For my part I do not feel compelled to vote for the amendment, because I am satisfied that the rights of the minority will be just as well protected under the law of Manitoba as they would be if that territory remained a part of the Dominion.

This also is to be remembered, that the last government had drafted a Bill for the annexation of Keewatin to Manitoba, and they drafted a Bill just like the Bill drafted by the present government. No one, I think, will contend that if the school question was not mentioned, and if the words 'at the union' had been fraught with danger to the future of any class of people in Keewatin, the right hon. leader of the opposition would not have taken care to safeguard the rights of the minority in Keewatin. But he knew as well as we know to-day that the Manitoba Act is going to remain in force in Keewatin, and that the settlement of 1897 is not changing the constitution of Manitoba. In my opinion it means simply this, that the Federal government says to Manitoba: We can resort to a remedial order, but if you pass provincial legislation of a certain character we will not intervene. This is the real meaning of the arrangement. Can it be pretended for a moment that, even with the authorization of the Privy Council to intervene, we could change the constitution of Manitoba in any way? No; it was a temporary arrangement, made I believe in the interest of peace in this country.

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF KINGSTON.

Mr. NICKLE moved the third reading of Bill (No. 68) respecting the Queen's College at Kingston and to change its name to Queen's University at Kingston. He said: Mr. Speaker, I am instructed by those interested in these measures, namely, Bills (No. 68) and (No. 69), to say that they adopt the amendments of the House as passed yesterday.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time.

Mr. NICKLE moved that the Bill be now passed and that the title be Queen's University at Kingston.

Motion agreed to.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 69) to incorporate Queen's Theological College.—Mr. Nickle.

EXTENSION OF BOUNDARIES—MANITOBA.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Borden for the second reading of Bill (No. 115) to provide for the extension of the boundaries of the province of Manitoba and the proposed motion of Mr. Mondou in amendment thereto.

Mr. RAINVILLE. Mr. Speaker, I believe that five years ago our friends the Liberals had no intention whatever of bringing in the school question in connection with the Bill that was presented by them to annex Keewatin to Manitoba. But Sir, in the legislation that I have cited, there is a principle which comes out very clearly and it is the principle of protection to minorities. I do not need to cite the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie or the Hon. George Brown who said very emphatically that if you establish separate schools in this country you establish them forever. Would it be of any use to look for an opinion on this subject from members of the Privy Council in England? I could quote the opinion, for instance, of Lord Carnarvon who, in proposing the second reading of the British North America Act on the 19th of February, 1867, and speaking with particular reference to section 93, of British North America Act, said:

> The object of the clause is to secure to the religious minority of one province the same rights, privileges and protection which the religious minority of another province may enjoy. The Roman Catholic minority of Upper Canada, the Protestant minority of Lower Canada and the Roman Catholic minority of the maritime provinces will thus stand on a footing of entire equality.

But is Manitoba in a similar law as the British North America Act and will Keewatin be deprived of any rights on being annexed to Manitoba? I do not think so because an interpretation of article 22 of the Manitoba Act was given by Lord Herschell, who gave an opinion similar to that given by Lord Carnarvon with regard to the British North America Act. Lord Herschell in answer to the Attorney General of Manitoba who wanted to plead a difference between the two laws in favour of Manitoba's autonomy said:

> Before leaving this part of the case it may be well to notice the arguments urged by the respondent, that the construction which their lordships have put upon the second and third subsections of section 22 of the Manitoba Act is inconsistent with the power conferred upon the legislature of the province to exclusively make laws in relation to education. The argument is fallacious. The power conferred is not absolute, but limited. It is exercisable only subject and according to the

following provisions: The subsections which follow therefore, whatever be their true construction, define the conditions under which alone provincial legislatures may legislate in relation to education, and indicate the limitations imposed on, and the exceptions from, their power of exclusive legislation. Their right to legislate is not indeed, properly speaking, exclusive, for in the case specified in subsection 3 the parliament of Canada is authorized to legislate on the same subject. There is, therefore, no inconsistency as was suggested.

I could quote Lord Watson and Lord Morris on the very same subject, but the point is clear enough to me and it shows that the spirit of our laws is well understood and protected in England. What would the difference be, if we annex Keewatin to Manitoba with or without the clause proposed by my hon. friend from Nicolet? None at all in my humble opinion.

But from a legal point of view, Manitoba having been formed into a province on the 12th May, 1870, about one month before the Northwest Territories were acquired by Canada, the Act admitting Manitoba receiving the Imperial sanction on the 29th June, 1871, the Federal government were prevented from acting, and I really cannot see why the minority or the people in Keewatin about to be annexed to Manitoba, could not obtain justice according to article 22 of the Manitoba Act as already interpreted by the Lords of the Privy Council. For my part, convinced as I am that Manitoba deserves money and land, this territory having been kept for her for over 35 years, I would not propose to perpetrate another injustice because injustice was done to a part of the population by the right hon. the leader of the opposition. Sir, take the point of view of Manitoba. Would Ontario accept an addition to her territory if coupled to that addition were a restriction of her constitution? Would Quebec accept Ungava with a condition forbidding the use of the code Napoleon or that she must establish in it non-sectarian schools? My answer to those questions is no. We should treat Manitoba in the same way as we would treat Quebec and Ontario. As to the people of Keewatin and the minority of Manitoba I hope justice will soon be given to them as was guaranteed in the name of the Crown many years ago. I have all confidence in the Premier of Manitoba, Mr. Roblin, who has fought for separate schools during 25 years of his life.

Furthermore on my own behalf, as a Liberal until 1908, I will not say to the Conservative party: If you do not remedy the injustice of the alleged settlement made by the right hon. the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), myself and the whole Liberal party, I will attempt to bring about your downfall. Such a course would be an injustice to them, an injustice to the Conservative party of the past, an injustice to the old statesman, Sir Charles Tupper, an injustice to the victims of 1896, an injustice to the present Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) who had the true conception of the constitutional aspect of the school question in 1905. I am glad to give this testimony in the name of the province of Quebec because the province of Quebec realizes this to-day.

The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) is not in his seat at the moment, but I have told him that I intended to speak and he should be present. That hon. member will allow me a few words in reply to the speech he made last Wednesday. I hope he will take my remarks in good part as coming from a friend. I know he is an admirer of Lacordaire, and I shall tell him with Lacordaire: We say the truth only to the ones we love. I will try to tell a few truths that will interest the House, the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), and even Lacordaire. The hon. member talked of the school, not of Manitoba but of the school of Montalembert, and compared such a school with the English Liberal school to which he claims to belong. I want to tell him that I find a slight difference between, not the schools, but between his conduct and the conduct of Montalembert, because Montalembert, Liberal all his life, had principle all his life, and I find that the hon. member for Rouville has principle only when he is in opposition, where I hope he will long remain.

The hon. member for Rouville talked about the sincerity of my good friend the member for Nicolet, and I agree with him but I may not be able to return him the compliment, because on many occasions, and even to-day, it would need a strong magnifying glass to find an atom of sincerity in his utterances. He spoke pointedly of the 'young' member for Nicolet. Does the hon. member for Rouville want to say to all new members of the House that sincerity belongs only to young men, and that it is sacrificed later to political needs? Was he trying to defend his speeches and lectures on the independence of Canada not very long ago, because he was young at the time? He found fault with the consistency of the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) who, he said, had not always been a Tory and was with the Nationalists in 1885. Where was the hon. member for Rouville at that time and where was he a little later on? I can quote by heart one of his speeches in Quebec in favour of the leader of the Nationalist party at that time:

They will apply to him (Mercier) the poet's word about Papineau: 'He filled a whole epoch of our history and for a long time his voice was his people's only sword and his body their only armour.'

I think if the Postmaster General was associated at that time with a man who deserved such a eulogy from the hon. member for Rouville, he was not, after all, in such bad company. If it is so reprehensible to change in politics I am surprised that my hon. friend forgot to mention the hon. the Minister of Finance (Mr. White) who looks just as happy to-day as he looked when he was with the Liberals.

He has not referred to the member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lavallée), who cannot complain as yet, and for my part I think the country is safe enough with the present government. I think some examples could be cited under the Liberal regime. To mention only one, we all remember that the Hon. Mr. Tarte, Minister of Public Works in the Liberal government for whom I had great admiration, would not swear that he was anything else than a Tory. Now, Sir, the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) is scandalized because the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier), the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), and the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Nantel), do not give up their portfolios. My hon. friend will admit with me that with none of them is it a question of money, for they are all well off, and they do not need to think of their cheque at the end of each month. Of course, they have some bad examples before them, and I hope they will resist the temptation. They know that certain members of the last administration came into office poor and went out with the reputation of having many millions. I do not mean to accuse anyone in particular, but I can tell them that a great portion of the people of Canada thought that something was going wrong at the time and made it clear on the 21st of September last. The hon. member for Rouville paid a great compliment to the right hon. leader of the opposition in saying that in 1896 he had prevented a civil war; but to-day hon. gentlemen opposite do not seem to be afraid of war. This is why I suppose they are so quiet on the other side of the House on the school question. But, Sir, they have not always been as quiet as they are to-day. The hon. Postmaster General has accused the Liberal party of having played football with all the big questions that came before the parliament of Canada in order to obtain power. For my part, having known what was going on when I was with the Liberal party, I feel like pleading guilty. But what did the hon. member for Rouville answer? He read a letter from the Rev. Father Lacombe, and the answer of the right hon. leader of the opposition. The Massey hall speech of the right hon. leader of the opposition has already been referred to, so that I need not repeat it. But, Sir, how did my right hon. friend conduct himself in 1896? I was with him. Will you allow me to quote from 'Hansard' debates of the session of 1897, where I find that an hon. gentleman, before accepting the nomination for the county, I think, which the hon. Postmaster General represents, signed the following:—

Being sincerely disposed to put aside all party spirit and all questions of men, in order to secure the triumph of the Catholic cause in Manitoba, I, the undersigned, promise, if elected, to conform myself to the Bishops' mandement in all points and to vote for a measure according the Catholics of Manitoba that justice to which they have a right by virtue of the judgment of the Privy Council, provided that the measure be approved of by my bishop. If Mr. Laurier reaches power, and does not settle the question at the first session, in accordance with the terms of the mandement, I promise either to withdraw my support or resign.

I withhold the name of this gentleman, for particular reasons. But there were some others who did the same thing whose names I can give. What did the hon. member for Rouville sign in 1896 on accepting the nomination for Gaspé?

I, the undersigned candidate in the county of Gaspé solemnly promise to vote in parliament in conformity with the desires of the Right Reverend Bishops as expressed in their last pastoral letter.

Many other candidates signed this in order to beat the Hon. Mr. Angers and others; and this is why the Conservatives were beaten in 1896.

A settlement was made, but there were a great many people who were not satisfied with that settlement. The right hon. leader of the opposition has been pleased to say on many occasions that Canada is a nation. What steps has the right hon. gentleman taken to give effect to that statement? Immediately after 1896 he organized a system of diplomacy which was intended to extend as far as Rome, to prevent those who were not satisfied with the settlement of 1897 from expressing their views freely on that important question. Here again we see the game of football. But that is not all. In 1905 the leader of the opposition came forward with the famous clause 16, but on the second reading of the Autonomy Bills for Alberta and Saskatchewan, that clause was withdrawn. When that took place we heard talk of possible resignations, by members of the cabinet. Sir, I ask those hon. gentlemen on the other side who were members of the ministry at that time, did any one of the French Canadian ministers

resign? That question must be answered most emphatically in the negative. In 1910, what happened? We saw another football game played. A navy was created to please the Imperialists, and a policy of reciprocity with the United States adopted to please the west, where a good many immigrants had been introduced at $5 per head, and who are now ready to fight against the east, if we are to judge by the speeches of the ex-Minister of the Interior. But, Sir, what is transpiring to-day? Another game of football, this time with the Manitoba question as its object. Why, Mr. Speaker, there are some hon. gentlemen on the other side who are preparing to go to the province of Quebec and say, that if they vote against the amendment of my hon. friend from Nicolet, it is because the subject is already covered by the amendment of the right hon. leader of the opposition. That, Sir, is an actual fact, a statement to that effect has been made to me in the corridors of this House. Are we not justified therefore, in the conclusion that this is another game of football? I am perhaps too young to tell hon. gentlemen on that side to be on their guard, but I do warn them to maintain a strict lookout, because if you leave two open doors, one for the east and the other for the west, one for the Protestants, and the other for the Catholics, one for the Imperialists and the other for the Autonomists, it is going to be bad for somebody. The gale will pass, but it may hurt the young chickens and the old cocks too. Before I take my seat, I want to make it clear to my compatriots and to my province, that I am not voting as I do through any influence whatever, or through any promise of any kind.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. RAINVILLE. But because I am convinced that the people of Keewatin, whether it be the majority or whether it be the minority will be protected to the fullest extent under article 22 of the present constitution of Manitoba.

Mr. LOUIS CODERRE (Hochelaga). I would like, Mr. Speaker, to say a few words in explanation of the vote I am about to give, not only on the amendment of my hon. friend from Nicolet (Mr. Lamarche), but also on the motion for the third reading of this Bill. My remarks will only bear upon one feature of this measure, that is on the omission by the government of a clause that will protect the rights and privileges in educational matters of the Roman Catholic population of Keewatin. My vote to-night will not differ from the one I have already given on the motion for the second reading of this Bill. It will not differ, Mr. Speaker, from the vote I would have given on Tuesday afternoon on the amendment of the right hon. leader of the opposition had I been here. Sir, I will vote with the government. As my absence from the Capital when the question was put to the House may be misrepresented later on, and in hostile quarters, I beg of you, though it be a personal matter, to allow me to explain. When I left Ottawa for Montreal on Friday afternoon on the first day of this month, I could not even suspect that the House would reach that phase in the progress of this Bill before Thursday last. As a matter of fact, we all know that was the general belief; and confident that I would be here in time to take, by my vote, my full share of responsibility in the rejection of the amendment of the right hon. leader of the opposition, I spent four or five days of this month in Montreal, where my presence was called for by very urgent private and legal business. Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, I was very disagreeably surprised when I reached Ottawa on Tuesday evening to hear that the vote had been taken. If anything could have alleviated my disappointment, it would have been that my determination to vote against the amendment of the leader of the opposition was very generally known. I approached this very important and troublesome problem with the earnest purpose that it should be solved in what I honestly believe to be the very best interests of all concerned. Sir, I have studied it with the greatest care in all its various aspects, taking into consideration all the circumstances and trying, as far as humanly possible, to put aside all influences of any kind whatever that could bias my judgment; and to-day, Sir, I have pleasure in realizing that I am in the best frame of mind and state of heart when I declare that I will stand by the government of the right hon. Mr. Borden. I truly believe this Bill to be the best measure that could be introduced here, under the actual circumstances, whether we look at it generally or from the special point of view of which I have mentioned. Though the question be much controverted as to whether the minority, in that part of Keewatin to be added to Manitoba, enjoys special rights and privileges in respect to educational matters, it seems to me to be now generally admitted that the provisions which apply are those of the Northwest Territories Act, chapter 62 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, which came into force on the 31st of July, 1907. The article X of chapter 62 of the above-mentioned statutes, reads as follows:

X. The Commissioner in Council, if authorized to make ordinances respecting education, shall pass all necessary ordinances in respect thereto; but in the laws or ordinances relating to education it shall always be provided

that a majority of the ratepayers of any district or portion or subdivision thereof, by whatever name the same is known, may establish such schools therein as they think fit and make the necessary assessment and collection of rates therefor; and also that the minority of ratepayers therein, whether Protestant or Roman Catholics, may establish separate schools therein, and in such case the ratepayers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic separate schools shall be liable only to assessment of such rates as they impose upon themselves in respect thereof.

Before that legislation could become operative, three conditions had to be reckoned with:

1st—That the government of this country should appoint a council of four members to assist the commissioner of the Territories.

2nd—That this Commissioner in Council should be authorized to make ordinances respecting education.

3rd—That this Commissioner in Council should make such ordinances.

Sir, we all know that up to the 10th of October, 1911, the very day this government came into power, none of these three conditions had been complied with. We all know that, as far as this government is concerned, the only demand ever received from the interested parties that the two first conditions above mentioned should materialize, reached the Governor in Council only on or about the 1st of December, 1911. In that respect, I fully concur with the right hon. leader of the government (Mr. Borden):

I ask any honourable gentleman in this House whether or not it would have been a reasonable thing for that government, after that matter had stood for nearly four years without the appointment of any council, without the authority of the commissioner to put into force these provisions respecting education. I would ask whether or not it would have been a reasonable thing for us to undertake to do that without which these Northwest Territories had got on very well for three and a half years at least. And, to do that, remember, on the very eve of carrying out a proposal to which parliament had given its unanimous acceptance on the 13th of July, 1908. Why, Mr. Speaker, I think it would have been the very worst thing we could do in the interests of all concerned if the government had seen fit on the eve of enlarging the boundaries of Manitoba, to take any such step as that which has been suggested.

But in view of the stand I am taking in this matter, the question whether or not separate schools are now in operation in Keewatin, according to article X of said chapter 62, has no importance whatever. I will even go farther and I will admit, for argument's sake, that these separate schools do exist to-day in Keewatin, according to that law. Have we the constitutional authority to force them to-day upon Manitoba? This question, Sir, has already been according to me, victoriously answered in the negative, by the right hon. leader of the government, one of the greatest legal minds we have to-day in Canada, and I do not know that this opinion of his has been yet contradicted, whether inside or outside of this House. I beg of you, Mr. Speaker, that I should be allowed to quote the right hon. gentleman's own words in that respect, as I humbly submit that I could not do as well as he has done himself:

I do not think it is constitutionally possible. I would like to point out to hon. members, to whose attention this may not have been brought, that the provisions of the British North America Act of 1871, with regard to the constitution of the province in the first instance, are very different from those contained in the clause of the same Act, providing for the alteration of the boundaries of a province. Section 2 of that Act—the one which provided for the constitution of a province, carved out of the Northwest Territories, for instance, Alberta—reads as follows:—

The parliament of Canada may from time to time establish new provinces in any territories forming for the time being part of the Dominion of Canada, but not included in any province thereof, and may, at the time of such establishment, make provision for the constitution and administration of any such province, and for the passing of laws for the peace, order and good government of such province and for its representation in the said parliament.

But when we come to the third section of that statute—the one in virtue of which this Bill is brought before this House—we find that the language with regard to increasing the area of a province is in very different terms. It is as follows:

The parliament of Canada may from time to time, with the consent of the legislature of any province of the said Dominion, increase, diminish, or otherwise alter the limits of such province, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the said legislature, and may, with the like consent, make provision respecting the effect and operation of any such increase or diminution or alteration of territory in relation to any province affected thereby.

We have in the one section the direct authority of this parliament to deal with the constitution of a province. In the other section we have not any such thing, and it seemed to me absolutely impossible to conceive that you can have a province in Canada, such as Manitoba would be after this Bill had passed, which would be governed as to one part of it by one constitutional provision in respect of education, and in another part of it, by another constitutional provision in respect of education. I do not believe that the British North America Act of 1871 contemplated any such thing. To my mind it is inconceivable, and I do not find warrant for it in the statute. It is inconceivable that you could have one constitutional limitation in Manitoba and another constitutional limita-

tion in the part of Manitoba which we now propose to add.

Now, the right hon. leader of the government says that 'a proposal to place any such restriction upon Manitoba is politically impossible because,' he does 'believe that Manitoba would not accept the extension of her boundaries coupled with any such restrictions.'

And later on the right hon. the Prime Minister adds that he is 'absolutely certain that it is politically impracticable.'

Well, Sir, I do not know of any other means by which this Bill could be amended so as to embody in it a clause safeguarding the rights and privileges mentioned in said clause X, whether this clause has been or not, to-day, taken advantage of. We have not the constitutional authority to insert that clause in this Bill without Manitoba's consent. And that consent, Manitoba is unwilling to give. We have the word of the right hon. gentleman to this effect. I am proud to say that I rely with the greatest confidence upon that affirmation. The right hon. gentleman who makes it is the man who, whilst he was touring the western provinces on the eve of the last federal election, said to the farmers who wanted him, as the leader of a great political party, to promise them reciprocity with the United States in natural products:

Gentlemen, I am against the reciprocity, and I would not make the promise you ask for, even if I knew that by doing it I would become the Prime Minister of this Dominion of ours.

Sir, the man who has the moral courage to speak in that way, in such circumstances, is not a Talleyrand, of such a man one cannot say that language has been given to him so that he might hide his thought.

And this is the reason why I say to-day that I believe the right hon. the Prime Minister, when he says that Manitoba is unwilling to 'accept the extension of her boundaries coupled with any such restrictions.' What are we to do then, Sir? Are we to say to Manitoba: All right, we shall keep Keewatin?

Where is the man that would dare to give such an advice to this government? We must not forget Mr. Speaker, that the honour of this House has been pledged to 'a proposal to which parliament has given its unanimous acceptance on the 13th of July, 1908. We all know Sir, that, on the 12th of April, 1876, the district of Keewatin was made a distinct and separate district by chapter 21 of the statute of 1876, which statute came into force by proclamation of the Governor in Council on the 7th of October, 1876, and the reason given for that legislation by the legislator at the time was that Keewatin was to be made part of the province of Manitoba.

Mr. CODERRE

Perusing lately the debates on this question in this House, I could not help noticing that a certain member took exception to that law being passed without a clause similar to clause X of chapter 49 of the Statutes of 1875, which chapter 49 is in force yet to-day, and gives a constitution to the Northwest Territories. That clause X of said chapter 49 of the law of 1875 is almost identically in the same terms as clause X of chapter 62 of the revised statutes of Canada, 1906, which gives to the population of Keewatin the right to separate schools. I found then in the debates that the predecessors of the right hon. leader of the opposition, Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, and the Hon. Edward Blake, then at the head of the Liberal party of the time and sitting in this House on the Treasury benches met that objection by saying that that omission of said clause X in the law of 1876 had been made purposely because in the course of time Keewatin or at least part of it, was to be added to Manitoba, and that the annexation would naturally and legally bring Keewatin in respect to educational matters, under the law of the province of Manitoba.

What is the law one can find to-day in the province of Manitoba?

The law of 1890, passed by a Liberal government, and against the passing of which all the Conservative members of the legislative assembly, Protestants as well as Catholics, fought to the bitter end, a law which has deprived the minority in Manitoba of certain rights and privileges in respect to education according to a judgment of the highest tribunal of the empire. We know that that law of 1890 has been amended by the legislative assembly after the general election of 1896, which brought to power the right hon. the leader of the opposition; but we know too, Sir, that this amendment, accepted by the right hon. leader of the opposition of to-day, then Prime Minister, does not give to the minority the full plenitude of their rights and privileges as admitted by that judgment of the Judicial Privy Council of the King. As a matter of fact, it is generally conceded, by all men of good faith at least, that was it not for the very generous and liberal interpretation given to that law of 1890 and its amendment by the Hon. Mr. Roblin, Conservative Premier of Manitoba, the position of the Roman Catholic minority in Manitoba to-day, though far from being what it should be, would be simply outrageous in the estimation of all broad-minded and law-abiding men. What is the population in Keewatin to-day, Sir? In the territory there are at the present time not more than 165 white people 400 or 500 half-breeds, and the balance of the population are Indians. The Roman Catholics, we are told, are in the minority. All rights and privileges are sacred to me,

Sir, but the rights and privileges of the few weak should be considered more sacred yet.

But, Sir, if by adopting that very dangerous and unwise device suggested to us that we should refuse to consent to the annexation of Keewatin to the province of Manitoba unless the representatives of that province accept the incorporation in this Bill of a clause apt to safeguard and protect the rights and privileges of the few Roman Catholics of Keewatin, is it not to be feared that without bettering at all the actual position in educational matters of those Keewatin people, we would hurt the interests in that respect of the 250,000 Roman Catholics of Manitoba? What more human, Sir? The political agitation that would manifestly follow such a course in Manitoba in the whole of this Dominion, agitation influenced by the religious passion, the most dangerous of all in a mixed population like ours, would very naturally bring the people of Manitoba, who have been described to us by the right hon. leader of the government as 'imbued with a big, broad, generous spirit, as inclined to deal with their fellow-countrymen who may be of a different faith in the same broad-minded and generous spirit as that which has been evinced in other provinces of Canada where no constitutional provisions of this kind exist,' such an agitation, I say, would very naturally bring them to retaliate on our Roman Catholic brothers in Manitoba, whose hopes for betterment in a near future and gain made in the past in respect to education, would then be lost.

Sir, this is my conviction, and that conviction is founded not only on human nature, but also on the experience gained during the years 1890 to 1897, on the very same matter, in the very same province. A great Canadian has said once: 'Let the country perish rather than a principle.' Sir, I do not belong to that school, and I refuse to-day to be coerced in saying: 'Let the 250,000 Roman Catholics in Manitoba perish if, to avoid that calamity it is necessary that the few hundreds of Roman Catholics in Keewatin should be placed not under the law passed in respect to education by the Liberal party of Manitoba in 1890, as amended in 1897 according to the poor settlement made that year by Messrs. Laurier and Greenway, a settlement which has been approved in this House by the hon. the member for Rouville to-day, then member for Gaspé, and by Mr. Henri Bourassa, then member for Labelle; no, sir, not under that law so miserably amended, but, Sir, under that law and its amendment as interpreted by the 'big, broad, generous spirit' of the Hon. Mr. Roblin.

There is an agitation in my own native province, says the right hon. leader of the opposition. We know it, Sir, and we know too that the right hon. gentleman in this House, is folding his arms, and is refusing to take any positive stand one way or the other in respect to this matter of school rights. He keeps cool and quiet, and he contents himself with putting before the House a double-faced amendment which will permit, on account of its vagueness and ambiguity, his political friends in the province of Quebec to say: We are against that Bill because there cannot be found in it a clause protecting the rights and privileges of the minority in Keewatin in respect of education and which will allow his partisan followers in the other provinces to say: We are against that Bill because some friends of the government wanted to coerce the province of Manitoba. We know too that the political organs of the right hon. gentleman in the province of Quebec are doing their best to bring that agitation to its greatest intensity. With respect to the agitation which is threatened to-day I would say to my hon. friends: Remember what we lost in 1896 in Manitoba through the agitation which was aroused as far back as 1890, especially by the Liberal press and the Liberal politicians of that day; bear in mind what we have gained in the same province since the agitation has cooled down; do not forget what the right hon. leader of the government said lately as to the very refreshing state of things which exists in the province of Nova Scotia to-day because our Roman Catholic brethren there have never used that very dangerous weapon. See what the hon. member for Kent, N.B., (Mr. Robidoux) said yesterday to a reporter of the 'Gazette,' a well known newspaper in Montreal, in respect to the happy lot in education matters of the Roman Catholics of New Brunswick who have always been careful not to agitate. Mr. Speaker, I might as well read this interview to the House:

NEW BRUNSWICK SCHOOLS.

Conditions are Satisfactory, Says Mr. Robidoux, M.P.

Mr. Robidoux, M.P. for the county of Kent, N. B., who was in the city on Saturday, made the statement that the general policy of the Borden government was giving satisfaction in the maritime provinces, and to the Acadian population in particular.

Mr. Robidoux is particularly well pleased with the immigration policy of the present government, as far as the province of New Brunswick is concerned. The hon. Mr. Rogers, he says, has just appointed Rev. Father Legace, of Legaceville, N.B., as immigration and repatriment agent for the county of Northumberland, where a goodly number of Acadians are located and a good many more are expected to return from the States and other countries, having left New Bruns-

wick in past years in the hope of bettering their condition.

Three years ago Father Legace founded Legaceville, and today there are a hundred families residing there, and with the help the Department of the Interior is giving them, the movement from the United States and other places to get back on the land will result in the addition, so Mr. Robidoux hopes, of three hundred families during next year.

Speaking of the school question in New Brunswick, Mr. Robidoux, after referring to the troubles some years ago when Mgr. Sweeny was bishop of St. John, stated that the compromise arrived at between the then head of the church in New Brunswick and the Hon. John Boyd, an eminent citizen of that city, and a strong friend of the late Sir Leonard Tilley, resulted in making peace between the warring factions of that province.

Resolutions in parliament year after year had been unavailing, but goodwill did the work, and although Mr. Robidoux declares that the system is not perfect from a Catholic point of view, he has reason to be pleased with the situation, as it now exists. In virtue of this compromise religious instruction is permitted in the schools under certain conditions. In the Acadian centres the teaching of French prevails, although the compromise made no mention of the fact.

'We have a series of French books,' he added, 'prepared by a commission composed of Father Bourgeois, of St. Joseph's College, Memramcook; Abbé Dagnaud, at one time superior of St. Ann's College, Nova Scotia, and Mr. Charles Hebert, one of the New Brunswick school inspectors, and others. Thanks to the intelligent co-operation of our friends, we now have a French department at the Normal school in New Brunswick, which is under the direction of Professor Beliveau, of that province also. Under the administration of the Hon. Mr. Hazen, now Minister of Marine and Fisheries, we had adopted by the Council of Public Instruction, a history of Canada, written in French by Father Bourgeois, and destined for the French schools of the province of New Brunswick, which will permit the young Acadian children to learn in their own tongue the history of this country. In several centres, like Moncton, Buctouche, Memramcook, Shediac and elsewhere, nuns who hold provincial licenses to teach in the schools, and although we do not have separate schools in name, we have them in practice. Obligatory instruction is discretional according to the will of the ratepayers, and only exists in populous centres, such as St. John, Fredericton and other places, while the price of school books was diminished by half, a year following the advent of the hon. Mr. Hazen to power.

Sir, the hon. member for Kent, N.B., a Canadian of French extraction and a Catholic, has added, whilst speaking to us on the same lines since the beginning of that agitation in Quebec:

Friends of Quebec, we belong to your race and creed; you are the strongest member of the French family on this continent; we certainly need your help and your sympathies, but do not proceed by means of violent agitation, have rather recourse to quiet ways and sunny smiles. In the past, according to my own experience, instead of helping us out of our difficulties by agitating, you have added to those difficulties.

This is and has been my policy. This is the policy of my church, as enunciated in an encyclical of the Holy Father, Pope Leo XIII, addressed on the 8th September, 1897, to the archbishops, bishops and other ordinaries of the Dominion of Canada, in relation to the settlement of the Manitoba school question made that year by the right hon. the leader of the opposition of to-day, then Prime Minister of Canada, and the Hon. Mr. Greenway, then Premier of Manitoba. This document can be found in 'Hansard' of 1898, vol. 2, page 5338:

We are not unaware that something has been done to amend that law. The men who are at the head of the Federal government, and of the province of Manitoba, have already taken certain measures with a view to decreasing the difficulties of which the Catholics of Manitoba complain, and against which they rightly continue to protest. We have no reason to doubt that these measures were taken from a love of justice and from a laudable motive. We cannot, however dissimulate the truth, the law which they had passed to repair the injury is defective, unsuitable, insufficient. The Catholics ask, and no one can deny that they justly ask, for much more. Moreover, in the remedial measures that have been proposed there is this defect, that by reason of changed local circumstances they may easily become valueless. In a word, the rights of Catholics and the education of their children have not been sufficiently provided for in Manitoba. Everything in this question demands—and it is conformable to justice—that they should be thoroughly provided for, that is, by placing in security and surrounding with due safeguards those unchangeable and sacred principles of which we have spoken above. This should be the aim, this the end to be zealously and prudently sought for. Nothing can be more injurious to the attainment of this end than discord. Unity of spirit and harmony of action are most necessary. Nevertheless, since, as frequently happens in things of this nature, there is not one fixed and determined, but various ways of arriving at the end which is proposed and which should be obtained, it follows that there may be various opinions equally good and advantageous. Therefore, let each and all be mindful of the rules of moderation, gentleness and mutual charity, let no one fail in the respect that is due to another, but let all resolve in fraternal unanimity, and not without your advice, to do that which the circumstances require, and which appears best to be done.

In a pastoral of His Grace, the Archbishop of Quebec, of that time, Mgr. Taschereau, 'To the clergy and Catholic people of Canada,' commenting upon the above-quoted encyclical, we read, page 5342, of 'Hansard' of 1898, volume II:

Nothing remains to us now but to appeal to that spirit of faith and submission with which we know you to be animated towards the Holy See. We are desirous to proclaim it aloud. We are above all political parties. We have no intention to be bound to any. What we desire is the triumph of a sacred cause and not the triumph of a party. And this triumph, we hope that all men of heart, all friends of justice and liberty will help us to obtain it. There is no question of coming back upon an unfortunate fact; this is the hour for a complete, entire reparation that we expect, and that hour, all sympathies, every noble courage, every generous kindness must strive to hasten. Let public men, therefore, unite together and have recourse to the means that wisdom and patriotism shall inspire them with to put an end to the violent state of things we are all enduring. p. 5343. In the name of justice, in the name of that harmony that should reign among all the citizens of the same country, we invite Protestants—whom this diversity of belief does not prevent from being our brothers—to give us their help and to work with us.

This was also the policy of Mr. Henri Bourassa, then member for Labelle. In a speech he made in relation to the said settlement of the Manitoba School Question. 'Hansard' of 1898, volume II, page 5437, we find:

I do not want to enter again upon the quarrels of the past. I think we have already had too many divisions between the two parties on this question.

Mr. Bourassa at page 5431, says:

I believe firmly that this school question will be settled, and settled on account of the position taken by this government, a position which has been met by the goodwill of the Greenway government, which has given more since this government come into power than during the whole time when hon. gentlemen opposite were in office. I hope this is the last we shall hear of this question, not because we are afraid of it or afraid of the position that we and this government have taken.

All I can add is this: By advocating the policy adhered to in 1897 and since, a policy which commends itself to-day even more than in 1897 to all wise and patriotic men, I sincerely believe I am doing my duty, all my duty, to the Roman Catholic population.

If I err in that respect,—and I do not think I do,—I err in very good company, with men who have never for a moment believed that they acted as traitors in 1896 and after.

Sir, before resuming my chair, though I am still a young member in this House, without much experience, I shall take the liberty of expressing to the right hon. leader of the opposition what I think of his attitude on this question. It is the duty of any member in this House, who does not approve of this Bill, to say so. This duty cannot be deemed to have been fulfilled by criticising the provisions which the Bill embodies. A Bill may be defective, not only by what it contains, but also by what it does not contain. In this case, some members have protested that the Bill does not embody a clause safeguarding and protecting the rights and principles of the minority in respect to education. When the right hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) spoke on his amendment, he alluded very vaguely to that question by affirming that a certain agitation was going on in the province of Quebec on account of that omission, but he personally took no stand whatever on that matter; he contented himself by saying that he would wait until some member on this side of the House had given his own view on the point at issue. The right hon. gentleman said, to use his own words, he was waiting within 'the lines of Torres Vedras.' What do we know of Torres Vedras?

Torres Vedras, a town of Portugal, in the district of Lisbon. Here were the noted fortifications known as the 'lines of Torres Vedras,' constructed by Wellington in 1810, during the Peninsular war.

These elaborate works, history tells us, had been constructed in the course of a year by thousands of Portuguese labourers, directed by Colonel Fletcher, of the Royal Engineers, upon a plan carefully thought out and laid down by Wellington himself.

When Masséna had carefully inspected the stupendous barrier reared in front of him, his well-trained eye recognized it as impregnable; he paused for some weeks under semblance of blockading the British forces, while he was really scouring the country for the means of feeding his own; but in November he began to retreat upon Santarem, Almeida and Ciudad Rodrigo, with a half-starved and dispirited army, greatly reduced in numbers during the campaign.

I would humbly beg the right hon. gentleman not to desecrate the glorious souvenir which has come to us through those words, 'the lines of Torres Vedras.' Do you believe, Sir, that the brave French general Masséna did not know whom he would encounter by attacking this 'stupendous barrier.' He knew, Sir, that Wellington and his valiant troops were behind these lines; he knew that those British soldiers had an ideal: the defence of the freedom of the Spanish and Portugese peoples, which freedom the ambitious Napoleon the First was willing to take away from them; he knew that they would fight for that principle till death. And, Sir, that knowledge had much to do towards the decision of Masséna to pass by without attacking. There was, Sir, on that 'stupendous barrier,' a glorious flag, the Union Jack, the symbol of liberty the world over, within and without the empire, with one exception, however, as far as the province of Manitoba is concerned: the liberty of

the Roman Catholic population in respect to education.

But what do we see here? The spectacle we have before us does not justify at all the right hon. genleman in comparing his own attitude and the attitude of his party, on this very important question with the attitude of Wellington and his soldiers at Torres Vedras in 1810. That great political party has no policy to offer the House; if these politicians, Sir, have such a policy, they have not the courage to stand openly by it. We see no flag, Sir, flying bravely on top of their lines of battle. I know they have two, though; but their political cunning advises them that those flags should remain in the dark till the day of the election comes. And then, Sir, those who do not know the hon. gentleman will be surprised to find one of those two flags in the province of Quebec, bearing the motto, 'Separate schools for Keewatin,' and the other one flying in the other province with in its folds the slogan, 'Hands off Manitoba.'

Sir, if there were lions within the lines of Torres Vedras, there are political foxes on those opposition seats. These tactics have succeeded once in 1896; but I really believe that this country will not consent to be deceived once more.

Sir, I really hope that this message of good-will, of harmony and of concord, that we, on this side of the House, are just sending to the people of Manitoba, will bring them to give, in their plenitude, to my Roman Catholic compatriots in Manitoba the rights and privileges in respect to education which a judgment of the highest tribunal of the empire in the Brophy case has decided that they were entitled to. Knowing the past of the Conservative party in Manitoba, that the Hon. Mr. Roblin had been defending, against Greenway, Martin and Sifton, the separate schools attacked by the law of 1890, that he was by the side of Sir Charles Tupper in 1896 to obtain that the rights and privileges of the minority, as embodied in a remedial law, presented in compliance with the judgment rendered in the Brophy case, and which gave complete satisfaction to the interested parties, should become the law of the province of Manitoba;—knowing moreover that since he has obtained power —and, Sir, history will tell us that the Conservatives could not get into power in Manitoba, only after the great agitation raised by the Liberals against them on that school question had cooled down—he did all that he could to alleviate the harm the law of 1890 and its amendment have done to the cause of the Roman Catholics of Manitoba, I really believe that the Hon. Mr. Roblin, whose already very high reputation as a statesman will be greatly increased by this success of his policy, will take advantage of the feelings of joy and enthusiasm brought to his own people by the passing of this measure, to at last give fair justice to my compatriots of Manitoba. Sir, I have the greatest and sincerest admiration and love for the British flag. It is on account of that admiration and that love that I most deeply desire that that dark spot put on that flag by the Liberal Chieftain Greenway in 1890 would at last disappear. We are told that the Hon. Mr. Roblin has had the very patriotic idea to order that the Union Jack should fly over and above each and every public school in Manitoba. It will be a day of universal contentment and joy, all over the land, when the Roman Catholic children, frequenting these schools, will feel that that great flag shelters and protects all their rights, privileges and liberty, and that they are on a footing of equality with their young comrades of other extraction. Sir, thanks to the policy of the present government, I feel that we will soon see that day.

I feel confident, Sir, that taking the course I am taking, I have done my duty, not only to the Roman Catholic population of Manitoba and Keewatin, but to the whole population of our country.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, much as I believe that the province of Manitoba is entitled to the extension of boundaries which it is to receive under the Bill which we are now considering, I have felt it my duty to oppose the passage of this Bill for reasons which I have already stated to the House, and which were set forth in the amendment which I proposed, namely, that the terms granted to Manitoba were at once unfair to that province and to the rest of the Dominion as well. My right hon. friend opposite, speaking some time afterwards, characterized that amendment as a piece of political strategy to avoid an impending political difficulty in connection with this Bill. Let me say to my right hon. friend that if I thought it advisable in this matter to resort to political strategy, I would think it best to play the game as well as I could. But there are occasions when it is not advisable to resort to political strategy, when the question before the House has to be squarely met, and this is the position I intend to take now. There are two considerations which, for me, dominate the present situation. Manitoba is entitled to an extension of its boundaries, not only for the welfare of Manitoba itself, but for the welfare of the whole Dominion. The territory which it is now proposed to give to Manitoba has been, up to the present time, a sealed book as far as the white man is concerned. The white man has never penetrated into this territory except as a hunter. He is now going in as a permanent settler. A railway is actually in course of construction from

the wheat fields of the western provinces to the waters of Hudson bay, and, therefore, it follows as a necessity that this territory must be given provincial organization. Municipal institutions have to be established, civil institutions have to be established likewise, towns will grow, and all the other accompaniments of civilized life will have to be attended to. Therefore, as a matter of necessity, this territory must be either organized as a province or annexed to another province. Nobody can contend that it would be advisable, opportune, or politic, for reasons well known to everybody, that a new province should be constituted out of that territory. It must be annexed to another province, and the only province to which it can be annexed is the province of Manitoba. Then, Manitoba, from the fact of this annexation, is entitled to receive, for the purpose of revenue, either the lands of the territory or an equivalent in money. Beyond this, everything that is contained in this Bill, and there is much contained in it, is in violation of the rights of the other provinces.

Mr. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Manitoba has been for forty years in this Dominion. It has been on a footing of equality, in so far as provincial subsidies are concerned, with the other provinces, and now you take it from that condition of equality and give it favoured treatment. It seems to me that my hon. friend opposite has not measured the length to which this concession is going to lead him. He has raised problems which, evidently, he never dreamed of in his philosophy. But already, from all sides, troubles have arisen for him and for the country. I can say fairly that the troubles which will face him do not disturb me very much—that is his own concern—but I cannot be indifferent to the condition of the country; and it does seem to me manifest that the other provinces will not be satisfied unless there is a reorganization of the whole of the provincial subsidies which we thought we had secured for all time in the amendment to the constitution, which was passed by the Imperial parliament in 1907. Now, whilst Manitoba is given extravagant terms, for which there can be no justification whatever, on the other hand that province is treated in a manner which cannot be defended by any man who values the rights of the province. Manitoba had the right to expect from the men who form the present government, when they were in opposition, that she would receive her lands, but instead of her being given her lands, a portion of her lands have been given to another province. Here again the government is introducing a new principle which is fraught with dire consequences. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, stated some days ago in this debate, that if Manitoba was not given the extension of her territory during the regime of the preceding administration, it was because I wanted to penalize that province the government of which was not composed of friends of my own.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Nobody at this moment, or indeed at any moment, can quote a word or a syllable of mine which could justify such an imputation. I would like to ask anybody who has seen me in opposition or in office for more than thirty years in this House, if any imputation of that kind could be based on anything I ever said or anything I ever did. Sir, it is useless to refute such a statement as that. When Manitoba came to ask for the extension of her boundaries, I thought it advisable before considering her application, that her neighbour to the east and her neighbour to the west should be consulted. Can anybody in this Hause say that it was not the first of all things to be done? I had a conference summoned, composed of members representing Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Ontario. Manitoba was not represented by friends of mine, Ontario was not represented by friends of mine, but Saskatchewan was represented by friends of mine. Saskatchewan made application there and then for the territory which is now given to Manitoba, and I said to my friend from Saskatchewan, Mr. Walter Scott, the premier of the province, that in my humble judgment, in all fairness and equity that territory should go to Manitoba, and I reported accordingly to my colleagues and to the House. Now the province of Saskatchewan is coming forward with a new request. It is asking that since it could not have the territory, it should have access to the waters of Hudson bay in the same manner that Ontario has access to that bay. If, Sir, it is right to give to Ontario 800,000 acres, or thereabouts of the lands of Manitoba, together with access to Hudson bay, is there any reason in the world, why the same measure of treatment should not be given to Saskatchewan as well?

Mr. SPEAKER. I am sorry to interrupt the right hon. gentleman, but with reference to a Bill which was before the House last night motions were made to refer it back to the Committee of the Whole, and I was obliged to rule that those who were speaking should confine themselves to the amendments that were proposed to the Bill, as I regarded that to be the proper ruling of the Chair. To-night the amendment has been moved that this Bill be

referred back to the Committee of the Whole House with instructions that they have power to amend the measure by inserting a clause in reference to the educational rights of the minority. Following the same rule, I would be obliged, of course, to decide that the right hon. gentleman is not speaking strictly to the question. But if it is the desire of the House that the debate should be of an unrestricted character, covering the whole scope of the Bill, I certainly have no objection; but I do not wish it to be understood that I desire to rule one way one night and rule to give a reverse ruling another.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would bow most respectfully to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and I am all the more grateful to you since I was not in order that you did not interrupt me sooner because I have about finished what I have to say on that particular point. I might perhaps be allowed, without trespassing on the time of the House, and on your ruling, Sir, to finish what I intended to say. In my humble judgment Saskatchewan had as much claim as Ontario to the same treatment, and with that statement I will close this part of my argument. I now come, Sir, to another matter, the matter which is involved in the amendment that is now before the House. My young and hon. friend who has just addressed the House and also the hon. member from Vercheres (Mr. Rainville), I understand, though I was not here at the time, commented somewhat adversely upon the fact that I had stated at a former stage of the debate that I was within the lines of Torres Vedras.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If I was within the lines of Torres Vedras it was not with any intention of remaining there permanently. My hon. friend who has just addressed the House stated that the Duke of Wellington was within the lines of Torres Vedras. That is true, but as everybody knows the Duke of Wellington came out from the lines of Torres Vedras, and came out with some effect upon the army of the enemy. If I have taken that position, Sir, it was with no intention whatever of shirking an expression of my opinion, in which I am very proud to see hon. gentlemen on the other side seem to take some interest, but it was because I did not think that it was advisable for me to enter so early in the debate when so far, the debate was not within the two sides of the House, but altogether within the government side of the House.

If the question has been brought before the House—this family question—in connection with the boundaries of Manitoba, the debate was not raised from this side but from the other side of the House. I think it would have been rather imprudent in me to interfere in that family quarrel. I think it was my part to keep out of it and see what position was taken by hon. gentlemen opposite. I have a word to say to hon. gentlemen on the other side. But before I proceed further, I must say that, for my part, I approach this question at the moment, not in my capacity as leader of a party, but as an individual, I do not want to bind anybody to my own opinion on a question of this kind; I leave it to the judgment and conscience of every one of those who have honoured me in the past, or to-day honour me, with their confidence. But I never meant anybody to be in doubt as to what my attitude would be on this question. My attitude upon this question is well known; it has been well known for the last sixteen years. I stand, in this year 1912 on the same platform on which I stood in 1896. I would not then interfere with the autonomy of Manitoba; I will not now when in opposition interfere with the autonomy of Manitoba.

As regards this amendment proposed by my hon. friend from Yamaska (Mr. Mondou), to my mind, it is beyond doubt, and I think ought to be beyond doubt to himself, that if his object was to maintain in the new territory of Manitoba the legislation upon which he has based his amendment, the legislation of 1875, he could not have taken—I hope he will allow me to say so without offense—a more ineffective way of doing it. I think it has been demonstrated to him that the amendment which he has proposed even if it had been adopted by this House, would not in any way add to the rights or privileges of the minority in the new territory accorded to them in the Manitoba Act. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), has argued, and my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), also has argued, that this whole question is a question of law. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice has been particularly emphatic upon that point. This is indeed a question of law, and, so far as this amendment is concerned, it is nothing but a question of law. But, though this is a question of law, my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, who comes from the province of Quebec, is well aware that it is as a political question that we must look at it at this moment. My hon. friend is well aware that for the last fifteen years it has been stated by all the forces of the party to which he belongs in that province that the settlement we made of the actual question in 1896, was no settlement at all, and that if the party to which he belongs were returned to office, the first thing they

would do would be to tear that settlement to pieces and restore to the minority in Manitoba the full system of separate schools they had prior to 1890. That is the battle we have had to fight at every election since 1896. In 1900, in 1904, in 1908, the same question was always discussed. It was declared that I, in particular, as leader of the party then in office, had betrayed my fellow-religionists, that the settlement we had made was in violation of the clear injunction of the Privy Council, that we were in default, that the settlement was invalid, and that as soon as the Conservative administration was returned to office, all this would be set aside, and the minority in Manitoba would be put back into the position they held in 1890. Everybody within the sound of my voice who comes from the province of Quebec knows that I am not in any way exaggerating the case, but that I have stated it as it was stated over and over again by the party to which my hon. friend belongs, in every election we have had since 1896.

Let us look at this question. I agree with something that was said by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice this afternoon. We are a people of many origins and many creeds; but there is no class in this country which, by reason of creed, race or any other consideration, can claim to have rights indefeasible and superior to the rights of any other class. All the classes have rights, and all these rights are limited by the rights of the other classes. And whenever there is a clash of interests, as unfortunately there have been too many in the past, it behooves the minority to be moderate in its claims, it behooves the majority to be generous in its treatment of the minority. But, if any class in this community insists upon its pound of flesh according as it may be written in the bond, and if all the other classes meet such pretensions in a similar manner, the result must be a condition of affairs not far removed from anarchy. The policy I have advocated ever since I have entered public life, the policy upon which I fought the elections of 1896, is that all such clashing of interests, whenever and wherever they occur, must be settled and can be settled only through compromise, through conciliation, and through appeal to all interested parties to make some sacrifices of opinion, and even pretensions, yes, and even of rights, in order to come to an understanding of peace, wood-will and harmony in this land. I was elected on that platform, and upon that platform I stood so long as I was in office, not only upon this question of education, which came to the front on more than one occasion, during the term of office of the late administration, but even on all similar matters in which their was a clashing of interests. May I recall to the recollection of the House, for instance, our method of dealing with the problem which has been agitating the province of British Columbia for many years, the problem of Asiatic immigration.

There is in British Columbia constant cause of trouble arising out of Asiatic immigration. This is not due to any prejudice of colour, this is not due to any ill-will, but it is the result of economic conditions which prevail in British Columbia. It has been shown that whenever 'Asiatic labour' comes into competition in the labour market with white labour, there is an immediate cause of disturbance. The reason is obvious, it is that the standard of Oriental civilization as compared with our own civilization is very different, and the Asiatic labourer is able, on a lower wage than the white man, to live in comparative comfort, whereas it is not possible for a white man to accept such a wage. The consequence is that we had in British Columbia a constant source of trouble. When we came into office in 1896 we were approached by a majority of the members of the government of British Columbia, who were then in sympathy with the government, with a request to increase the capitalization tax upon Chinese immigrants which had been put on the statute-book by Sir John A. Macdonald in 1885, and to which we had no objection. We were asked at the same time to impose a similar tax upon the subjects of His Majesty the Japanese Emperor. To that we would not agree, and why? Why did we think it advisable to put a capitation tax upon Chinamen and not upon Japanese? The reason was that there had been recently signed between the King of England and the Emperor of Japan a treaty of alliance, to a large extent offensive and defensive, and it would have been an indignity to put such a stigma upon the subjects of our ally. So, instead of putting that indignity upon the subjects of the Emperor of Japan, we sent to Japan one of our colleagues, the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) to settle that question; and by pursuing a policy of conciliation between the two countries we were able to obtain from the Japanese Emperor an engament that he himself would restrict Japanese immigration within a certain limit, and the result has been that since then we have had peace in British Columbia. True it is that the course then followed was not satisfactory to the people of British Columbia; but I believe that I am within the judgment of the House in saying that the policy was not only a strong one, but was eminently wise.

In the same manner we settled the school question that had been a source of trouble in Manitoba previous to 1896; in the same manner we settled the school question in

Saskatchewan and Alberta by the Autonomy Bills of 1905. All these questions, burning as they were, we settled by a policy of compromise, of conciliation, by an appeal to the good sense, and better judgment, and better heart of all the parties interested. But Sir, that policy of conciliation and of compromise was denounced with the greatest possible severity in the province of Quebec, by all the forces of the Conservative party, and by none with greater bitterness and severity than the hon. gentlemen whom I now see before me on the treasury benches, my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) and my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Nantel). These hon. gentlemen and their friends, in the press and on the platform, denounced compromise as humiliating, denounced conciliation as weak, and this they preached in season and out of season, in public prints, in the press, and everywhere they could get a hearing. Wherever they could find a stump for their two feet they preached the policy of no concession. Their plea was: We want the plentitude of the rights of the minority in the province of Manitoba restored to them, and if the Conservative party is returned to power we will give them that plenitude of rights. Now Sir, am I exaggerating? Everybody knows that this has been the policy of hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House. Everybody knows that they have maintained that policy from 1895-6 up to the 5th of March. 1912, when, within our hearing, and to the dismay of their followers, they declared that the settlement which was made in 1897, whether good or bad, was binding, and that there was nothing more to be done for the minority in the province of Manitoba. Sir, there is no doubt whatever that if the speeches that we heard on the 5th of March, a week ago, to-morrow, from the mouth of the Minister of Public Works, and from the mouth of the Postmaster General, had been heard during the last election in the province of Quebec, the result would have been somewhat different from what it was. The general result would have been different, as to the individual result, I daresay the Minister of Public Works might have squeezed into his seat by the skin of his teeth, but even of that I am not very sure. But as to my hon. friend the Postmaster General, he would never have come within 1,000 votes of obtaining the seat of the county of Quebec.

Heaven, Sir, is my witness, that so far as I am personally concerned, the defeat of the 21st September last never caused me a moment of pain, I certainly regretted it for the party, and I still more regretted it for the country. But I repeat, that it never affected me personally in the least. I do not know but that I am rather glad than otherwise, for this reason, that the defeat of the Liberal party gives us the measure of the men who have replaced us, and the people of Quebec will understand now that all these loud professions and promises of restoring the rights of the minority in Manitoba were simply snares and shams made to reach office, and to be disavowed as soon as office was reached. The people of Quebec will now understand that I and my friends did not deceive them when we told them that the school question had been settled in 1897, and that these gentlemen who boasted that they would re-open it, never could re-open it at all, because it was settled for all time. The country has gained this much, that we shall have no more agitation upon this subject; the country has gained this much, that we shall know where we are, and that forever this question is removed from the field of agitation.

My hon. friend the Postmaster General and my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, in order to cover their retreat, went very far back upon the record and threshed the old straw over and over again threshed before. They said, in order to cover their retreat, that the settlement which I made with the government of Manitoba of the school question in 1897, had gone behind the judgment of the Privy Council, and had been at variance with its dispositions. I have to take issue with my hon. friends upon that point. I say that the settlement which we made in 1897 in no way contravened the dispositions of the judgment of the Privy Council. I say that the Privy Council never ordered the restoration of separate schools in Manitoba.

I say more; I say that the minority in Manitoba, before the Privy Council, never asked for a complete restoration of separate schools as they existed before 1890. This is a broad statement on my part. I say that the minority in Manitoba, before the Privy Council, never asked for the full restoration of the school system which existed prior to the legislation of 1890. For what I say now I will give book and verse. I will quote from the argument of the counsel of the minority, Mr. Ewart. This is the thoughtful argument with which he summed up the case. I beg hon. gentlemen to give me their attention while I read the argument presented then by Mr. Ewart as to what were the conditions of the minority in Manitoba. This is the language that was used by Mr. Ewart:

> Before closing I would like to say a word or two as to what we are seeking. As it has been already remarked, we are not asking for any declaration as to the extent of the relief to be given by the Governor General. We

merely ask that it should be held that he has jurisdiction to hear our prayer, and to grant us some relief if he thinks proper to do so. It may be that the Dominion authorities may not choose to re-establish us in all the rights and privileges which we enjoyed prior to this Act of 1890, although that was acquiesced in by everybody, and it remained as a good working Act for a period of nineteen years, and although I may say also that that is the system, or almost the system, which has existed in the province of Quebec for more than a quarter of a century, it may be that the Dominion authorities may prefer the Ontario system, under which there is a closer governmental control—a system under which government control is very complete, under which books are chosen by the government inspectors appointed by government, and all school regulations are made by government. Or it may be that some other system may be devised which will enable the Roman Catholics to teach in schools to which no Protestant child now goes, the religion of its parents under limited circumstances, without thereby being penalized by ostracism from the public school provisions. We cannot tell, nor have I come here instructed to state what the measure of relief will be which will be asked if it be held that the Governor General has jurisdiction to deal with this matter, but this much I think I may properly say that we have no desire to withdraw from the operation of state statutory control. That position we never did possess under the Manitoba statutes, and we do not see—nor, indeed, can we ask—to be placed in any better position than the position which we occupied prior to the Act of 1890.

Is there in these words of the counsel of the minority any statement that they asked for the full restoration of the system which was abolished in 1890? They simply asked that it be decided that the Governor in Council had the right to hear their request, that he had power to interfere, leaving it to the Governor in Council to provide such relief as he might think proper after having looked into the circumstances. That judgment, so clear in itself, has been represented for fifteen years by the gentlemen who now sit on the treasury benches as an order from the Privy Council to the government of Canada, to the government of Manitoba and to every person else concerned, to restore Catholic schools as they existed prior to 1890. All they asked was in the very words of counsel, some relief, leaving it to the discretion of the government according to the circumstances, to give it in larger or smaller measure, as it might be decided. This is the order which was made by the lords of the Privy Council. I would also ask the indulgence of the House if I cite at some length from the judgment of the Privy Council. Their lordships say:

As a matter of fact the objection of Roman Catholics to schools such as alone receive state aid under the Act of 1890 is conscientious and deeply rooted. If this had not been so, if there had been a system of public education acceptable to Catholics and Protestants alike, the elaborate enactments which have been the subject of so much controversy and consideration would have been unnecessary.

And then it goes on to the concluding part:

For the reasons which have been given, their lordships are of opinion that the 2nd subsection of section 22 of 'The Manitoba Act' is the governing enactment and that appeal to the Governor General in Council was admissible by virtue of that enactment, on the grounds set forth in the memorials and petitions, inasmuch as the Acts of 1890 affected rights and privileges of the Roman Catholic minority in relation to education within the meaning of that subsection. The further question is submitted whether the Governor in Council has power to make the declarations or remedial orders asked for in the memorials or petitions or has any other jurisdiction in the premises. Their lordships have decided that the Governor General in Council has jurisdiction and that the appeal is well founded, but the particular course to be pursued must be determined by the authorities to whom it has been committed by the statute. It is not for this tribunal to intimate the precise steps to be taken. Their general character is sufficiently defined by the 3rd subsection of section 22 of 'The Manitoba Act.'

It is certainly not essential that the statutes repealed by the Act of 1890 should be re-enacted or that the precise provisions of these statutes should again be made law. The system of education embodied in the Acts of 1890 no doubt commends itself to and adequately supplies the wants of the great majority of the inhabitants of the province. All legitimate ground of complaint would be removed if that system were supplemented by provisions which would remove the grievance upon which the appeal is founded and were modified as far as might be necessary to give effect to these provisions.

Mark my words. No order here to restore the Catholic schools as they existed previous to 1890! Their lordships on the contrary are clear to state that there would be no necessity of repealing the Act of 1890 which was satisfactory to the majority but in order to remove the grievance of the minority they suggested that it should be supplemented by some such legislation or some such mode as would allow them to bring up their children in their own faith in so far as the schools were concerned. Upon this there was a remedial order issued, an order which was issued certainly very imprudently, without sufficient information, without taking into consideration what clashing of interests there might be in Manitoba and that order simply instructed the province of Manitoba to restore effectively and actually the system of separate schools

which had been in existence prior to 1890. Three things are necessary to constitute separate schools; first of all separate organization; second, exemption from taxation for public schools, and in the third place an adequate share of the provincial funds allotted to education.

These things were ordered in the Remedial Order of the previous government. The government of Manitoba was ordered to enact a law which would give back to the minority

(a) The right to build, maintain, equip, manage conduct and support Roman Catholic schools in the manner provided by the said statutes which were repealed by the two Acts of 1890 aforesaid.

(b) The right to share proportionately in any grant made out of the public funds for the purposes of education.

(c) The right of exemption of such Roman Catholics as contribute to Roman Catholic schools from all payment or contribution to the support of any other schools.

The great mistake which was made by the government of Sir Mackenzie Bowell in that Remedial Order was that they were ordering the province of Manitboa to do more than they who had passed the Order could enforce. If the province of Manitoba refused to comply with the Order, they could very well have passed a Bill which would exempt the minority from paying taxes to the public schools, they could very well have passed an Act giving the right to the minority to organize their own schools, but they could not by any Act of legislation or by order in council, or in any manner whatever, give away the funds of the province of Manitoba to the separate schools. And in this they made a fatal mistake; they introduced a Bill and, just as we had anticipated, while the Bill authorized the legislature to pass a Separate School Act, to exempt from taxation the supporters of separate schools, they could not give to the schools any share in the public moneys and therefore, if the Remedial Bill had become law, the schools which might have been organized could not have received any funds out of the public treasury; they would have been at once placed in a position of inferiority and therefore the settlement could not be satisfactory to the minority.

We came into office upon that issue. We made a settlement with the province of Manitoba. I do not pretend that the settlement we made with Manitoba was perfect, but I affirm it was the best thing that could be done for the minority in Manitoba; I never pretended that it was, but I say, without any hesitation, that it was far better than the provisions which were made in the Remedial Bill. It was as good as could be obtained under existing circumstances, after this question had been for six years the battleground of factions in Manitoba. My hon. friend the Postmaster General, in his speech the other day, said that the settlement which had been made had not been efficient. I take complete issue with him upon that point, and I think I might call witnesses to this, but it will be sufficient if I state here what the settlement was and how it was worked. The settlement that we made with the government of Mr. Greenway at that time was that wherever in any school in a town or city there was an average attendance of 40 children of the Roman Catholic faith, they would have a right to have a teacher of their own persuasion. In rural districts where there was an average attendance of 25 children, they would have the right to obtain from the trustees a teacher of their own persuasion, and a right, at certain times and under certain conditions to be determined by the trustees, to have religious education in the schools. Children speaking the French language would have the right to receive their instruction in French. That was the tenor of the settlement we made with Manitoba.

My hon. friend tells me, and told the House the other day, that that settlement was inefficient. I tell him, and I think I will not be contradicted by anybody here, that that agreement has been put into operation in at least 200 schools in the province of Manitoba, and it has given complete satisfaction. The only places in which it has not given any satisfaction are Brandon and Winnipeg, and the reason for that, as I understand, and I speak subject to correction, is that the settlement was not put in operation in these cities. For reasons which I do not know, or rather which I know too well, this settlement was not put in operation in those cities, but everywhere else it was put in operation, and I repeat that wherever it has been put in operation outside of these two cities it has given fairly general satisfaction. That is the position to-day, that is the position which was denounced in the province of Quebec for no other reason that I can see except the desire of obtaining power at all costs.

I now come to the question of the existing condition of things in the territory to be annexed under this Bill to Manitoba. There is no doubt whatever that the law of 1875 is in operation to-day in those territories, and were that territory organized to-day, as was stated by the Minister of Justice this afternoon, the minority would have the right to all its provisions. But that is not a constitutional right, it is simply a legislative enactment of this parliament under the control of this parliament so long as that territory remains

under its jurisdiction, but no further than that. If this were a constitutional agreement or right, there would be no necessity to put it in any law, because it would carry itself as a constitutional right wherever the territories might be placed. But there is this objection. The young members who have followed their leaders so far now believe that the grievances of Manitoba would be relieved as they want them to be relieved. There is this objection to the incorporation of the law of 1875 in the present Bill, which would give full separate school rights to that part of the country, that such an enactment would not be worth the paper on which it was printed because we cannot impose it on Manitoba. Unless Manitoba agrees to this law this parliament has no authority to force it upon Manitoba. This would have been a case for compromise, a case for conciliation, but my hon. friends who sit on the treasury benches from the province of Quebec despise conciliation, and have contempt for compromise. Their policy was everything or nothing, and the result is nothing.

My hon. friend, the Postmaster General, the other day stated three or four times that he was fully assured that Mr. Roblin was well disposed towards the minority, that he was disposed to give to the minority as much as or more than was given in the law of 1875. If, Sir, Mr. Roblin is so well disposed, it would have been an excellent occasion to make the compromise or settlement proposed. Indeed there might have been no necessity for a compromise.

If Mr. Roblin is so well disposed, perhaps he would have given everything on the asking. My hon. friend told us with great positiveness that he was assured of the disposition of Mr Roblin. We could not understand where his assurance came from, because he told us that he had no understanding with Mr. Roblin. But he was sure of his facts. How did he know? Was it a case of telepathy, or did a little bird come from Winnipeg and whisper in his ear that it would be all right? I have to point out to my hon. friend that if the law of 1875, giving the full right to separate schools to the minority, has not been incorporated in this Bill, it is because there are men beside him and men behind him who would not have this disposition incorporated in this Bill. I have no doubt that my hon. friend the Postmaster General, and also my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, made a pretty ardent request to their colleagues to save them from the humiliating position in which they would be placed, if the school rights were not restored to the minority. At least, I give them that credit. I suppose my hon. friend the Postmaster General, made the request to his colleagues, not from the love he may bear to the minority, but for the good name he wants to give to the Postmaster General. But he could not obtain his request. Mr. Roblin, I am prepared to believe, is well disposed, but Mr. Roblin has some men behind him also, who may not allow that fair disposition to materialize, as my hon. friend expects it to materialize. Sir, the public opinion which in 1890 forced the legislature of Manitoba to remove the separate schools as they existed then, was the result of conflicts and passions which I have reason to believe are now passed away. But, Sir, as it happens, very often, those passions have left behind them an aftermath which has not yet passed away, which has still a good deal of force and potentiality. It is with the human race as it is with the elements. When the elements are thrown out of gear by some cataclysm, it takes a long time before they are restored to their normal condition. When the storms have been raging on the ocean, when the waves have been roused to fury, if all of a sudden the winds ceased to blow, the clouds vanish from the horizon, and the sun shines again warm and bright. But though peace now reigns above, peace is not yet restored to the waters below. For a long time the billows continue to be tossed by the internal fury imparted to them by the storm. Though the storm itself has abated, it is a long time before the serenity of the heavens is reflected on the placid bosom of the deep.

Sir, we know only too well from the teaching of history, and from our own experience in this new country, that the passions which rage in the human heart far exceed the violence of winds and waves and storms. We know from our own experience, as well as from the experience of other countries, and from the whole teaching of history, that when in any community popular passions have been driven to wrath, even though the causes of their anger may be removed, still for a long time the community continues to be torn by their violence, and it is only by slow degrees, by mutual forbearance, that peace and harmony again recover their blessed sway. It is in the light of this experience that I have endeavoured to guide the destinies of the party to which I belong since that party entrusted me with its fortunes. I have learned from history, especially from the history of this country, that the best method of vindicating even the most sacred causes, is by moderation and the respect of others as well as the respect of ourselves. I have learned to apply this doctrine even to the settlement of the school question of Manitoba. On that occasion I appealed to the best elements of all parties, of all creeds, of all races, and I think I have succeeded fairly well except with one class the class now sitting on

the treasury benches. Whatever may have been the reward of my efforts in that direction, the policy which I maintained in office I shall maintain in opposition. Never shall I raise my hand in any way so that discord shall come in this land, and for these considerations I shall vote against the amendment.

Hon. F. D. MONK (Minister of Public Works). Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to detain the House at this late hour; and indeed, it seemed to me, after the full expression of my views which I gave the other day, that I would not be called upon to speak again on this subject. But, Mr. Speaker, I cannot allow the statement of my right hon. friend this evening to go unchallenged. I knew, when my right hon. friend stated the other day, with studied caution, that he had retired within the lines of Torres Vedras, that he would be chased out of those lines. I must confess that I was somewhat curious to see how he would manœuvre. I did not for a single moment doubt that he would not, as the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Coderre) has so eloquently portrayed, follow the example of the noble duke whose name is associated with Torres Vedras, but that his issuing from those lines would be coupled with a great deal of gliding and sliding. My right hon. friend, he will pardon me for saying, is getting old; we are all getting old; and he has acquired the habit of self-laudation coupled with the laudation of past times. For quite a while I have noticed that my right hon. friend, with whom my relations have always been most cordial, has been given to self-laudation. He is a 'laudator temporis acti.' He has been singularly faithful to that motto. But 'pride goeth before destruction and haughty spirit before a fall,' and he has fallen into the pit this evening.

I remember that my right hon. friend boasted from his place in the House that he would have a transcontinental line that would cost some $13,000,000 or $15,000,000, and that——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MONK—he said it would be paid out of the surplus of one year. We know what came of that assertion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MONK. That was one of those occasions. Another occasion arose when my right hon. friend, at the time which he referred to a moment ago, when we were discussing the Autonomy Bills, said that he stood upon the rock of the constitution, and invited us to come up there with him. Some one on this side of the House beckoned to him, and with the alacrity of a panther he jumped down from the rock, and he bears us illwill because we would not follow him upon that occasion. Let me point out to my right hon. friend that he has either not followed my humble and modest career during the past 15 years, or else I must accuse him of having intentionally deceived both the House and the country upon the real attitude which I, and those around me, from 1896 took upon this very question which we are discussing this evening. A few days ago I mentioned in this very debate that before the settlement —in which my right hon. friend appears to be so proud, but to which I will refer in a moment—where he sacrificed shamelessly the rights of those he was bound to protect, I declared that with respect to remedial legislation, the verdict of the people in 1896 was conclusive, that that mode of remedying the grievances of the minority in Manitoba was vetoed by the people. And when my right hon. friend, without even consulting the complainants—the minority interested—concluded with the government of Manitoba, which had deprived them of their rights, and alone and ex parte made that settlement; when he brought down Mr. Greenway to Montreal, gave him a triumph, tendered him a banquet, and invited all his friends to celebrate that settlement; when we knew the terms of that settlement; when my right hon. friend brought it down and laid it on the table of the House, but was so much ashamed of himself that he failed to put upon the agreement his signature, and that of the man who had concluded it with him—I found, Sir, that that agreement was not a fair one, and that after all his boasts, after all his representations, after all his conciliation, he had finally sacrificed the very people whom it was his duty to protect. That was what we found, that was what I declared, and on no occasion since 1897 have I discussed that question in our province. I have never discussed it, never raised it, never made it an issue——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MONK. And on every occasion when it has been discussed before me in public, I have declared that the time for our interference was past. The right hon. gentleman brought that agreement down and placed it upon the table of the House bearing no signature. The duplicate of it was brought before the House in Manitoba and upon that document the signatures can be found. I will not comment upon it at length but I will say this as a man who represents and believes in British institutions, after all the boasts of my right hon. friend it results in this: That the minority at the present moment in the province of Manitoba who have their voluntary schools and for conscientious reasons cannot attend the public schools, are obliged to pay taxes for the

support of the schools to which they cannot send their children, and at the same time to support their own voluntary schools, I say if you call that a fair agreement and the result of conciliation, the right hon. gentleman had a very good reason not to place his signature upon the agreement when he brought it down to the House. I have never discussed that question in public. It is not reopened here, and I do not intend to discuss it this evening beyond this point: That when my right hon. friend on the road of self-laudation points out this agreement, and what led up to it, as an example of his own famous achievements under the theory of conciliation, I say that it is proper to point out that we know this laudation is at fault. My right hon. friend passed on to what he did in Japan as an example of his powers of conciliation and of their marvellous results, to the sending over there my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux),whose conciliation went so far that he came back looking for retaliation. The hon. member for Rouville has been to France since and when he came back I mistook him for a Frenchman, no offence intended. But this argument is neither more nor less than childish. Why hon. gentlemen from British Columbia, who know what happened in our negotiations with Japan, will have been most stupefied I am sure to hear the self-laudation of my right hon. friend this evening in connection with that matter.

What are the facts? They are familiar to every one of us. When we were called upon to give our adhesion to that treaty, on two—yes, I believe, on three—different occasions, the Imperial authorities called the attention of my right hon. friend to defects in that treaty, apparent, glaring defects. Our American neighbours had, a short time before, or at that very time, concluded a treaty with Japan, in which they carefully guarded against the carelessness which characterized my right hon. friend. In treating with Japan, they carefully guarded against excessive immigration from that country. All this was pointed out lengthily here in the discussion which took place in reference to Japanese immigration. My right hon. friend and his colleagues swept aside the advice of the more experienced statesmen of the mother country and of the Imperial government on that point, and rushed headlong into a treaty the full effects of which weigh upon us to-day;—they hang over our heads like the sword of Damocles. The result of all this conciliation is simply this—that as everybody knows, we are in debt to the good-will of Japan and are not in the enjoyment of the plentitude of our rights.

Well, my right hon. friend then referred to the conciliatory process he had adopted in 1905 at the time of the foundation of the two new provinces. I know my right hon. friend upon that occasion, with the Minister of Finance of that day, sitting here in the very place which I occupy, and another gentleman who had got him down on the rock of the constitution, on the other side, had to do a great deal of conciliation; but I am not aware that there is anything in that particularly to boast of. On more than one occasion I stated in the province of Quebec that all that my right hon. friend did on that occasion was not conciliation, but a backdown by which he expected to save his position in the government.

Mr. Speaker, I must apologize to the House for taking even the short time I have taken. I merely wished to correct some of the impressions sought to be given to the House. And perhaps I might venture to suggest, very humbly, to my right hon. friend that he must really put some check upon what I cannot call anything else but the senile habit of lauding himself and speaking of the past.

An hon. MEMBER. What about yourself?

Mr. MONK. I have no apology to make for myself. Now, in closing, I wish to say this: My right hon. friend has imagined a picture, in comical vein, of my colleagues from the province of Quebec and myself as endeavouring to obtain, by entreaty and prayer and persuasion, from our colleagues in the government, the introduction of some guarantee clause in this Bill. Well, that may have been the mode of proceeding at the time when my right hon. friend was the leader of the government; we have not that habit as yet. I know that there has been—I myself have been the object of considerable obloquy in reference to our position in this matter. It has not put me in a resigning mood.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MONK. I am very glad to keep the House in good humour. I must say that to me it is absolutely inconceivable—and I think the same remark no doubt applies to my colleagues from the province of Quebec who are very much in the same position as myself—it is absolutely inconceivable, I say, that a man who has the cares and labours and responsibility of the office which I have the honour to hold, should have, past a certain age, any real desire to keep that office if he could decently get out of it. But the obloquy to which I have referred, has not, as I have said, brought me into a resigning mood. On the contrary, I must say that I feel riveted, bolted and barred to the office more than ever before. I should have to

borrow from the language that I learned at my good mother's knee, expressions strong enough to convey how little these insults and invectives have led me in the direction of resignation.

My hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) went deeply into the legal question this afternoon. I cannot claim to have his competency, but I may say that I have looked as deeply as time allowed into what has been called, and is still called among certain people, the vested rights existing in these territories. I find none,—could not find any of any kind. There was a restriction placed upon an administrative officer in case he was surrounded by a clause, in case he was authorized to legislate. He never had the clause without which he could not legislate; he never was authorized to legislate; he never did legislate. Laws were not passed; schools were not established. I cannot anywhere find the slightest trace of vested rights. Then you fall, as I said previously in this debate, into the region of policy. There are no vested rights. But, as was said this evening by speakers —and, I believe, very properly said—what rights there may be, are protected by the constitution of the province. I say you fall into the region of policy. And, as a Roman Catholic, as one who has had some experience of public life and knows something of this country, I say that, as a matter of policy at the present juncture I cannot conceive of anything more unwise, more unpatriotic, more calculated to injure the very interests we are called upon to protect here than to insist upon impossible conditions. Summum jus, summa injuria: to exact things impossible is to prejudice the very interests which it is our duty to protect. There has been upon the point under discussion, no divergence, no suing, no praying, but absolute accord amongst all the members of this cabinet. And I trust we shall soon see the end of this controversy.

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN (Wright). I had hoped to be able to approach this subject with all the dignity that a question affecting the position of religious colleagues of the minority in this country should demand.

But after hearing the remarks of the hon. the Minister of Public Works, after hearing the profession of the hon. Minister of Public Works, I think, Mr. Speaker, you will pardon me if I say to that hon. gentleman that any dispassionate listener this evening to this debate, hearing the language used by the right hon. leader of the opposition and the language used by the Minister of Public Works, will ask himself where the senility rests. I am surprised that the Minister of Public Works, who generally uses polite language in debate, who is a professor of constitutional law in one of the great universities of this country, and is charged to instruct the youth of our land, should so far debase the language of debate, in order to bolster up what he would like to make out as an argument, by insulting the man who is recognized on both sides of this House, and by all classes of our community, as the greatest citizen of Canada. In listening to such language as that, I, as a young man, having up to the present moment the greatest possible respect for the Minister of Public Works, in listening to the words used by him to-night when he says that since 1897 he and his colleagues, and his followers, from the province of Quebec, have not used the Manitoba school question against the leader of the opposition, am reminded of the words of Shakespeare: 'You make such a sinner of your memory as to believe your own lie.' Mr. Speaker, I have under my hand the political programme of a gentleman occupying the high post in this country of Minister of Public Works. At the time this programme was written he was plain Mr. F. D. Monk, and I find in this programme the following language:—

> Respecting the federal pact of 1867, as regards the protection of all minorities, in order to ensure contentment amongst all classes, a policy of protection which will ensure the full development of Canadian resources——

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what was the Minister of Public Works referring to then if he was not trying to make an appeal against the right hon. the leader of the opposition because of his treatment of minorities in this country. We who come from the province of Quebec, who have had to do with elections during the last fifteen years or more, have heard the Minister of Public Works upon public platforms, as I myself have heard him at St. Eustache and other places, making appeals against the right hon. the leader of the opposition, putting up candidates, publishing newspapers such as the one I have in my hand, called 'L'Ami du Peuple,' in the interest of the hon. gentlemen who were denouncing the leader of the opposition. Will the Minister of Public Works deny that he supported the Conservative-Nationalist or Independent, candidate in the county of Wright at the last election? Will he deny that, in the interest of that candidate, there was a paper published, either by the Conservative or by the Nationalist party, called 'L'Ami du Peuple,' in which I find these words, and which, knowing, Mr. Speaker, that you now possess a considerable knowledge of the French language, I will read as I find them written:

> The misdeeds of the 1896 regime caused us to league against him. We agreed with them at that time. With Laurier we used to say: 'Down with the culprits!' Heaven knows whether Laurier was sincere or not; but we

know that we were sincere. Shall we prove less honest to-day, or have we been so corrupted by Laurier that we have come to the point of tamely submitting to the rule of fraud and robbery.

Why should one vote against Laurier?

Why, because he has proven false to the constitution and to the traditions of all political parties.

Because, when imparting constitutional life to western Canada, he should have protected all such rights as were guaranteed by the constitution; because, although his prestige and his majority would have enabled him to do so, he did shrink from duty; because, having to choose between right and fanaticism, he did place his power at the disposal of sectarian hatred against right and justice.

Mr. Speaker, you understand these words, you understand why they were directed against the Liberal party, and more especially against the right hon. the leader of the opposition. But when you hear men who professed Nationalist principles in 1897 and since, who to-day, like the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Nantel), whom I also heard in the good old county of Terrebonne denouncing the right hon. the leader of the opposition, and denouncing the sacrifice of the rights of the minority, you must indeed blush for the language that has been used by these same gentlemen to-night, who are ready to sacrifice every right that the minority in Manitoba ever had—according to the arguments that were used by them prior to 1912. But, Sir, you have heard that we have in the province of Quebec a very able gentleman, a splendid speaker, in the person of Mr Henri Bourassa.

Mr. Henri Bourassa, whom I always refused to follow, and whose principles I always refused to adopt, was, up to within the last two days, the leader of the hon. gentlemen who form the Nationalist wing of the Cabinet, and of the hon. gentlemen behind who followed, up to within the last few days, the Nationalist wing of the Cabinet. Mr. Bourassa, addressing a very large audience in the city of Montreal the other day, insinuated, if he did not say, that the right hon. leader of the opposition had betrayed the rights of the minority in Manitoba. Mr. Bourassa was right then when he said that, and was wrong when he spoke in 1898, or he was right in 1898, and he was wrong the other night. I will leave you to judge of the matter. In 1898 Mr. Bourassa, speaking upon the Manitoba school question, said this—his words will be found in 'Hansard' of 1898, vol. 2, page 5426:

When we consider that such a question as the Manitoba school question had been treated on most unsound principles for five years, had been so handled as to develop racial and religious passions, we could not expect it to be settled altogether satisfactorily in the first instance. The government coming into power had to settle the question as to do substantial justice to everybody, and not deceive anybody, and this has been achieved.

Again, speaking on the same subject, he went on to say—I am sorry to weary the House by quoting his words, but in view of the circumstances surrounding this question I believe it is well to refresh even Mr. Bourassa's memory:

I do not wish to boast about my religious principles or my national attachment in this House or on the platform, but I say to the hon. member for Beauharnois that when the Roman Catholic Church is not satisfied with what has been given to her, she will be able to speak for herself and be heard as well as that hon. member. I am a firm believer in the Catholic church and in the destiny of my race, because I know that in America under our British rule there is freedom for every creed and freedom for every race. I am a believer in the rule of my church, and if I am a firm believer in the future of my race it is because the politics and policy affirmed by the hon. member for Beauharnois and the hon. member for West York are not the policies and politics that are going to prevail in this country. I believe firmly that this school question will be settled, and settled on account of the position taken by this government, a position which has been met by the goodwill of the Greenway government, which has given more since this government came into power than during the whole time when hon. gentlemen opposite were in office. I hope this is the last we shall hear of this question, not because we are afraid of it or afraid of the position that we and this government have taken. I trust that so long as this party is in power questions of this kind will be met in the same way.

With that language I am heartily in accord and the position I am going to take to-night is the position which has been taken in this House and in this country ever since my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), has led the Liberal party, and I believe it to be the only wise policy that could be followed by any government in this country. The hon. member for Yamaska wants to insert in the Bill a clause which will in a measure, according to his own reasoning, protect the rights of the minority. I am not particularly concerned for the purposes of the argument that I make whether by statute or not there are rights belonging to the minority in Keewatin. I believe there may be certain legislative rights given to them. I believe that it was the intention of the legislators in 1875, that the minority should have certain rights, and that they intended that these rights should be lived up to. I am also of the opinion after studying the statutes, after reading the law of 1875, the law of 1876, and the law of 1906, which have been cited in this House, and which

it would be useless for me at this late hour to repeat, that the particular laws guaranteeing to the minority in Keewatin these rights, have been embodied in subsequent statutes. But, whether they have rights or whether they have not rights, would the amendment of the hon. member for Yamaska, protect those rights? I do not believe that it would. I believe that the only policy to be followed in controversial questions, in religious questions, is the policy which has been adopted by my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition, and that is the policy of conciliation, the policy of meeting the majority in goodwill, representing to them the rights which the minority have, and asking them to give the minority the rights which have originally been guaranteed to them or which, in accordance with the spirit of the constitution of our country, they should have. I want to make my position perfectly clear, and if for one moment I thought that the amendment of the hon. member for Yamaska would give to the minority in the province of Manitoba greater rights than they have to-day, then, Sir, I would be ready to support that amendment because I believe in the system of separate schools. I have had occasion to go to separate schools. I do not want to have any class of people in Canada believe that I would be opposed to the system of separate schools. I have had occasion to go to denominational schools, and also to non-denominational schools. I believe in religious liberty for all classes of our citizens. I believe that we should not differentiate against any class of citizens or against any religious sect, or against any religious persuasion, but between believing that, and trying to coerce a province into giving rights which they have refused to adopt in the Bill which is now before the House there is a large difference. It seems to me that it would be ridiculous to imagine for one moment that we could put a clause in that Bill against the present constitution of the old province of Manitoba, and go before the people of that province, and ask them to adopt it. Let me refer for one moment to section 3, of 34-35 Victoria, chapter 28, which has already been read to this House, but which I make the base of my argument this evening. What does it say?

> The parliament of Canada may from time to time, with the consent of the legislature of any province of the said Dominion, increase, diminish or otherwise alter the limits of such province, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the said legislature, and may, with the like consent, make provision respecting the effect and operation of any such increase or diminution or alteration of territory in relation to any province affected thereby.

Do you suppose in virtue of that clause, that we can go to the province of Manitoba and say: Here are a few miles of territory that we want to give you to annex to your province, but before you annex it you must obey a condition which we lay down. That would be taking Manitoba by the throat and Manitoba would say: We will not accept your territory, or else: We will not accept the condition which is tantamount to saying that we will not accept your territory. If we were creating out of Keewatin a new province and annexing Manitoba to Keewatin, I can readily understand it would be reasonable for us to include a clause in the Bill which would guarantee separate schools; but we are not doing that, we are annexing new territory to an old province, with a set system of school law, with a set form of government. I for one, no matter what may be the consequence of the vote which I give to-night, no matter how my views may be received in the constituency which I have the honour to represent, believe that when questions such as this one come up it is by approaching the majority in a spirit of conciliation, as the right hon. the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has done, that Catholics, if they are in the minority, or Protestants, if they are in the minority, will obtain from the majority the rights to which they are entitled. In this, I thoroughly agree with the arguments of the Minister of Justice this afternoon. I might cite the clauses of the different statutes which he cited, but I think when he represented the law, he represented it as it stands to-day, and while there may be a divergence of opinion, while there may be references to the courts, I agree that the law that was laid down to-day by the Minister of Justice, is the real law on the subject and that if we approached the question of rights in Keewatin in any other spirit, we would be doing graver injustice to the Catholics of Keewatin and Manitoba than we could in any other way.

In concluding, I simply want to say that I shall vote against the amendment. I would vote for any amendment which would tend to approach the majority in Manitoba in a spirit of conciliation, but to approach them in the spirit in which the hon. member for Yamaska (Mr. Mondou) asks us to approach them, is unsound in law and unwise in fact and, therefore, I shall have no hesitation in voting against the amendment.

Mr. L. J. GAUTHIER (St. Hyacinthe): (translation). Mr. Speaker, in order to obey the decision which you have just rendered, that to be in order we must only discuss the amendment of the hon. member from Yamaska, I shall presently come to the remarks which I intended to make and which will be very

short on account of the late stage of this debate.

The hon. members sitting at your left being driven into a corner because they remember their past promises and they must face the present conditions turn towards the hon. members of the opposition and say: 'Tell us what is your policy.' They forget, Mr. Speaker, that the Opposition is not bound to manage the affairs of the country, but to criticise the measures submitted to us by that government. And I state that as long as we are within the legitimate bounds of reasonable criticism, we fulfill our duties and the government can expect nothing more from us.

When the government, in submitting their measures and their reasons so as to enlighten their followers, shall have utterly failed in the accomplishment of the task which it is incumbent upon them to accomplish of demonstrating to the hon. members around them the fairness of the proposed measure; when within the ministerial ranks those who remember their promises and their pledges shall have exhausted all the available means in order to find a way out, to seek an amendment which will satisfy their conscience and their constituents, and shall also have failed, then it will be time for the Opposition to come forward and to move an amendment which will prove once more to the whole population of this country that the management of public affairs in Canada is only possible by following the policy of the Liberal party and by observing the principles which we have always recommended. We shall prove, Mr Speaker, that this country cannot be governed by coercion, intimidation nor threats, but that upon every troublesome question the government in power must have recourse to conciliation in order to have friendship between all nationalities and to maintain everlasting peace throughout this country.

As a member of His Majesty's loyal Opposition I am in duty bound to take a definite stand upon the question which is submitted to us and I have deemed it preferable, Mr. Speaker, to use my mother tongue so as to state exactly what I intend to do. When I remember that last week the hon. member from Yamaska made use of the English language, that at half past five in the afternoon he stated that he was not ready to vote and that at midnight that very evening, having heard the remarks of the hon. Minister of Public Works, his former professor of constitutional law at the Laval University, he declared, being cheered by the hon. members on the other side that he had formed his opinion and that he would vote in favour of the Bill, and specially, Mr. Speaker, when one remembers that two days later the hon. member complained that the English reporters had misunderstood him and that himself had not understood what he said because he had spoken English, it is the part of wisdom upon such a solemn occasion as this to use the language which is more familiar to us, and it is why I speak my mother tongue.

Now coming directly to the question, I declare, Mr. Speaker, that I am opposed to the Bill because it is incomplete, unfair, and that far from solving the question presented to us it tends to future litigation which is only liable to throw this country into a useless and even harmful agitation.

The amendment offered by the hon. member from Yamaska is nothing but a bluff resorted to by the government members in order to make the population of Quebec believe that some French Canadian members propose to keep their pledges and to fulfill the promises they made to the electorate. According to me, Mr. Speaker, the amendment is but a useless duplicate in so far as it puts into the Manitoba Boundaries Act a section which is already found in our statutes and which shall govern the annexed territory as soon as it will be part of the province of Manitoba. No rights are given to the minority; no rights of the minority are sanctioned and I say that such an amendment cannot have the assent nor the approval of a member wishing to do complete and integral justice to all the interested parties.

Mr. LAMARCHE. Has the hon. member himself a better amendment to offer?

Mr. GAUTHIER. Before he left the Chair, the Speaker of the House—probably on account of his perfect knowledge of the French language—has settled a point of order; he has stated that in this debate we must not wander away from the amendment offered by my hon. friend from Yamaska and if I understand the rules, the hon. member from Nicolet is not in order. We are now discussing the motion of the hon. member from Nicolet and as soon as the House will have settled the question, we shall be at liberty to submit a new one and I may be able then to enlighten my hon. friend from Nicolet.

When the hon. Minister of Public Works did reply to the right hon. leader of the Opposition, he spoke quite forcibly; he even addressed bitter words to my right hon. friend. I would like to remind the House and the country that the hon. Minister of Public Works, although he tried to belittle his opponent hoping no doubt to raise himself, has forgotten to tell us whether he was or not in favour of the amendment which we are now discussing.

Mr. Speaker, if I intended to be malicious I would say that it is strange that the hon. Minister of Public Works has not been called to order.

The remarks of the hon. Minister of Public Works, if they were not in order, were

nevertheless intended to justify his present stand in the opinion of his new friend, who is now his protector and who may be his tormentor to-morrow. The hon. minister knew quite well that in order to justify himself in the opinion of his nationalist leader he had to heap abuse upon the right hon. leader of the Opposition, being sure that if he abused Laurier, the hatred of Bourassa would be so well served that he would absolve the hon. Minister of Public Works of the surrender of his opinions which he had lately made.

For the last sixteen years, Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to meet the hon. Minister of Public Works upon the hustings; I have crossed swords with him in over fifty meetings. When I remember his impassioned appeals for the defence of the rights of the minority, his burning sentences against the then prime minister who had betrayed the confidence of his fellow-countrymen and surrendered the rights of the minority in Canada and when I hear him to-night state upon the floor of the House that he never was guilty of what we charge him with, I am at a loss to understand how the hon. minister can have forgotten so soon his speeches, his promises and his pledges.

I understand that hon. minister of Public Works does not care much about the opinion I may entertain about him from a political point of view. But I was surprised to hear his statement as to the Catholic point of view. This defensor of the altar, this protector of the hierarchy, this uncompromised champion of the Catholic religion said, last week, in his speech, that the Greenway-Sifton settlement, in 1897, was a final settlement. Has not Mr. Speaker, the Encyclical "affarivos" declared that the question of the Manitoba schools was not finally settled. That it would be settled only when the Catholic minority would have received their integral rights? Now the hon. minister of Public Works, contrary to the dictations of the Church, asserts that this question has been settled fifteen years ago. If the hon. Minister of Public Works is not excommunicated by the young men of the "Association de la Jeunesse Catholique," and in every conclave of the Sacred Heart League he will be lucky.

Before explaining the vote I will give in a moment, I would like to allude to some statements made by the hon. member for Chambly-Vercheres. The hon. member stated that he was now a faithful follower of the government, and he speaks with disdain of his whole political acquaintances. I would like the hon. members to know that during the last electoral campaign, which was closed on the 21st of september last, the hon. member for Chambly-Vercheres paid me a visit in the parish of Ste. Madeleine and in the middle of the meeting, when he was speaking, he declared emphatically that he had kept in their integrity the true principles of the liberal party. Any one who heard the honourable member would have thought that he was really liberal, but that we of the liberal party had abandoned all the principles of our party. We were nothing else but ministerialists and were fattened at the party manger.

Mr. MONK. Have I well understood the hon. member when he said that he was a liberal? This surprises me, because I think I met him at the Club Lafontaine.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It was after a good supper, I suppose.

Mr. GAUTHIER. It was perhaps before going to bed.

When the hon. member for Chambly-Vercheres who is a ministerialist asserts, as he did to-night, that he has remained honest and that he has kept all his political virtue of the old times I feel it necessary, Mr. Speaker, to bow very low before him and tell him that I do not need myself his declaration (I know him too well), but he would do well to repeat it often, if he wants the public to believe it. If the hon. member desires to know all my mind, I will tell him that I doubt very much if he can keep his virtue in the surroundings in which he lives now.

The hon. member for Chambly-Vercheres has declared that on the ramparts of the opposition there was no flag. The hon. member, since he has gone to the ministerial ranks, seems to have lost the sense of sight. Let him look to this side of the House and he will see that on our ramparts, to-day as yesterday and to-morrow as to-day flies and will fly the two flags of liberty and justice. Equal justice for all the classes, equal justice for all races and religions, liberty for every one; equal rights for all the provinces that is the programme of the Liberal party, that is the platform of our party. Following the prescriptions of my political leaders, and remaining faithful to the doctrine which I have always defended, I will vote against the bill and against the amendment.

Mr. H. BOULAY (Rimouski) (translation.) Mr. Speaker, the county which I have the honour to represent has a population of 52,000 souls, of which 90 per cent are French-Canadians. Born and raised in a parish of the county of Rimouski, I need not say that I am truly Catholic and French. I came to this House to take part in the general business of my country, and also to vindicate the rights of the oppressed, and claimed justice for whom justice is due. I came here to tell to my compatriots of another origin that the fact of being French does not deprive us of the sense of justice

and prevent us to resent injustice and insult from what ever side it comes. My first act in this House was to put right in the teeth of the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) a flagrant injustice which he had made me in 1904 when he occupied a seat in this House as Minister of Railways and Canals, and I think I nobly fulfil my duty.

The French are polite, said to me yesterday in very good French the hon. member from Red Deer (Mr. Clark). Yes Frenchmen are polite but just as much as they are polite, just as much they resent deeply any insult or injustice, and we consider that it is a crying injustice on the part of the province of Manitoba to try to oppress the Catholics and the French of that province because they are the minority.

We have a minority in the county of Rimouski, a Protestant and English minority who support two dissentient schools. We would never think of molesting them. On the contrary if any one would ever make that suggestion, 95 per cent of the French Canadian would rise to a man to protect them. Why would we not find the same spirit of equity amongst our English compatriots? Let us better know and respect each other. Let the English provinces do for the study of the French language what we have been doing for the study of the English language in the province of Quebec, and we will very soon know and appreciate each other better. Let all men of good will put their efforts together to bring to an end this useless and nefarious campaign against French schools and French teaching in certain parts of this country, and you will see very soon the most perfect harmony established between the different races which compose our population.

Is there any reason in this war against the French language in Canada, when the sons of the mother country themselves, who desire to become business men and distinguished men, take pride and glory to learn French? For the last twenty years and more, our compatriots of Manitoba suffer from unjust laws, and their sufferings seem to be felt more by the province of Quebec than by those living in Manitoba. But I stop on these considerations.

I do not intend to waste the time of the House; but as the agitation upon this question is somewhat strong, I think I should explain the vote which I have given. First, if we vote with the hon. gentlemen opposite, will we have a better guarantee that the minority rights will be protected than if we vote with this side of the House? Secondly, will any amendment made to this Bill have any practical effect? That is the question which I will explain in a few words. If I look back in the history of this country, if I read all the debates of the House of Commons in March and April, 1896, I find previous information as to the feelings of both parties engaged at that time in the discussion of the famous Manitoba question, this province having been always like a cannon ball tied to the Confederation car.

What a delight to read the speeches of the valiant and generous heroes, such as Sir Hibbert Tupper who, on the 17th March, 1896, made in this House this memourable speech in which he shows Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the grand master of the Orange Order at that time, joining hands with this man of evil omen, Dalton McCarthy, in the unjust spoilation of the Catholic rights in Manitoba. Lashing in a masterly way the infamous conduct of these two fire brands, he said:

It is not, as has been truly remarked, a question of government and opposition, nor of Protestant or Catholic. It is one of constitutional action and equal rights. But members of the government and their supporters in this country claim great credit for the government's action in passing the order in council. The governments have, however, done only what they were bound to do under the constitution, and in obedience to the command of the highest judicial authority in the realm.

It is not, as has been rightly remarked, a question which interests more the government than the opposition, or the Protestant more than the Catholic, it is a question of constitutional law, and of general interest. That was the opinion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier before he let himself to be fooled and seduced by the thirst of power, because I find the following words in a speech which he made in Winnipeg in 1894:

'Give me the proof that the grievances of the Roman Catholic minority are well founded, that their rights are violated; that instead of being able to send their children to schools where no religious teaching is given, they are forced to attend a school where the religious teaching is contrary to their beliefs, and I will be ready to go before the people of Manitoba to tell them that a school law which authorizes that state of things should not be kept on the statute-book.' And continuing his speech in quoting the words used by Herschell in his judgment he said:

Let us compare the position which the Roman Catholic minority occupied before 1890, with the one they occupied since that act to which appeal is taken.

In making that comparison it does not seem possible to contend that the rights and privileges of the Catholic minority as to education, which existed before 1890, have not been affected.

As a matter of fact, the objections of the Roman Catholic minority to the schools which are alone aided by the state, in conformity with the law of 1890, lies in their conscience and are deep rooted. It is well

known that before 1870, acute differences of opinion about education existed between Catholic and Protestant. This fact is admitted in almost every line of the school laws enacted at that time. There is no doubt either about the nature of these opposed views, and it is in that light that section 22 of the Manitoba Act of 1870, which was in reality a parliamentary pact must be interpreted.

As showing that the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition held at the time the same views as the government in 1896, I may quote an affidavit embodying an extract from a speech he delivered at Grande Rivière, county of Gaspé, on August 24, 1895:

Canada,
Province of Quebec,
County and district of Gaspé.

We, the undersigned, citizens and electors for the Dominion Parliament, residing in the county of Gaspé aforesaid, solemnly declare :

That we were present at the meeting held by the electors of Gaspé at Grand River, on August 24, 1895, at which meeting the hon. Wilfrid Laurier, M.P., delivered a speech on the political issues of the day.

That such meeting comprised four or five hundred people, 90 per cent of whom were Roman Catholics, and among them a large number of Roman Catholic priest who were on a visit to Grand River. That in the course of his speech the hon. Mr. Laurier said among other things, why his hearers should not have faith in the then Dominion Government. He claimed that the government would never submit to parliament a bill for the relief of the Catholic minority of Manitoba.

That the hon. Mr. Laurier in support of his plea for an enquiry into the facts connected with the Manitoba school difficulty, stated that as regards himself he did not need an enquiry, being satisfied in advance that the demands of the Catholic minority were legitimate and fair; but that such an enquiry would induce others who were not as yet so convinced that, in the school act of 1890 and amendments thereto, an injustice had been committed in regard to the Catholic minority of Manitoba.

Following on so many statements of his views, how comes it that Sir Wilfrid Laurier so suddenly changed his mind? He gave in that instance the greatest exhibition of political inconsistency that ever was given by any man, and Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper brought it home to him in the following terms:

How could I expect—even if my experience of public life had been unexceptional—that a Roman Catholic leader would to-day be found lagging behind a Protestant leader in this House when it come to vindicating the rights of a minority and of a race which this Catholic leader had formerly defended, as I stated previously.

A little further on, speaking of the French Canadian race in this land of Canada, he exclaimed: 'I would be happy, he said, to see that million and a half of French Canadians increase three-fold. I would be happy to see them increase to any extent, for I know what they are worth to the country. What I now say, I say it as a Protestant and a Canadian.' Such utterances are very different from those which were dealt out by the McCarthys and the O'Briens and the Sproules, utterances which were assented to by the hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and confirmed subsequently many a time by his own statements and dealings in 1905. It is only in the Conservative party that there is to be found feelings of loyalty, a spirit of toleration and fairness, noble sentiments, which Sir Wilfrid Laurier endeavoured so strenuously to defeat, and which he succeeded in defeating through the sinister obstruction he led against the carrying of the remedial bill, together with his allies, a number of Orangemen. However, it is after listening to these fine sentiments uttered by a Protestant that twenty-five of our compatriots of the province of Quebec, among whom I notice the name of Bourassa, had the heart to approve the Laurier amendment for the hoisting of the remedial bill on March 20, 1896. At that same sitting of March 17, McCarthy exclaimed,—repeating the words of Sifton, another persecutor of separate schools, another close friend of our great fellow-citizen, whom he will seek later on and make a cabinet minister as a reward for having inflicted such ill-treatment on our compatroits,—McCarthy exclaimed that separate schools managed as they were in 1890 were utterly indefensible as regards the instruction they imparted, an unjustifiable reflection, for our schools compare advantageously with any others. And farther on, referring to the stand taken by the province of Quebec in regard to Protestant schools, he added:

The non-Catholics of Quebec have nothing to fear for themselves, in case Manitoba should maintain its stand in favour of public schools, for to speak of reprisals on the part of the majority is absurd.

We are requested from every quarter to protect the rights of the minority in connection with the annexation of the territory of Keewatin. We are told that we should not follow in the footsteps of the traitors and wretches who did away with these rights in 1896 and 1905. It is all very well to lay down principles; it is all very well to vindicate these courageously, vigorously, and better still to reap encomiums after falling on the battlefield, in the midst of the fray. But to distinguish one's self by such brilliant achievements, by such heroic deeds which lead to immortality, one must at least have the hope that they will ensure some practical result which will be of

actual advantage if not to the hero who sacrifices himself, at any rate to those who will come afterwards. Leonidas defending with his stalwarts the Thermopylae knew that he was courting certain death; but his country would be delivered thereby. Salaberry and his men at Châteauguay were fighting under great disadvantages, and might well have been crushed by a much larger force, however, they retained some hope of winning the day. Cambronne at Waterloo answered back to the general who called on him to surrender, those historic words which are characteristic of that chivalrous French race of old, whose spirit still animates us, we the proud descendants of that gallant stock: 'Guardsmen may die, but surrender never.' Why should the French guardsmen who occupy seats in this House, why should that small phalanx of twenty Canadians be expected to accomplish what another French Canadian, with the support of fifty others, refused to do when the time had come to play the hero, and make sacrifices, and assert existing rights which had been confirmed by the highest court in the empire? Why should we be expected to do what a great Canadian supported by fifty others refused to do in 1905, while fortune was smiling upon him, and glory followed his flag and made the earth quake wherever it passed? Why should we be called upon to make such a sacrifice, when for fifteen consecutive years in the province of Quebec there has been a continuous round of applause for the great hero who was digging the grave wherein were buried all our fellow countrymen's rights to separate schools, and to the use of that French language which we learnt on our mother's lap and which has produced the finest literature known to the world?

Why should we be expected to protect rights which legal authorities declare to be non-existent, and which in any case are not interfered with by this Bill of they do exist?

In 1890, while Laurier was working hand in hand with McCarthy and other fanatics of the same stripe, on this side of the House the Tuppers, the Northrups, the Hazens, the Fosters, the Haggarts and many others were defending the rights which it was still time to defend and safeguard.

But no, the French race will survive in spite of its oppressors; it has successfully pulled through the disasters of 1760 and the persecutions which have been its lot in the meantime, and the miserable dealings of Greenway will come to an end.

In 1896, I had faith in Laurier, a French Canadian and Catholic; I was confident at any rate that he would support by his vote and his eloquence the rights defended even by Protestants.

But no, his mongrel alliance with the twenty-four fanatics who still formed part of the conservative party, resulted in miserable obstructive tactics which prevented sanction being given to the remedial Bill, in spite of a message from His Grace Archbishop Langevin which read as follows: Bill workable, effective and satisfactory; I approve of it. All bishops and true Catholics should do the same. It means salvation. (Signed) Archbishop Langevin.

I shall now quote the following from the letter written by Rev. Father Lacombe to Sir Wilfrid Laurier:

> At this critical period in connection with the Manitoba school question, allow an aged missionary, representing to-day the bishops of our country in this cause which interests all of us, to appeal to your faith, to your patriotism and to your spirit of fairness and to beg of you to comply with our request. It is in the name of our bishops, of the hierarchy and of the French Canadian Catholics, that we beg of your party, whose worthy leader you are, to help us in obtaining a settlement of this vexed question, and to settle it by voting with the government in favour of the remedial Bill. We are not asking you to vote for the government, but in favour of the measure which will restore to us our rights, and which will be submitted to the House in a few days, etc.
>
> (Signed): A. LACOMBE, O.M.I.

What shall we say of the stand taken by the leader of the opposition who refused to comply, who continued his agitation, the outcome of which was the defeat of the conservatives in 1896, but also the wiping out of the rights of our compatriots in the province of Manitoba?

With a political record such as the one I have described, should any reliance be put in the promises and policy of the liberal party? And are they making any promises? No, their party organs are making an onslaught, that is all. That is why I have not supported the Laurier amendment, and rightly so, as it was not serious.

Times have changed since the days when the two governments who are responsible for the passing and sanctioning of that unjust legislation of 1890 were holding the reins of power; both of them are now in their political grave. The distinguished gentleman who is now at the head of the Manitoba government is very well disposed, and we have every reason to depend on his faithfulness for which his record is sufficient pledge, while Sir Wilfrid Laurier had to deal with a fanatical government made up of his allies, and very badly inspired. Under such conditions failure was inevitable. Today, having dealt justly with Manitoba, having enlarged its frontiers, having granted the amounts request-

ed as subsidies, we expect from that province, not favours, but full and entire justice for our compatriots, and we shall be greatly disappointed if we fail in obtaining that.

I lay down as a principle that it is but fair that we should add that territory to this little province. After all, Keewatin is made a part of Manitoba with all her rights to the very act by which this province has been constituted, rights which have been trodden upon by Greenway's liberal government, but which still exist, having been ratified by the judgment of the Privy Council, and shall not cease to be claimed until they have been acknowledged. Those same rights exist for Keewatin and nothing but a new and nefarious legislation such as was adopted in 1890, could paralyse them if not absorb them and make them disappear. If this should happen, the same recourse to the federal parliament still exists as in 1896, for this territory, as it did exist for Manitoba, and were we even to add clauses after clauses in order to guarantee the rights to separate schools we would be doing no more than to pour ink upon paper, than to deliver a great many useless speeches if we are dealing with intransigent and unjust people.

But no. We expect something better on the part of Manitoba. The wave of intolerance that has dashed upon that province in 1890, stirred up as it was by the friends of the leader of the opposition, is lulling from day to day. The example of justice and equity which is set constantly by the province of Quebec impassible though she has to face this profligacy of fanatism shall, at last, make our compatriots of a different language and creed understand that the time of moral and religious slavery must be over; that the Catholics and the French must be granted the full measure of liberty to which they are entitled in this land of Canada. Shall we, the sons of those valiant knights who have discovered the plains of the West; shall we, the brothers of those missionaries who have shed their blood on this territory of Canada, keep waiting in vain for a glimpse of liberty? Loudly do we beseech the province of Manitoba to open her doors wide open and make us breathe, at last, that liberty, a glorious attribute of the British flag.

From that day only shall we have peace in our country. One may check, one may restrain the exercise of a right for a time, for a long time even, but one cannot make it perish when it rests upon the solid basis of justice and of equity. I would ask my English-speaking compatriots who represent all parts of Canada, to repeat these words to their electors: The day when the French language would cease to be written and spoken in this part of America which is called Canada, that day would mark the destruction and the ruin of the British flag, for, as somebody has so well said it before me, the last shot that shall be fired for the preservation of this country in behalf of the British crown shall be fired by a French Canadian.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Mondou.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Barrette,	McCoig,
Béland,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Bellemare,	Michaud,
Boyer,	Molloy,
Delisle,	Mondou,
Demers,	Murphy,
Ethier,	Papineau,
Guilbault,	Paquet,
Lamarche,	Power,
Lapointe (Kamouraska),	Proulx,
Lapointe (Montreal, St. James),	Seguin,
	Sevigny and Tobin.—24.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Achim,	Law,
Alguire,	Lemieux,
Ames,	Lennox,
Armstrong (Lambton),	Lesperance,
Armstrong (York, O.),	Lewis,
Arthurs,	Lovell,
Ball,	Macdonald,
Barker,	Macdonell,
Barnard,	Maclean (Halifax),
Beattie,	Maclean (York, O.),
Bennett (Calgary),	MacNutt,
Bennett (Simcoe),	McCraney,
Best,	McCrea,
Blain,	McCurdy,
Blondin,	McKay,
Boivin,	McKenzie,
Borden,	McLean (Queen's, P.E.I.),
Boulay,	McLean (Sunbury),
Bourassa,	Marcile (Bagot),
Bowman,	Martin (Montreal, Ste. Mary's),
Brabazon,	Meighen,
Bradbury,	Merner,
Broder,	Middlebro,
Brouillard,	Monk,
Brown,	Morphy,
Buchanan,	Munson,
Burnham,	Nantel,
Burrell,	Nesbitt,
Cardin,	Neely,
Carroll,	Nicholson,
Carvell,	Nickle,
Chabot,	Oliver,
Champagne,	Pacaud,
Chisholm (Antigonish),	Paul,
Chisholm (Inverness),	Pelletier,
Clare,	Perley,
Clark (Bruce),	
Clark (Red Deer),	

Clarke (Wellington),	Porter,
Clements,	Pugsley,
Cochrane,	Rainville,
Cockshutt,	Reid (Grenville),
Coderre,	Reid (Restigouche),
Crocket,	Rhodes,
Cromwell,	Robb,
Crothers,	Robidoux,
Cruise,	Roche,
Currie,	Rogers,
Davidson,	Ross,
Devlin,	Schaffner,
Doherty,	Sexsmith,
Donnelly,	Sharpe (Lisgar),
Douglas,	Sharpe (Ontario),
Elliot,	Shepherd,
Elson,	Sinclair,
Emmerson,	Smith,
Fisher,	Stanfield,
Fortier,	Staples,
Foster (King's, N.S.),	Steele,
Foster (Toronto, N.),	Stevens,
Fripp,	Stewart (Hamilton),
Gauthier (Gaspé),	Stewart (Lunenburg),
Gauthier (St. Hyacinthe),	Sutherland,
	Taylor,
Gauvreau,	Thoburn,
Girard,	Thompson (Yukon),
Goodeve,	Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Graham,	Thornton,
Hartt,	Tremain,
Hazen,	Turgeon,
Henderson,	Verville,
Hepburn,	Walker,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Wallace,
	Warnock,
Hughes (Victoria, O.),	Webster,
Jameson,	Weichel,
Kemp,	White (Renfrew),
Kidd,	White (Victoria, Alta.),
Knowles,	
Lalor,	Wilcox,
Lancaster,	Wilson
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	(Wentworth) and
Lavallée,	Wright.—160.

Amendment (Mr. Mondou) negatived.

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Beauce). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the question of extending the Manitoba boundaries is a very important one, and there is nothing strange in the fact that the measure now under consideration has given rise to a most interesting debate.

There could be and there is, in fact, no serious objection to extending the territory of Manitoba itself as far as the shores of Hudson bay. It is admitted by the whole population of this country that it is only fair and just that the territory of Manitoba should be extended; both political parties have given their entire adhesion to this project.

Of course, the building of a railway up to Hudson's Bay, which has been resorted to as a new element for the solution of the transportation problem shall be of great help towards developing that region through industrial, agricultural and commercial channels. But while the proposition itself of annexing Keewatin to Manitoba meets with no opposition, quite the reverse can be said of the conditions attached to the cession. Protests have been made in all parts of the country against the exorbitant advantages which Manitoba was granted from a financial point of view. The people of this country will hardly understand and will surely blame the decision arrived at by the cabinet as regards the payment of certain arrears. In fact, how is it possible to explain that a certain sum of $2,178,000 is paid to Manitoba as arrears? True it is that negotiations have been carried on more or less assiduously for a few years past, but they have been pushed to an end only of late, when Mr. Roblin, after a conference with his friends of the Borden government, left again for Winnipeg, crying out victory. And he had good reasons for crying out victory, owing to the guilty compliance and to the excessive generosity of the government, he had just been granted, besides Keewatin, a yearly increase of subsidy of about $516,000. Nay more—and this seems to be beyond all limits—the federal ministers count that subsidy from four years back, and at once, they pay over to Manitoba $2,178,000. Is it strange that protests are made and they grow louder everywhere?

We claim that such preference, if it brings Mr. Roblin super-abundant joy, is unjust towards all the other provinces of the Dominion and that they will soon ask to share in that god-send with the Manitoba lion.

On the other hand, astonishment and then indignation have seized upon groups which, up to this day had shown themselves in close sympathy with the cabinet, and particularly with the French Canadian ministers. In the province of Quebec a good many spheres of society are pervaded with astonishment and indignation. It is found strange that there is not in the Bill before the House about the Manitoba boundaries a clause regulating education in the territory which is being annexed. They feel indignant when thinking that the so-called knights without fear or reproach who they were formerly, even up to yesterday, the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier), the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Nantel), would have flinched, would have failed to their word, would have been so weak, in short, as to violate their solemn pledges of last election.

For my part, having been for fifteen years the constant witness of all the plots and denunciations of those ministers, I readily understand if I do not share entirely the indignation of the sincere and honest people who, in certain quarters, raised their admiration to the point of adulation. Yes, I understand it especially well when I con-

sider the admission of importance which they have just made to the House with so oratorical precautions and endless quotations of statutes more or less contradictory. I understand it and I explain it to myself when I remember the appeals made to prejudice by the Conservative party, especially at the time the Manitoba school question was settled, in 1896. We remember that in 1896 and in 1898, the party under the direction of the right. hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who leads the opposition to-day was exposed to the attacks of those who, to-day hold portfolios in the Borden administration, and of Mr. Bergeron who, at that time, occupied an eminent position in his party.

What did those devoted champions of integral right in educational matters then pretend? They said that the rights of Catholics in school matters had been sacrificed by the Laurier government in the Manitoba school settlement. It was then that Mr. Bergeron discovered that sir Wilfrid Laurier was not Catholic enough and that there had been no Manitoba school settlement. Strange to say, Mr. Bourassa, far from approving of the stand thus taken, thought that Mr. Bergeron was too Catholic and when naming Mr. Bergeron, I also include those who were then his followers in the federal arena, Messrs. Monk, Pelletier and Nantel.

Would the House kindly accompany me for a moment while I go through the parliamentary debates of 1908? At a certain moment, Mr. Bergeron and Mr. Bourassa join issue on the school settlement and in order not to trespass upon the indulgence of this House by dwelling too long on a worn out topic, let me quote the very words uttered by the member for Labelle, such as reported in 'Hansard' of that year. About the Laurier-Greenway school settlement, Mr. Bourassa said:

'When they came into power, the Laurier government had to deal with that ticklish question so as to give substantial justice to all parties, without deceiving anybody, and that is what they did. I do not wish to stir up past quarrels.'

Let me tell you here, Mr. Speaker, how all friends of peace and harmony in this country admired those words in 1898. Mr. Bourassa was brought to book by the very men who now seem to be slumbering in the delights of power. The hon. the Postmaster General above all, then stormed in the Province of Quebec against what he called Sir Wilfrid's shameful capitulation.

Is it to be wondered at if the hon. the Minister of Public Works, the Postmaster General and the Minister of Inland Revenue should reap the storm in the very province where they have sown the wind of prejudices and passions?

I do not want to take up to no purpose the time of this House by going into all the details of the charges and accusations and denunciations piled up on the head of the venerable leader of the Liberal party during the elections of 1900 and 1904, in connection with this same Manitoba school question.

But it was in 1905; when the two provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta were created that the rage of the gentlemen who now occupy the treasury branches reached its paroxysm. Language, creed, race, everything was offered up in sacrifice to the ogre of Orangeism. The hon. gentlemen who then occupied seats in this House still have a vivid recollection of the phillipics delivered by the conservative members as well as of the nebulous harangue of the hon. member for Jacques-Cartier (Mr. Monk). What is most to be wondered at is that the hon. gentleman denounced the government because they had yielded on clause 16 No. 1, and yet, he confessed, during the debate, that the text substituted to that clause was clearer more explicit and therefore more favourable to the minority.

On the 23rd March, 1905, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) is reported (page 3193 'Hansard') as follows:

> So, I do not see in the last enactment that there is any concession—very far from it. I think the last amendment goes perhaps a little farther than the original enactment which caused so much excitement, because it defines more clearly what the privileges of the separate schools are. They were not defined at all in the original enactment. It defines them by the reference to the chapters of the Northwest Ordinances where they are fully explained, so that it defines more clearly these privileges, and it may be argued that it secures to the separate schools the right of religious instruction.

Here we have the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) giving the preference to the substituted text over the former clause. And yet he contrives to denounce the Laurier government, because the measure of school privileges dealt out to the two new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan was not deemed adequate. As a result there was a wide-spread agitation throughout the province of Quebec and Mr. Monk was everywhere acclaimed as the champion of Catholic rights. Let us pass over the elections of 1908 in order to reach those of 1910 and 1911.

Twice in 1910 and quite recently in 1911; at the beginning of this session, did the hon. the Minister of Public Works charge the right hon. the leader of the opposition with having sacrificed the rights of his co-religionists during the last fifteen years. He has upon each occasion, maintained

that on account of his so-called weaknesses, Sir Wilfrid Laurier had forfeited the confidence of his co-religionists.

Now what is the present situation?

Hardly have six months elapsed and events have just sided with the right hon. gentleman so bitterly denounced by the hon. minister. The system of compromise and conciliation so bitterly denounced has become the watch-word of the new minister.

Formerly, in imitation of the American patriot, Patrick Henry, the hon. gentleman and his French Canadian colleagues used to exclaim while appealing to us:

'You may accept fetters, if you like, as for us, we say: Freedom or Death!' But they have somewhat altered the libretto; and now they sing in chorus, 'dolcissimo'; 'O school freedom, thou art but a name!' Let us confine ourselves to the sweets of office".

If that is what the ministers say 'sotto voce', in a whisper, what do they say, when speaking aloud before parliament?

As a matter of fact, the question before the House provides for the annexation of Keewatin to Manitoba and in that Bill you cannot find a single clause defining the privileges of the minority in educational matters. Every one is wondering and asking how the hon. the Minister of Public Works and his three Catholic colleagues in the Borden cabinet could explain away the absence of that clause.

However amazing it may appear, the hon. the Minister of Public Works, says that there is no school rights in Keewatin and I shall by and by give a few extracts from his speech.

As to the hon. the Postmaster General, in a great display of oratory, he has found out that practically there are no Catholics in Keewatin, a handful at most; that, should there happen to be any Catholics there, they have no vested educational rights, and finally supposing that they had rights they have never asserted those rights.

As will be seen, he dismisses quite uncermoniously the claims of their friends who so faithfully supported them at the last election.

The hon. the Minister of Justice thinks that he would be very foolish, were he to jeopardize the fat important portfolio which he is now holding, and the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, (Mr. Nantel), not unlike the fourth officer in the famous burial of Malborough, simply keeps mum.

Would you like to know what has resulted from the painful partition of the hon. Minister of Public Works, in connection with school matters, on this Manitoba Boundaries Extension Act?

In the first place, a denial of all the rights of the minority.

Let us listen to the Minister of Public Works, (page 4630, unrevised 'Hansard'):

The provision is reproduced in the statutes of 1896, but it never was in any way enforced in the district of Keewatin. This Act of 1875 never applied to the district of Keewatin in any way.

And further on (page 4638)

I have said to the House that in my estimation there are, in this territory, no vested rights, no substantial rights acquired under any legislation.

And further on again, page 4641, answering a question which he had been asked by the hon. gentleman from Two-Mountains (Mr. Ethier), with regard to the vested rights——

The difference is this, that the rights of the Hudson Bay Company are purely proprietary rights, as to which there is no doubt whatever, and in transferring this territory, we are obliged to provide for those proprietary rights. I do not think there are any vested educational rights, but if there were any, the only way in which they could be protected, if the transfer is to take place, is under the educational clause 22 of the Manitoba Act, which we cannot change or vary in any way.

Again, page 4632 replying to this question of the right hon. the leader of the opposition(Sir Wilfrid Laurier): Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that there are no such rights?"

Mr. MONK. I am certainly of opinion, and have endeavoured to show, that there are no rights of any kind existing.

At last, page 4637:

Then, there were no vested rights of any kind in Keewatin territory, and there are at present no vested rights, nothing substantial in the way of legal or acquired rights in the territory with which we are dealing.

At all events, in the course of his remarks, the hon. Minister of Public Works intimates that the minority would have a shadow of vested rights had ordinances been passed with respect to education. It is true that no ordinance was passed by the commissioner in council, and on the ground that if there is a commissioner, there is no council.

But the hon. minister informs us that an application from a Catholic bishop had been forwarded to this government with a view to obtaining the appointment of a council which would be authorized, with the commissioner, to pass the ordinances asked for by that bishop and his flock. That demand was not granted and the consequence was that, in the opinion of the hon. minister, the minority has no vested rights.

But who is responsible for this application being denied? The hon. Minister of Public Works, the hon. Postmaster General and the government. It would be of no avail to plead extenuating circumstances.

In this connection the hon. Postmaster General has taken a stand for which he will be severely blamed. He said :

As far as we are concerned I may say that we received a similar request sometime in December last. Those who made that demand were not desirous enough that it should be granted to take the trouble of speaking about it for even five minutes with any of the four Catholic members of this government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how can the hon. the Postmaster General reasonably expect that Mgr. Charlebois or the petitioners will travel 1,600 miles to confer with him? The venerable bishop sent in his petition or that of his flock and I am convinced that he did not consider it necessary to undertake a 1,600 mile journey to make the acquaintance of the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) however interesting he may be.

The main point is that the Catholics' petition was ignored.

Whatever may be the opinion expressed by Catholic ministers in the cabinet, whether or not a study of the statutes reveals the clear and undeniable rights of minorities in Keewatin to separate schools, whether or not ordinances were enacted, it none the less remains to be considered whether or not it is opportunte to insert in this Bill a clause defining the status of minorities in annexed territories in educational matters.

In my humble opinion, any provision of that nature, if not accepted beforehand by the government of Manitoba, will be of no effect.

We would probably in any case obtain no better result than that of 1896, at which time the minority obtained recognition of their grievances as against the spoliation measure of 1890, at which time Sir Wilfrid Laurier solved the Manitoba schools difficulty in the only possible and reasonable manner, as admitted by Mr. Bourassa himself.

Have we not in this incident of 1870 the absolute proof that a federal statute however clear may be set at nought by a province? The Manitoba Act (art. 22) secured to Catholics the right to separate schools. The provincial government utterly neglecting this explicit provision, enacted legislation abolishing the separate school system in Manitoba and that law was declared to be constitutional by the highest court of the empire.

Of what value, therefore, is the contention that the only way of securing the school privileges of the minority is to insert in the Bill an imperative provision to that effect. For my part, I can perceive but one way of meeting the difficulty now facing us. That means is entirely at the disposal of the government.

Let us first of all take up the British North America Act of 1871, section 3, and then place face to face the two governments concerned in the annexation of Keewatin to Manitoba, and it will be possible to settle the difficulty without firing the train. Let us first of all read clause 3 of the Constitutional Act of 1871:

3. The parliament of Canada may from time to time, with the consent of the legislature of any province of the said Dominion, increase, diminish, or otherwise alter the limits of such province, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the said legislature, and may, with the like consent, make provision respecting the effect and operation of any such increase or diminution or alteration of territory in relation to any province affected thereby.

The annexation of any territory to a province is the result of an agreement between the federal government and that of the province interested.

In that agreement are to be found the terms and conditions as finally accepted and stipulated by both parties.

On examining the conditions of the agreement between the governments of Canada and Manitoba with respect to the annexation of Keewatin, I find that the limits of the territory have been defined and that this definition has apparently been accepted by both parties.

It has, I see, been stipulated that certain sums of money shall be paid as arrears and afterwards annually by the federal government to Manitoba, which arrangement also seems to have been agreeable to both parties.

I note also that the vested rights of the Hudson's Bay Company are to be respected, and many other things besides. All of these matters have been arranged by means of conferences.

The Roblin government is friendly towards the Borden government. Would it not have been possible had they taken the trouble for the Catholic ministers in the cabinet to obtain by agreement and with the consent of both parties, the insertion of a clause securing the privileges required by the minority?

This has been done, and I submit to the House that it is the great mistake made by the government. Every attempt to insert any such clause against the will of Manitoba must fail.

The other day my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) put the following question to the Minister of Public Works: 'Has the hon. Minister (Mr. Monk) any

assurance or promise that anything will be done?'

This was with reference to school privileges.

And the minister answered: 'Absolutely none.'

It was clearly the duty of the ministers to insist upon the acceptance of such conditions as appeared essential to the protection of minorities. It is not yet too late to do so. Delay the third reading of the Bill and re-open negotiations with Manitoba. You will secure these conditions, you will insert them in the Bill and we shall enact the law containing them. This difficult question can be settled by conciliation only. It may be settled in a satisfactory manner if the Catholic ministers will but display the courage, energy and determination which the people have a right to expect from them.

The Liberal party has always favoured methods of conciliation. Liberals have always refused to resort to coercion measures, because although these may appear more brilliant and in some cases appeal to certain classes, they cannot fail in the end to lead to serious difficulties and even to disastrous results.

But extremists of all shades, who in the absence of a text in support of their contentions, never fail to appeal to the constitution; what are these men doing with the constitution to-day?

They set it aside and they remain in hiding behind a rampart of some twenty statutes; a very fragile one for all are more or less contradictory, and the fabric, therefore, may easily be overthrown by the slightest wind of public indignation.

In the name of the Catholic population of Keewatin, of Manitoba, and of other provinces of the Canadian confederation; in the interest of peace and harmony between the citizens of this country, I call upon the government not to insist to-day upon the third reading of the Bill. I call upon them to delay it for some time, for one month perhaps, to take up once more negotiations with the government of Manitoba for the purpose of prevailing upon that province to accept of their own volition, as a condition of the annexation of Keewatin, such educational privileges as shall be acceptable to the minorities and concerning which the effect of existing laws may be doubtful.

I have no doubt whatever that such a move would give excellent results, nay I will go further and say that by a step of this kind alone can minority privileges be recognized and protected, because their recognition will be based upon conciliation and an agreement freely consented to by both parties.

Should the government refuse to meet this just demand, should they persist in using their majority to force through the third reading, then they implicitly admit that they hold as of no account the wishes of the majority of citizens in this great country and that they are ready to trample under foot the solemn promises made before the electoral body.

I have the honour to propose that this Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be resolved:

'That this House is of opinion that negotiations should be re-opened with the government of Manitoba in order to define by amicable conferences the status of minorities, either Protestant or Catholic, with regard to education in the light of existing laws in the annexed territory.'

Hon. ROBERT ROGERS (Minister of the Interior). I could well understand my hon. friend from Yamaska (Mr. Mondou) and my hon. friend from Nicolet (Mr. Lamarche) approaching the discussion of this delicate question from the point of view of their own conscientious conviction and therefore I am only too pleased to consider the views of those hon. gentlemen with feelings of the most profound respect and consideration. But, Mr. Speaker, when my hon. friend (Mr. Beland) moves that the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to committee, and that we hold a further conference with the government of Manitoba, I say that we cannot even consider the acceptance of this amendment, and I am surprised that my hon. friend who was a member of the late administration during its last days should suggest any such course. The late government on the 22nd of February, 1909, transmitted for the consideration of the government of Manitoba a Bill by which the right hon. gentleman proposed to settle the question which this parliament is now being asked to settle, by giving the present Bill a third reading to-night. In connection with the measure presented to the government of Manitoba, the leader of the opposition did not invite then, and I do not believe he will invite now, any such conference as that proposed by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. Let me read the Bill to which I refer and the letter from the right hon. gentleman which accompanied it. The letter is as follows:

Ottawa, 26th Feb., 1909.

Dear Mr. Roblin,—

I have the honour to enclose the draft of a Bill for the extension of the boundaries of the province of Manitoba. This Bill is on the line of the resolutions adopted by the House of Commons at its last session. The amount of the allowance to be paid to the province in lieu of lands, has been left in blank. According to the aforesaid resolu-

tion of the House of Commons, this amount should be fixed by negotiation between the Dominion government and the government of the province.

We will be happy to confer with you at any time that may be convenient to yourself and your government.

Yours respectfully,
(Sgd.) WILFRID LAURIER,

Now I will read the draft of the Bill referred to:

An Act to provide for an increase of the limits of the province of Manitoba.

Whereas a petition has been presented to the House of Commons on behalf of the Legislative Assembly of the province of Manitoba praying, amongst other things for an extension of the boundaries of that province northward and eastward and for an additional subsidy to the province in lieu of the ownership of the public lands in the territory to be added to the province by such extension, and it is expedient to grant the prayer of such petition to the extent and in the manner provided in the enactments hereinafter contained; therefore His Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:

1. Upon the legislature of the province of Manitoba consenting thereto, the limits of the said province shall be increased so that the northern boundary of the province shall be the sixtieth parallel of north latitude; the western boundary shall be the present eastern boundary of the province of Saskatchewan; the eastern boundary shall be the present eastern boundary of the province to the northeast corner thereof, thence in a straight line to the most easterly point of Island lake and thence in a straight line to the point where the eighty-ninth meridian of west longitude intersects the shore line of Hudson bay, thence following the said shore line to its intersection with the sixtieth parallel;

2. And whereas in accordance, with the provisions of the Act establishing the province of Manitoba the ungranted lands of the Crown in the territory so to be added to the said province will continue to be administered by the government of Canada for the purposes of Canada and the province will not have such lands as a source of revenue, it is further enacted that there shall be paid by Canada to the province an increased allowance by money payment to an amount of

The amendment was left blank.

3. This Act shall come into force upon a date to be fixed by proclamation of the Governor in Council.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the hon. mover of the amendment if he can find one syllable in this Bill that would justify this amendment. Not only was this Bill forwarded to the Premier of Manitoba, but immediately on its receipt a delegation was appointed by the government of the province to come to Ottawa and take up the question of the conference as suggested in the letter of the leader of the opposition, and I was honoured by being invited to become one of that delegation. We came to Ottawa and sat in conference for several hours, upon the second and third of the following month, I think, and we discussed everything connected with the settlement of this question, save and except the matter which my hon. friend (Mr. Beland) has brought to the attention of the House to-night. If hon. gentlemen opposite had any idea of asking Manitoba to take any such action as they are suggesting to-night by this amendment, that was the time and that was the place to have made the re-request. But they did not do so, and therefore, I claim they have no right to urge any such proposition now, because the record of the government of Manitoba does not warrant that course. The government and the people of Manitoba are naturally very sensitive with respect to their position upon this question, because for many long years, they have suffered, as no province in Canada has suffered, owing to outside interference, and especially the interference of the right hon. gentleman, who leads the opposition. That hon. gentleman told us to-night that he had undertaken to effect a settlement with Manitoba in the year 1907 of which he was proud and satisfied. I want to tell him that that settlement has not satisfied any citizen within the borders of Manitoba, be he Protestant or be he Roman Catholic. That settlement has kept this question as a live and a burning issue before the people of the province. Is the Manitoba government which came into power two years after the so-called settlement had been enacted, entitled to be asked to come down and confer upon the question as suggested in this amendment? I say that the actions of that government have not been such as would justify this House in passing this amendment. I will say further, that during the ten or eleven years that I occupied a position in the Manitoba government we never failed in our duty to endeavour to carry out in the most generous, the most fair, and the most liberal manner, the Act complained of, which was placed on our statute book through the interference of the leader of the opposition, and which is doing an injustice to the people of Manitoba.

During the last eight or nine years, the leader of the government in Manitoba and the members of that administration have been accused time and time again by their opponents of being too generous in their interpretation of the law in regard to the minority of that province. And never upon any occasion, to my knowledge, did that government apologize for that generosity or for the broad spirit in which they administered that law to the advantage and comfort, so far as they possibly could, of the

minority of the province of Manitoba. And, so long as I occupy a position in the public life of this country, I do not propose to be either afraid or ashamed to acknowledge my spirit of fairness and justice in all respects to the minority. And in making this statement I feel I represent the views, the broad spirit and generosity, which exists in the province of Manitoba alike with Roman Catholics and Protestants of all classes. My right hon. friend the leader of the government (Mr. Borden) the other night, told us about the splendid spirit that existed in the province of Nova Scotia. I wish to tell my right hon. friend and the members of this House that in no province of Canada can you find a better spirit existing as between the two great races of our country than exists to-day in the province of Manitoba. And I say that it would be a sad day when that good feeling now existing there should be interfered with by such an amendment as the one proposed by my hon. friend (Mr. Beland). In that province the people are desirous of going on as they have gone on in the past, in harmony and good fellowship one with the other. And if this parliament takes no action such as that suggested by my hon. friend, I have every confidence in the generosity and in the fair-mindedness of the people in that province, irrespective of race, creed or nationality, and I am sure that they will do everything in their power to settle the affairs of their province on the lines best calculated to promote good feeling. They will follow a course that will be acceptable to all. And I am sure that if Manitoba is left free to take its own course, the result will be just, fair and reasonable, and will carry satisfaction to all who are interested in the maintenance of harmony and in the settlement of this great question.

Mr. J. A. C. ETHIER (Two Mountains). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, we are witnessing the final act of the farce which the government has just played, and having for its subject the Manitoba boundaries question.

Before it is all over, before the voice of the Ontario Tories has drowned the protests of the minority, sacrificed by those who had sworn to protect it, before the French-speaking ministers have been for the last time sat upon by their Ontario colleagues, before the Nationalist majority in this House repudiate once more their leaders, Armand Lavergne and Henri Bourassa, I deem it my duty to define the stand which I propose to take on this question and to give my opinion regarding the men who were entrusted with the duty of defending the minority previously referred to by me.

I wish to point out the manner in which they have deported themselves in regard to this question. I shall not discuss the principle of the Bill, which I approve as regards the location of the proposed boundaries. The financial question in connection with the money grants has been discussed by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and particularly in the shape of amendments which have been negatived by the government supporters.

I cannot imagine what has induced the government to increase the grant to the province of Manitoba, contrarily to the principles embodied in the constitution, thereby ignoring the just claims of the maritime provinces, particularly of the provinces of Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, in respect to the Dominion subsidies. Why grant to Manitoba an amount of subsidies out of proportion with her population, as compared wtih the other provinces of the Dominion? Moreover, why grant over two millions to Manitoba in the shape of so-called arrears dating back to 1908, though in the meantime the province of Manitoba did not spend a single cent of her own moneys in the interest of the district of Keewatin and for its benefit, said district having always been up to this day administered at the expense of the Dominion parliament?

Should we consider it as a gift which this government is making to Mr. Roblin, in view of the Manitoba local elections which, it is rumoured, are to take place shortly? Or should we consider it as a leaven to entice the electors into voting for the Roblin government, in the hope that thereby the minority might be granted some special favours in connection with the school difficulties, as suggested by the Postmaster General in his last speech?

But enough has been said in regard to this financial question which, to my mind, is of secondary importance; I wish to deal more particularly with that aspect of the question in which we are most interested, not only we of the province of Quebec, but all members of the minority in this great Dominion, I mean the school question in the territory of Keewatin, which is to be annexed to the old province of Manitoba.

After listening to the explanations given by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) and the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier), and even the hon. Minister of Justice, all representing the rights of the minority, I had reason to believe that the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Nantel) would rise in his seat to protest against the stand taken by his colleagues, comparing his present stand with his past utterances. I was anxious to know what his views were since he accepted the portfolio of Minister of Inland Revenue. But I see that he has not as yet opened his mouth, and will not do so, to express the feelings of indignation which should fill his heart

under these circumstances. His views remain 'inland' in the same way as his portfolio. Silence characterises him since he has become a minister. However, he was able to speak out previous to September 21, previous to his having a taste of office, of its delights and advantages.

He was still able to speak out when, at St. Scholastique, on June 24 last (1911), in company with the leader of the hon. Postmaster General and his own Mr. Armand Lavergne, together with Jules Fournier and Jean Prévost, he applauded Mr. Lavergne's spech, and especially the following words uttered before the electors of Two Mountains and Terrebonne: 'See what is going on in our midst, in Manitoba, in Alberta, in Saskatchewan, our religious and national franchises have been sacrificed while we were dozing.'—I imagine it was the hon. Minister of Public Works who was dozing—and, allowing the Lauriers and the Brodeurs to secure honours while losing honour. On this feast of St. John Baptist, reflect that we have been guilty of such remissness.

On that occasion he applauded the above statements made by Mr. Lavergne, his leader, adding that, if he was elected, and the Conservative party returned to power, he would restore the Separate schools as they were previous to 1890. I know it for a fact, being present at the meeting. The same statement was made at St. Thérèse de Blainville, in the county of Terrebonne, on September 18th last, three days before polling day. Mr. Nantel applauded at the time and opened his mouth to exclaim: 'Shame, shame on these traitors!' But since September 21, he as well as his colleagues, and his colleagues as well as himself, even the hon. Minister of Justice—who, between us, is not content with his salary of Minister of Justice, but retains his pension as former judge—suddenly changed their minds, and like the hon. Minister of Public Works, they said to themselves: 'We are here and you are there,' which means: 'We are in the manger, let us gorge ourselves.'

Subsequent to 1896, the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue stated in the county of Terrebonne and throughout the district, on every public platform, that the Manitoba school question was not settled. In this regard, he is contradicted by the hon. Minister of Public Works, who has just stated, what he had already stated in his former speech, that he had never raised the Manitoba question in public or in this House, in the course of the last fifteen years, as he considered it finally disposed of. At the public meeting of St. Eustache, on July 17, 1910, the Minister of Public Works, while denouncing what he thought fit to designate as the damnable Navy Act, pledged himself at the same time to restore the Manitoba schools, and that, with the support of his colleague the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue and of the Nationalist candidate in Two Mountains, Mr. André Fauteaux. Such are the pledges given in the province of Quebec.

The hon. Minister of Public Works has certainly not forgotten the statements he made in this House on March 29, 1897, when giving his appreciation of the then Laurier-Greenway agreement, he said: 'I contend that the so-called concessions referred to are worthless.' I consider that the concessions made by the Manitoba government to the Dominion government are paltry and stingy. They are far from being generous. That settlement is a bluff, a gold brick, which will not satisfy any one.

And I affirm that from that date up to the 21st of last September, the hon. Minister of Public Works had the same language during the elections of 1900, 1903, during the by-elections that took place in Two Mountains and Terrebonne; in 1904, 1908 and 1911. He has changed his opinion, but from the day he has become the holder of a minister's portfolio. In order to please the Tory majority of Ontario he has disavowed his past and his programme, he was ashamed of them. And he comes and tells us, with a shocking impudence: The settlement of the school question I have condemned, blamed and censured for fifteen years, but I now approve of it and it is the most effective which could be thought of, under the circumstances.

Those good, faithful and patriotic ministers think of nothing else but drawing their salary, and I have no doubt that the first people to put up an appearance at the accountant's office and to ask for their cheque every month must be those ministers, those three hirelings who follow in the wake of the Ontario Tory tribe.

The hon. Minister of Public Works has told us that he had not the mania of resignation. That is obvious. He prefers to cling to power in spite of all justice, even in spite of all political decorum.

But let us walk into the Post Office Department. Who is the leader of that department? The hon. L. P. Pelletier. The position he has taken in this debate could be no surprise to any one who knows him; it does not astonish those who have followed his political career for the last twenty-five years. The hon. member for Rouville has portrayed the hon. minister by quoting an extract of his biography which appeared in 'La Croix,' a Catholic newspaper of Montreal and a Conservative newspaper at the same time. What did that paper say about the ministers coming from the province of Quebec, in its edition of the second day of last March? I quote textually. Speaking of the Kee-

watin schools and of the Bill now before us, 'La Croix' said:

As to the rights of the Catholics of that territory to their schools, not a word, not even an allusion.

The Borden government ignores them. To his mind they amount to nothing, they do not exist. However, he did not forget to consecrate by a special clause all the privileges now enjoyed by the Hudson's Bay Company.

If this is not an iniquity perpetrated intentionally, there is no such thing as iniquity.

Mr. Speaker, allow me to interrupt my quotation at this point and to make a digression about the clause benefiting the Hudson's Bay Company in this Bill. If you remember, Mr. Speaker, upon the second reading of the Bill enacting by clause 7 that the rights of the Hudson's Bay Company should be protected, I asked the hon. Minister of Public Works why the government protected especially the rights of the company and ignored those of the minority, and the hon. Minister of Public Works answered me that clause 7 protected the proprietary rights only and those rights must be mentioned in the Bill. Now, from the very opening of the present sitting, the right hon. Prime Minister has given notice and has had the said clause 7 crossed out, alleging that it was useless, and this, notwithstanding the opinion of a professor of constitutional law at a certain university of Montreal, the Hon. Mr. Monk, who, in answer to my question, had said the contrary.

In face of this official denial by the Prime Minister as to the opinion of his colleague the Minister of Public Works on a legal question like this, I am not surprised to see that his pupil, the hon. member for Yamaska (Mr. Mondou), has changed his own opinion of the value and merit of the hon. minister's knowledge as far as constitutional law is concerned.

And if his opinion as to the existence of the rights of the minority in the Keewatin district is as doubtful as that which he expressed with respect to the rights of the Hudson's Bay Company and to the necessity of protecting them in this Bill, it is not worth more in the one case than in the other, and I am surprised that his own pupils, even the member for Yamaska, do desert him.

But I shall leave this aside, and come back to the hon. Postmaster General, and I shall go on making the House acquainted with the sayings of 'La Croix,' which I was quoting.

Speaking of the present government, this newspaper says further:

They are in power, they have authority, they also have strength; nothing prevents them from acting, their is no obstacle in their way, and still what are they doing?

Impassive like a hangman who has lost all human sentiments, they abandon the Catholics of Keewatin to the torture of neutral schools.

What shall the ministers: Mr. Monk, Mr. Pelletier and Mr. Nantel do?

Shall they throw their portfolios on the table of their chief if he persists in leaving out of this Bill a clause to the effect of acknowledging the rights of the Catholics of Keewatin to their schools? Have they even insisted on that point, so far? We know nothing of it as yet. The events which are going to occur at the Commons will tell us.

But from a Pelletier especially, we expect nothing good, nothing manly.

That soul of a politician bent under the yoke of personal interest is nothing good in our estimation.

To resist the craft and the hatred of the lodges, one must not be but a cunning lawyer, he must have a will inclined to do good, a soul which has stood the test of sacrifice, a generous heart, fixed principles; and Mr. Pelletier is devoid of all that.

Oh, I know that the Postmaster General has declared this newspaper to be unworthy of respect. However, when it sang the praises of these gentlemen previous to the 21st day of last September, and when it abused the right hon. leader of the opposition, it was read with satisfaction. But if this newspaper has ever struck the right note it has certainly done so when speaking of the Postmaster General as it did.

I say that the French ministers follow in the wake of the Tory majority of Ontario; that it is the voice of Ontario which commands, and I shall quote as ground for such assertion, an impudent article of the 'Citizen,' a government organ published in this city. That article appeared this morning, March 12, and here is an extract of it which is very expressive:

Hon. Mr. Borden's government was not affected either by Quebec as a province or by Mr. Bourassa, and possibly the sooner this basic fact is emphasized, the sooner the people of Canada will cease to have their parliamentary business unnecessarily meddled with. In the days of the Laurier government, which lived and moved and had its being by leave of Quebec province, as that province was then represented in parliament, necessarily everything that Quebec thought or felt or said had to receive that attention which is due to a force which can make or unmake a premier. Times have changed. The people of Canada, as a whole, have elected the Borden government with a working majority quite irrespective of the province of Quebec.

And the French ministers keep silent, they swallow this insult without wincing. Did not the Prime Minister himself say at Toronto, the day after the election which took place on the 21st of September last, that Ontario had made her powerful voice heard? The rights of the minority are being trodden upon, and the hon. Minister of Public Works comes and tells us that this minority has no rights. It is not strange.

for the hon. Prime Minister himself stated on the very first reading of the Bill, that there were doubts as to the existence or the non-existence of rights in behalf of the minority in Keewatin. If there is a doubt, why then refuse the benefit of it to the minority? Twenty-four members have declared, by their vote, that they claimed the benefit of that doubt in favour of the minority by means of an amendment which was proposed and rejected.

But I bow down to this denial on the part of the majority, because it consecrates for ever the legal right of such majority. They have taken away from us the right which we believed, in good faith, we should claim.

Why now does the House refuse to hold out to the minority a sheet-anchor, the last of all, in order to protect their rights, or at least a scrap of those rights, by rejecting the amendment which has been proposed by the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Béland)?

Why is it that the government and the Prime Minister, who has some doubts, should not agree to submit this question to some expert and disinterested parties, to some distinguished lawyers, to the Supreme Court, for instance, and to the Privy Council if need be?

By the amendment which the hon. member for Beauce has proposed, the government could secure an honourable arrangement with respect to this question. But no, an important question like this breeds hesitation. If some poor employees must be beheaded though not guilty of anything else than being Liberals, then there is no hesitation and the guillotine works regularly.

Now, let us proceed by an analogy. Has the government shown any energy at all in the case of the Bill which was introduced by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) concerning the Ne Temere decree on marriages in the province of Quebec? If the government has deemed it proper to refer this question to the Supreme Court and even to the Privy Council if need be and this notwithstanding the opinion of the honourable Minister of Justice and of the Prime Minister himself—which opinion has been corroborated by the ex-Minister of Justice and by Sir Wilfrid—why, on such an important question as the rights of the minority of Keewatin, why not accede to a request of that kind and submit the question to the same judicial authorities, so as to make it a test case? No, Mr. Speaker, the voice of Quebec rules no more, the Tory voice of Ontario is the one which now rules, and as Mr. Bourassa, their past chief, would say, our ministers from Quebec follow those who take them to pasture like sheep. I believe that this latter is sincere because he maintains the position he has taken with the five other Nationalists whom he got elected, and who have voted in favour of the amendment proposed by the hon. leader of the opposition on the second reading of the Bill.

I shall not address the House any longer on that question. May I be permitted, however, to add that, in my humble opinion, the idea which has always prevailed with the fathers of confederation from the first, and with the Canadian statesmen who have succeeded one another from Sir John Macdonald up to the present time was: Protection to the minority and equal justice to all minorities in the different provinces which compose this vast Dominion? One has only to study the British North America Act of 1867, the laws concerning the admission of the Northwest Territories and of Rupert's Land into confederation, the Territories Act of 1875, the Keewatin Act of 1876, and last, chapter 62 of the Revised Statutes of Canada (1906), to convince one's self that my pretension is well founded in law, whatever the hon. Minister of Public Works may say or think contrarywise.

It is the same as to the Acts concerning Alberta and Saskatchewan and has induced me to vote for the amendment submitted by the hon. member for Yamaska.

It may be pointed out that this is in contradiction with my vote on the settlement of the Manitoba school question in 1897, but the situation to-day is very different. What I did in 1897, I should do again under the same circumstances, even as I would be ready to renew my vote in favour of the Mondou resolution without feeling that I had in any way contradicted my past record.

The difference is that in 1897 the question had been pending since six years, going from court to court and from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. When we were returned to power in 1896 the question was exhausted, the life had been taken out of it by the contradictions of the Conservative party who, to use the expression employed by the hon. the Post Master General, had played football with it.

It was the Conservative party who, from 1890 to 1896, fostering race and religious prejudice carried us to the verge of civil war. This was by good luck avoided thanks to the diplomacy and the energy of the then Prime Minister, to his policy of peace and conciliation. This indeed was the only practical manner of settling the question, as only later admitted by the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), and in 1897 by Mr. Bourassa, as stated by him in reply to the hon. member for Beauharnois, Mr. Bergeron.

To-day the situation is not the same; the matter is just beginning. The opposi-

tion are not responsible for the deeds of the government who act as they deem expedient. Shall this farce which lasted from 1890 to 1896 be repeated?

In a word, and on account of the considerations I have just recalled, I will vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Beauce, because, wanting a better, it is the last and supreme chance offered to the Keewatin minority.

By following the policy of concilation, concord and peace inaugurated by the hon. leader of the opposition the question may be disposed of for ever and I hope that the five Nationalists who have shown their sincerity so far will vote in favour of the amendment now submitted.

Mr. SEVIGNY. (Dorchester). (Translation). Will the hon. member allow me to put a question?

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) Certainly.

Mr. SEVIGNY. (Translation.) If no amendment is added to the Bill as brought down, is the hon. member of opinion that the Keewatin minority will be subject to the conditions of the Laurier-Greenway settlement?

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) I am not in a position to answer that positively and the conference suggested by the amendment might throw light upon the matter.

Mr. SEVIGNY. (Translation.) Has the hon. member voted for the Laurier-Greenway settlement?

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) I certainly did, and I do not regret having done so. The interruption by my hon friend the member for Dorchester reminds me of a fact which I might have forgotten to communicate to the House concerning the confidence expressed by the hon. the Minister of Public Works, and the hon. the Postmaster General in Mr. Roblin, when those two hon. gentlemen declared that they had Mr. Roblin's assurance that the situation of the Manitoba Catholics would be improved. I have just read in 'Le Devoir' of March 12, 1912, the following article:

POSITIVE DECLARATIONS OF 'LES CLOCHES' OF ST. BONIFACE.

The organ of His Grace Mgr Langevin says that the Manitoba school question was never settled, that the rights recognized by the Privy Council were never re-establish and that the double tax has not been accepted by the Catholics of Winnipeg and Brandon. A worse proposal from hon. Mr. Caldwell.

(Special despatch.)

Winnipeg, 12.—'Les Cloches de St. Boniface," organ of the archbishop of St. Boniface, in the number of March 15 now under press declares notwithstanding the statements of the hon. Mr. Monk, that the Manitoba school question was never finally settled; that the constitutional rights recognized by the Privy Council were never re-establish by the so-called final Laurier-Greenway settlement and that the suffering minority has never accepted the arrangement obliging the Catholics of Winnipeg and Brandon to pay double taxes.

The organ of His Grace Archbishop Langevin also says that he cannot accept the negation of the constitutional rights of Keewatin, and that he regrets that a new breach has been made in the wall of the constitution.

A bill submitted by Mr. Caldwell makes the situation worse.

(Special despatch.)

The hon. Mr. Caldwell, Provincial Minister of Education, had introduced a seven page Bill amending the School Act. The amendments make the situation worse from the French and Catholic point of view.

The word 'school' is restricted to the meaning of 'class.' The parish priest will no longer be allowed to say a word in schools without the formal and express consent of the commissioners.

Two special articles are framed with a view to school concentration, &c. Nothing therein can justify the gleams of hope to be gathered from the ministerial speeches.

Mr. PELLETIER. (Translation.) Is that the organ of the hon. member?

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) It is the organ of Mgr. Langevin, your chief on the school question from 1896 to the 21st September last.

Mr. PELLETIER. (Translation.) What paper are you quoting from?

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) From "Les Cloches de St. Boniface," reproduced by 'Le Devoir.' You have already forgotten your 'devoir' (duty).

Mr. PELLETIER. (Translation.) The member from Two Mountains will never be able to teach anyone his duty.

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.)No, I might not be able to teach some persons how to do their duty. Does that satisfy the hon. member for Dorchester in case the Keewatin minority should be governed by the Laurier-Greenway agreement? So much for the promises made by the Hon. Mr. Roblin to the hon. the Postmaster General.

Mr. PELLETIER (Translation.) That is not what I stated. I declared that I had no promises and the hon. member has no right to misquote me.

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) However, you have faith in those who come forward with a bill such as that submitted by Mr. Caldwell, provincial minister of education and Mr. Roblin's colleague. We may judge by that what your hopes are worth.

As for the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, it would be difficult for him to make any statement; he is mute.

I will vote for the amendment brought down by the hon. member for Beauce.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). The amendment of the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Beland) is based on the same capital error as all the other amendments are, it fails to recognize that this proposal, like

the other proposals, is an interference with the sovereignty of the province of Manitoba. We have settled once for all that Manitoba is sovereign within her own territory, and any proposal in this House to enter into negotiations with Manitoba over this question would raise the issue that she was not sovereign over this question at the present time. No other province in this country would for a moment entertain a proposal to reconsider her constitutional rights.

Mr. BELAND. You can confer with a sovereign.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). You may, but this proposed conference implies that Manitoba is called into court to have her rights readjusted. It is a proposal to reopen a question that has been settled for all time; and if it had not already been settled, I think we must admit that the majority in this House to-night of 136 against the amendment of the hon. member for Yamaska (Mr. Mondou) has effectually settled it. I remember fifteen years ago when I was in this House and this question first came up, there were eight men in the House who decided to take their political lives in their hands and to say that there should be no coercion of Manitoba, or any questioning of her rights. I think this majority of 136 votes to-night is a still clearer declaration that there must be no interference with the free action of Manitoba on matters falling within her jurisdiction, and no questioning even of her rights, no invitation to Manitoba to inquire into her rights. I say that the question has been settled once for all, and all we can do now is to write over it 'requiescat in pace.' If this amendment were adopted, some one would then get up in this House and ask Ontario to come into a conference. Would Quebec for one moment consider a proposal that she should go into a conference to have her constitutional rights made the subject of inquiry? Would Ontario do it? Would little Prince Edward Island do it? Certainly not. We must respect the rights of all the provinces in this House, we must leave off discussing them for no good can come of it. For sixteen years now we have had more or less discussion of this question in this House, and to no good purpose. There are other and more important questions before the people that ought to command our attention. If there is to be a conference where should that conference be held? That conference should be held in Manitoba, and it should be held between the minority in Manitoba and the provincial government. If such a conference were held now, and if there are any grievances, I believe they would be adjusted. But that is a matter with which we have nothing to do in this House. Every speaker on this question to-day has acknowledged that Manitoba is seized with jurisdiction in this matter, her sovereignty is acknowledged, and no good can come of prolonging this discussion any further. Therefore, I shall have to vote against the amendment of the hon. member for Beauce, because I hold that there should be no coercion of Manitoba, either under the guise of a conference, or by way of direct legislation.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Kamouraska). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I thought that the remarks of my hon. friend the member for Two-Mountains (Mr. Ethier) would have brought the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Nantel) out of the trenches behind which he has prudently been keeping since the beginning of the session. I was mistaken. Times have changed!

I still remember the vehement and passionate discussions that took place within these walls in 1905. In public meetings, I have witnessed tumultuous scenes. I remember the stinging and insulting statements that our opponents hurled against us in respect to separate schools in the West. I have even heard violent denunciations against that faction of the ministerial party that the nationalist conservatives called the 'Ontario fanatics.'

And I am witnessing to-day their fraternal embrace under the folds of the old tory flag.

The fire which the government is to-day attempting to stifle, was kindled by their own friends and the agitation of which the hon. the Postmaster General complained in his speech is the result of the campaign they themselves conducted, in the course of which they condemned beforehand their conduct of to-day.

The hon. member for Rouville has given us some idea of those hon. gentlemen's electoral promises. Allow me to read to you there appreciation of the result of the last elections, the things that they then undertook to do and the hopes to which they gave utterance.

'L'Evenement' of the 22nd September published the following:

> The betrayal of the Catholics of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, and later on those of the unorganized territories of the Northwest was a three fold crime on the part of the government, and as governments are collectivities of an essentially temporal nature, we awaited with confidence the day when that of Sir Wilfrid Laurier would receive the just punishment of its odious actions.
>
> That day has dawned and we greet it for our part, as the marvellous rising of a new sun of justice.
>
> The heritage of the Macdonalds and the

Tuppers is transmitted by the working of Providence, and the fate of arms to Mr. R. L. Borden. We know that he will prove in every way worthy of it, and our joy in greeting him is the more sincere that he has already given us proof that he understands the mentality and the aspirations of the French Canadian people.

We hail at the same time his most noble followers, Mr. F. D. Monk, the distinguished defender of our autonomy; Mr. L. P. Pelletier, the powerful fighter who has vanquished the enemy's hordes in one of their most ancient strongholds; Dr. Paquet, the soldier who is always ready to fight in a good cause, and last but not least the young knight 'sans peur et sans reproche,' Mr. P. E. Blondin, the terror of the scourge of public robbers.

The causes dear to us are in good hands, and the dawn of a glorious day is rising for Canada we love so well.

On the same day 'L'Evenement' rejoiced at the election of two of its directors, Messrs. L. P. Pelletier and Lespérance.

On the 2nd October the hon. member for Montmagny celebrated his victory and the hon. the Postmaster General attended the demonstration.

In the report of the event published by 'L'Evenement', October 3, we read this:

Mr. Pelletier assured the electors that French Canadian Conservative members, from the Province of Quebec, would be less the representatives of their constituencies than of their race. He proclaimed himself a Nationalist and proud of being one. The day will soon come when there will be Nationalist groups, but when the Nationalist spirit will pervade tre whole country. ('L'Evènement', October, 1911).

Let us now see what was said by the other faction of the conservative party in Quebec, the nationalist group.

On the 27th October 1911 the hon. Postmaster General after having been sworn in as a member of the present government, was re-elected in the county of Quebec. A large meeting was held at Lorette and the nationalist leader of the District of Quebec, Mr. Armand Lavergne, was one of the principal speakers. In the report of his speech published by 'L'Evenement,' (18th October) I find the following :

The seed we have sown has risen and ripened and already harvest time has come. I am glad that the harvester to-day should be the hon. Mr. Pelletier, who, as a minister has repeated to you the promises made before his election: that he would demand and insist upon a plebiscite on the naval question. I will go further and I state positively to you that we will obtain that plebiscite.

I went to Ottawa while the cabinet was being formed and I saw Mr. Borden from whom I expected neither honours nor portfolio. I said to him: 'I bring you the Province of Quebec regenerated; will you take it'? Mr. Borden extended to me a loyal hand. I can assure you that Mr. Borden is not the fanatic he has been painted, but one of the greatest living Canadians.

The English from the sister provinces have understood us, English Conservatives especially know that if we desire that this Confederation should live, there must no longer be any question of victors or vanquished, but complete equality between the two great races who divide our soil.

We can confidently confide the cause of the French Canadian Catholic minority to the present government; I know that our interests will be in good hands.

A little snow beginning to fall, my friend Armand Lavergne exclaimed in a moment of enthusiasm :

Fall, fall snow flakes! Cover with an immaculate pall the turpitudes of past governments. To-morrow the sun will shine upon an honest government which we hail with joy and gratitude. ('L'Evènement,' October 28, 1911.)

Mr. PELLETIER. They were fine and good words.

Mr. LAPOINTE. (Translation). Yes, they were fine words. I am convinced that today Mr. Lavergne would consider three feet of snow at least necessary to cover the mis-deeds of the government he hailed with such delight.

I do not desire to give any more quotations; I cannot however pass over the statement made a moment ago by the hon. Minister of Public Works that never since 1897, in this House or out of it, he spoke of the Manitoba school question. The hon. Minister went to the length of declaring that when speakers on the hustings had, in his presence, spoken of this question, he had blamed them for it, stating that as far as he was concerned the question was settled and outside the sphere of politics.

Mr. Speaker, on the 6th August last, in the city of Three Rivers, the hon. Minister of Public Works, in company with Mr. Henri Bourassa, opened the electoral campaign in the Province of Quebec.

I have here the report of that meeting as published in "Le Devoir", recognized organ of the minister.

This is what Mr. Normand, the conservative candidate said :

Mr. Bureau must render you an account of his conduct in the great questions touching our national life. He must account to you for the Manitoba school question which is not settled in spite of the statements of those who betrayed our brothers and which remains now as it was then, an iniquitous and monstrous violation of the natural law which permits every man to adore God in the language spoken by his father and mother.

The same day, on the same hustings, in the presence of the hon. Minister of Public Works, the hon. deputy Speaker of this House, the Knight (sans peur et sans reproche,) as described by 'L'Evenement,' made the following statement.

One day when a wave of fanaticism blew from the Orange lodges—

I beg, Mr. Speaker, that you will excuse these words spoken by your deputy in an electoral address.

—when the Quebec representatives were thinking deep of shame and fear rather than to make any sacrifice of personal interest, when iniquity led its forces against justice in order to do her violence and against liberty to strangle her, two men rose in parliament to defend justice and liberty in the Province of Quebec and on this land of America, and those two men are Bourassa and Lavergne.

The present government does not settle great questions they kill and bury them.

Their final method is to declare a question dead and buried.

Dead and buried they say is the Manitoba school question in spite of the eloquent voice exclaiming: 'I am the eternally wounded and my grave is a cradle.

Listen now to the words of the hon. Minister of Public Works, who declares that he protested every time that any of his friends dared to say that the school question was not settled:

In the moral order of things, we demand that the constitution, under whose shelter our Confederation has developed in the marvellous manner we are now witnessing, shall be as the ark of the covenant, securing to all minorities, Protestant or Catholic, the full recognition of dear and precious rights, and that no compromise, no refusal of justice shall cause the people to regret the political event of 1867.

Is that the protest which the hon. gentleman claims to have made on every one of those occasions?

Mr. Speaker, after having heard such speeches and declarations, after having witnessed all that has taken place in this House since the beginning of the session, the attitude of the ministers representing our promise and of the members supporting them, I ask you and all the members of this House, I ask the country whether it would not be proper to give to the 21st September 1911 the historical name of 'the day of dupes.'

What a number of dupes there were that day in our good old province! Too large a number of voters did not perceive that they were the instruments of bold and skilful agitators using them to break up and mutilate the Liberal party, and knowing well that after the battle all these contradictory forces, imperialists and autonomists, orangemen and stalwarts of all shades would unite to control the administration, and having attained their end would trample under foot their electoral doctrines.

You know, Mr. Speaker, what calumnies they spread and with what consummate skill they prepared and organized the elections which gave the country a majority composed of men having diametrically opposite ideas and among whom said union is possible without absolute violation on the part of several of their pledges and sacred promises.

It was really very skillful to state in Ontario that Borden was the champion of public schools and of provincial rights betrayed and abandoned by Laurier in 1905 and to proclaim in Quebec that Monk was the champion of separate schools and of the sacred rights of minorities also betrayed and abandoned by Laurier.

It was really artistically dishonest to cry throughout Ontario that the navy created by the Liberal government was a step towards independence and a Canadian organization of no use to the empire while repeating in Quebec that Laurier had sold his countrymen to England. It is in favour of this unfortunate coalition that ardent appeals were made to the Quebec electors who were beseeched to support it by their votes.

The present government was born of that conspiracy and duplicity. But we await them on the day of reckoning and retribution has already begun. After five months of power that government has already reached the lowest degree of unpopularity and impotence.

Already we see the dawn of the day when the unnatural coalition shall be dissolved and disappear as some chemical product unable to withstand the atmosphere in which it is placed.

The members of the cabinet are to-day obliged to face their solemn pledges and violent denunciations. What has become of their stern unyielding attitude? On the first occasion they have fled from the field to employ an expression they themselves have used, caring nothing for their allies of yesterday. The latter are no longer necessary, they can do without them. In a very short time they will lead them from the capitol to the Tarpecan rock.

Those we believed in their sincerity and good faith are now suffering from disillusion, disappointment and sorrow. We had predicted this.

To rally his Quebec partisans by vague declarations covering his reasons the hon. Postmaster General was fain to sound the onset against the Liberal party. It was a tactical move, but public opinion will not accept any such line of defence.

The denunciations of the hon. minister are only skirmishes where no honour can be gained; in all his declarations it is easy to detect an admission of incapacity.

The Liberal members of this House will easily sustain the untimely assault of the hon. minister. They are the only ones here who can declare that they have not violated their pledges nor torn up their electoral programmes.

They are the only ones who can appear before their constituents without fear or

remorse, secure in the feeling that they will not be accused of deception.

The hon. minister has communicated his hopes to the House. He declared that he had faith, much faith, that faith which moves mountains. Has he forgotten that faith without works is but a dead faith?

It must not be forgotten that we are legislating to-day under a section of the British North America Act of 1871 which reads as follows:

3. The parliament of Canada may from time to time, with the consent of the legislature of any province and of the said Dominion, increase, diminish or otherwise alter the limits of such province, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the said legislature, and may, with the like consent, make provision respecting the effect and operation of any such increase, or diminution or alteration of territory in relation to any province affected thereby.

If it was the intention of the government to get certain concessions from Mr. Roblin, as the two representatives of the province of Quebec in the Cabinet would have us believe, why did they not ask for them before giving to Manitoba the numerous advantages which have been granted in this bill? If Mr. Roblin was so well disposed towards the Catholic minority, why should he object so strongly to the least little text in the law? No, Mr. Speaker, the electors of this country and specially of the province of Quebec, will not allow themselves to be deceived by the remote illusion of possible concessions on the part of Mr. Roblin.

The representatives of the minority in the government, in committing to the care of the Premier of Manitoba the interests of that minority, are in the position of the legendary Gribouille who stood in the water up to his neck so as not to get wet by the rain.

Their action could also be likened to that of the lamb who would go for assistance to his fierce enemy, the wolf, instead of staying within the fence that would protect him.

You are giving to the province of Manitoba an immense territory, you are loading it with favours, you are giving it two million dollars to which it is not entitled, you are creating a new province, why then do you not avail yourself of this exceptional occasion to exact the redress of the wrongs under which the Catholic minority is labouring?

Twist as much as you want the meaning of the statutes, oppose one to the other, as well as you can, the public opinion will never be satisfied and the government will be held responsible for this neglect and this omission.

The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) told the House how the ministers have been denounced and repudiated by almost all the newspapers of the province of Quebec that helped the present government to carry the last elections.

Now, let us see the reverse side of the medal. Let us listen to the victorious clamours of the other wing of the ministerial party. Only this morning the "Ottawa Citizen" was writing rapturously that the conservative party have no need of the province of Quebec to govern this country, that under the Laurier administration everything was done at the bidding of Quebec, but that happily that time is past.

With the permission of the House I will quote from a newspaper which is the official organ of a society closely allied to the Conservative party, I mean "The Orange Sentinel". This article published on the 7th March, will show the people of the province of Quebec what masters they gave themselves to on the 21st September last. The title of the article is "A Fine Exhibition" and it says :

A FINE EXHIBITION.

'The resolutions will go this afternoon if the government is defeated before six o'clock,'

These are the words of hon. Robert Rogers in reply to the Nationalist demands for delay in the introduction of the Bill to extend the boundaries of Manitoba.

English-speaking Canada has been waiting many years for this straight talk to Quebec clericals. It stirs the British spirit of Canadians to read such a declaration. We have been accustomed for so long to see our representatives at Ottawa grovelling before the black robes of Quebec, that it seems like the beginning of a new era to have a responsible Minister declare the intention of the government to do right regardless of the threats of bishops, priests, or their Nationalist infantry.

It is the voice of a full grown man, in whom courage is the dominant characteristic, not the expression of a politician who listens to the timid council of the place-hunters.

Hon. Robert Rogers has placed himself on the level taken by Sir John Macdonald when he was urged to pardon Louis Riel the second time. Then as now, the black frocked priests and bishops of Quebec invaded Ottawa to save the neck of a twice convicted murderer. The old chieftain, who had gone much too far when he pardoned Riel the first time, made up his mind that the death penalty should be inflicted. From within his cabinet, from the floor of the House, from the episcopal palaces of Quebec, they came pleading and threatening to save the French rebel. It was all useless. The old man, driven into the corner by the fierce attacks, gave his head a characteristic shake as he said:

'Riel shall die, if every dog in Quebec barks at my heels.'

From that day until last week when hon. Robert Rogers spoke, there has not been such a display of strength and courage among the ministers at Ottawa. We hope that this determination to resist Quebec will be maintained. Ontario and the other provinces will do justice to the French. But the time has come when they will no longer allow Quebec

to ride rough shod over their constitutional rights.

I will not stoop to disprove the malignant charges of that paper against the clergy of the province of Quebec, passing over them in scorn is the best answer which can be given.

But are not the victorious clamours of the organ of this section, whose influence in the administration of the day cannot be denied, a most evident proof of the shameful retreat and the unconditional surrender of the representatives of the minority in the government?

The ministers are complaining bitterly of their Nationalist auxiliaries who to-day are up in arms against them. Their tranquility has been troubled. They lament over the obtrusive voices that disturb their sleep and dispel their dreams.

We can afford to look with indifference on this family quarrel. We have no sympathy for those by whom we have been slandered, hissed and insulted.

We cannot forget that we have been charged with cowardice and treason, when we had done our duty as loyal citizens and had taken our political lives in our hands to stand by a cause which we considered to be in the interest of the country.

Those men, our most violent enemies of yesterday, are to-day isolated, standing between two seats, denounced on the right, ignored on the left, in that position in a word, in which must inevitably sooner or later, find themselves all those who play such a game.

In concluding, I will say that the stand of the government on this question is the same that they have taken on all the problems they had to solve. They are satisfied with having the agitation kept up and they carefully avoid taking action.

What did we see three or four weeks ago? The ministers from the province of Quebec, the so-called champions of orthodoxy, those lofty sponsors of our religion, in order to please their allies of Ontario who have made a political machine of the 'Ne temere decree,' asking the Privy council in England if they can refrain the province of Quebec from giving effect to the rules of the Catholic church for the celebration of marriages between members of that faith, instead of voting down at once the arbitrary Bill which had been submitted to the House.

And what about the naval question? It has been solemnly declared in front of every chuch in the province of Quebec that the naval law would be repealed at the first session of Parllament, after the election.

But to-day, the government are waiting to consult with the admiralty and we can easily forecast what the answer will be.

In the meantime we have entered the fight and we will keep it up to the end.

Public opinion is better enlightened, better informed and conscious of the grave error committed in a moment of weakness is already beginning to regain its foothold. When the occasion will come, the people will take revenge on those by whom they have been so outrageously misled.

I will have great pleasure in voting for the amendment of the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Beland).

Mr. A. SEVIGNY (Dorchester). (Translation). Mr. Speaker, at this late hour of the night and at this phase of the debate, it is not my intention to detain the House by a long speech, but I think it is my duty to give some explanation before casting my vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Beland).

It has been my privilege for several years past to be acquainted with the ex Postmaster General. I am quite ready to concede here, as I have done more than once outside of this House, that my hon. friend is a talented French-Canadian; nevertheless, I hold together with several members to whom I have spoken about it, that the hon. gentleman, besides being a clever young man is also an excellent comedian. I followed him in that memorable campaign of Drummond-Arthabaska, in the fall of 1909; I followed him during the last electoral fight that was ended by the great victory of the 21st September. On all occasions it was made apparent to me. . .

Mr. LEMIEUX. (Translation). Is my hon. friend alluding to me?

Mr. A. SEVIGNY. (Translation). No. I am alluding to the ex-Postmaster General (Mr. Beland); if I mistake not, my hon. friend must be styled the ex-minister of Marine and Fisheries.

I have always found my hon. friend—he has been a Minister for thirty days—to be very clever when meeting his opponents and discussing the naval question. I was honoured by his presence in my county and I listened to him on numerous other occasions. When he was addressing French Canadian electors in the province of Quebec, he used to say: Our opponents are trying to work you up about that navy, a small little navy that will serve only to protect your butter and your cheese; you are not going to vote for the large navy that Borden wants, and don't forget that Borden wants to give, besides, 25 million dollars to assist England in the wars of the empire. He invariably concluded in appealing thus to his fellow citizens: If you vote for Laurier, you are voting for a small navy; if you vote for Borden you are voting for a large navy. For him the whole question was between a small and a large

navy. That tactic was clever enough and was fairly successful in several places; it succeeded even in my county, but not sufficiently to prevent my being elected.

To-night, after the vote, I listened with great pleasure, as I always do to, the speech of the hon. member for Beauce, who is one of the best speakers of the province of Quebec.

For more than a week now, we are discussing this question of the Manitoba boundaries. For my part, I took on that question a stand which is absolutely sincere and definite, and that stand I have taken at a considerable sacrifice. For the last ten years, unfortunately, I have been mixed up in politics and I have always fought for the Conservative party in the province of Quebec, in its darkest days, and a few months after taking my seat in this House, I came to the conclusion that I was in duty bound to vote against the party for which I have always fought.

I say that it was a great sacrifice. I did it in order to harmonize my vote with my past record and in justice to those whom my conscience called upon me to support under the circumstances.

The hon. member for Beauce has followed the whole debate; he did not however take any part in the discussion upon the amendment submitted by the hon. member for Yamaska. He proposed nothing himself as a measure of justice to the Catholic minority of Keewatin. He now comes forward with a motion having no bearing whatever on the question and which, as he says, would place the rights of that minority in the hands of a few persons who would confer with the government of Manitoba. What would take place at such a conference? Would the hon. member be there? Would I or other members of this House be there to offer suggestions? Certainly not. I say therefore that it is here in this House where the members from the province of Quebec and for all Canada are present that suggestions should be made. If the hon. member will submit a measure calculated to protect all the rights of the Keewatin minority, I will undertake to vote with him and once more against my party. But I will have none of the measure he now suggests, because I do not believe in its efficacy and past events strengthen me in that connection.

In 1905, the parliament of Canada had to debate a question concerning which public opinion was roused as it is to-day. The Liberal government having decided to create two new provinces in the west, Alberta and Saskatchewan, there arose the questions of separate schools and of the preservation of the rights of the French language in those provinces. What took place then? Mr. Bergeron, then member for Beauharnois, submitted an amendment which reads as follows at page 9046 of the Debates of that year:

That all the words after 'be' at the end of the question be left out and the words: 'Recommitted to a community of the whole House with instruction that they have power to amend the same by striking out all the words of clause 16 and to substitute therefor the following:

16. Section 93 of the B.N.A., Act of 1867 shall apply to the said province as if at the date fixed for the coming into force of this Act, the territory included in the said province were already a province, the word 'union' in the section meaning the same date.

2. The legislature shall have the right to pass laws with reference to education, but it shall always provide for (a) the existence of separate schools and their enjoyment by the minority, Protestant or Catholic, who may claim them. (b) The effective control of said school in matters of teaching by the said minority, (c) the full liberty for the majority in any school district to have such schools as they may desire, (d) the equitable and proportionate distribution between the majority and the minority of all monies appropriated for education by the legislature of the province and of all monies arising from the school fund established by the Dominion Lands Act.

Such is Mr. Bergeron's amendment, it is clear and precise and if the member for Beauce will prepare a similar one to secure the complete protection of the rights of the minority in Keewatin, I solemnly promise to vote for such an amendment.

What took place in 1905? When the division took place on Mr. Bergeron's amendment, the hon. member for Two-Mountains (Mr. Ethier), the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe), the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Béland), and all the French Canadian Liberals from the province of Quebec voted against it. Such is the measure of their sincerity in the protection of the minority and of Catholics in the new provinces. Am I not right in saying that they stand condemned by their past record and they will remain so condemned in the province of Quebec? At the same period and during the same debate, Mr. Bourassa presented an amendment concerning education in the new provinces. What did these members do about it? Consult the debates and you will find that they voted against the Catholic minority sacrificing all that they lay claim to to-day in the name of Catholics of the province of Quebec.

Did not the hon. member for Beauce who a moment ago,took upon himself to speak in the name of 42 per cent of the population, vote with his colleagues on your left against the use and maintenance of the French language in the new provinces?

Mr. Speaker, as I have already stated, I have come here resolved to do my duty. I remember the declaration I have made

in the province of Quebec since I am in political life. At the beginning of the present session, the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), a talented French Canadian, an honour to his nationality and whom I much admire—quoted certain words he said were uttered by the member for Dorchester, concerning the navy and which appeared to be an attack against the English of Ontario. I deny absolutely having ever uttered the words attributed to me by the member for Rouville. What I said outside of this Chamber I am ready to repeat here. Some days ago, I gave notice of a motion concerning the navy; I knew what I was doing on that occasion. Somebody had to bell the cat and I did so without hesitation.

I am quite satisfied with the government's attitude on this question, but here again as on the school question, my conduct was entirely sincere, I had no other object but to do my duty to the best of my knowledge and ability, and notwithstanding the deep regret that I felt and expressed, I did not hesitate to differ from my party, nor shall I hesitate to do in future if I consider it necessary. Let the hon. members for Beauce, Two-Mountains and Kamouraska submit an amendment securing the rights of the minority in Keewatin and I shall be very happy to separate once more from my party and to do my duty. But I refuse to be duped by such people who are not sincere, as I have proved, and for that reason I shall vote against the amendment presented by the member for Beauce.

Hon. W. B. NANTEL (Minister of Inland Revenue). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, at this advanced hour of the night, I have no intention of making a long speech. Other occasions will offer when I will be able to discuss the question before the people.

I simply desire to call attention to a statement made by the hon. member for Two-Mountains, my neighbour, who said that I had promised to settled the Manitoba school question if the Conservative party was returned.

This statement was quite unfounded and I protest strongly against it.

It is true that I have undertaken campaigns on that question, especially in 1896, when I supported in the county of Terrebonne Mr. Chauvin, a devoted partisan of the Manitoban minority. I discovered then to my regret that the electors of the province of Quebec declared themselves favourable to Mr. Laurier against the Remedial Bill. I discovered since that this feeling in favour of the present leader of the opposition did not cease to grow. So much so that approval came to him from quarters whence we had at first been encouraged to fight against him. I remember that my friend Mr. Chauvin was twitted with being more Catholic than the Pope. This was said by Liberal speakers throughout the province of Quebec. I might quote many speeches and newspaper articles in support of what I have said. I will quote only one. It shows clearly that the feeling in favour of Mr. Laurier's school policy had gathered strength and that starting from the deepest strata of the popular conscience it had reached the highest sphere of the religious world.

Allow me to read a despatch published by "Le Soleil" and reproduced by "Le Canada" on the 5th July 1907; it shows that the Laurier-Greenway settlement was then accepted as an accomplished fact.

'Le Canada,' a daily newspaper of Montreal, Sir Wilfrid's organ, reproduced to-day, (July 5, page 8), under the heading 'Sir Wilfrid at Rome,' the following from 'Le Soleil,' organ of Sir Wilfrid, at Quebec:

(Special correspondence.)

Sir Wilfrid, as the despatches have already informed you, spent a few days at Rome, coming from Marseilles by way of Cannes and Genoa.

He was received most courteously by His Holiness Pius X in a private audience.

He was given a reception at the Canadian college, at which were present a number of bishops and prelates.

The speech of His Eminence Cardinal (Vincent) Vanutelli was much remarked. His Eminence complimented Sir Wilfrid on his brilliant qualities as a stateman, and warmly thanked him for the services he had rendered to the church.

He spoke of the good example given by Sir Wilfrid Laurier to his fellow citizens in his private life.

The church, he added, is proud of this son of hers who has become, without betraying his convictions or principles the chief magistrate of a great country in which the majority of citizens are Protestants.

I send you without comment these declarations of Cardinal Vanutelli which received prolonged applause from the distinguished audience.

An event such as this taking place after the lame settlement of the school question in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan at length convinced me that the struggle was useless.

Moreover I had still present in my mind the manner in which the champions of the minority had been treated by the electorate of the province of Quebec. The defeat of the Tupper Government, that of our fellow countrymen Messrs. Taillon, Desjardins, Angers and several others proved to me that popular feeling was swayed by principles different from those we defended.

We might thenceforth say to our compatriots : "Since you allow yourselves to be blinded in his manner, I do not see why we should insist upon defending principles which you have rejected notwithstanding our efforts." And when I speak of blindness, I am using a very mild expression as

some others more appropriate might not be parliamentary.

Thenceforth my mind was made up. I ceased to pay any attention to the Manitoba school question and from that date I have never made any statement of a nature to justify the words which the hon. member for Two-Mountains has just uttered.

I have been called to task for my silence in the course of this debate, but I had an excellent reason for remaining so. On this point I had taken the lead of my colleagues. Before the Bill now being considered was submitted to the House, I had taken a well defined attitude with respect to the rights of minorities in the West. At a banquet given to the hon. Postmaster General at Quebec, some days before the cabinet was formed, I had expressed my views.

I have nothing to add or to withdraw of what I said on that occasion. Nothing since then has altered my views and I stand ready to answer for them before my constituents. I take my full share of ministerial responsibility as to the Manitoba Boundries Bill.

As to the Keewatin question, it would be useless for me to go into it at any length; it is exhausted. The House has heard all the arguments for and against the adoption of the Bill and the position taken by the government needs no further support.

I will merely call attention to the fact that there would be no justice in imposing upon Manitoba for the annexation of Keewatin restrictions which nobody dreams of putting upon Quebec for the annexation of Ungava or upon Ontario for the annexation of another portion of Keewatin. Everybody admits that by the fact of this annexation the laws of Quebec, be they school laws or otherwise, become those of Ungava.

In the case of Manitoba objection is taken to the school laws of that province under the Laurier-Greenway settlement. But this settlement is after all but an accident to which the people of Manitoba may themselves apply a remedy. In fact, the Laurier-Greenway settlement cannot be altered by federal legislation. It is unjust in respect to the Catholic minority, but may be corrected by an act of the Manitoba legislature. From this source alone can the remedy come and from the past conduct of the Roblin government there is a moral guarantee that all hope is not at an end and that the province of Manitoba is gradually reverting to a sounder interpretation of the constitution. Besides to whom are due these school difficulties of which we are to-day feeling the full weight?

To such men as Messrs. Greenway and Sifton who were rewarded by Mr. Laurier after having cooperated with him in perpetrating the injustice from which the Catholics of Manitoba have suffered so long.

That the system of toleration that now obtains in the province should be maintained that it gives us hope of a measure of complete justice is established from the declarations just now made by the hon. Mr. Rogers.

I will say no more; I merely wished to deny the statements made by the hon. member for Two-Mountains. I deny once more and in the most positive manner that I said anything like what he attributed to me. I stand by what I declared at Quebec. I assume entire responsibility for the attitude I have taken to-night and I have no fear of meeting my constituents on this question. For my part, I have received no petitions from my county and I do not consider that in acting as I do, I am abusing of the freedom of action thus left in my hands.

I shall vote against the amendment submitted by the hon. member for Beauce and in favour of the bill which I consider to be an act of justice towards Manitoba, granting as it does all proper security to minorities and tending to promote a proper understanding, peace and union between the different races and creeds, whose every right the government is anxious to recognize in an equal measure.

Mr. DEMERS (St. Johns and Iberville). (Translation.) At this advanced hour Mr. Speaker, I will only say a few words upon the question now before us, which is the annexation of the territory of Keewatin to Manitoba at the latter's request. Although I have no intention to consider the Bill from its financial aspect, I must say that from what I have heard of the debate on that point, I must come to the conclusion that Manitoba has been treated like a favoured child by this present government; Canada's other children, will after this, it seems to me, have much difficulty in believing that parental affection is equally distributed throughout the family. The consequence of the government's action, in my opinion, will be that other provinces will be coming to us for better terms which we will be obliged to grant them if we would wish to preserve that peace and harmony so necessary to progress and to the development of the country. Such a policy does not tend towards the unification of the different portions of the Dominion. On the contrary it cannot fail to strengthen the secession movement already becoming apparent.

My intention in rising this evening is more especially to touch upon another aspect of the question; the attitude of the Catholic Conservative members from the province of Quebec.

We have here a Bill for the annexation of territory to one of the provinces of the Dominion. It appears to me perfectly clear that this territory is at present govern-

ed by laws providing for the establishment of separate schools. Four members of the government are Catholics from the province of Quebec. Those ministers have proclaimed themselves or have been proclaimed the only true defenders of the rights of minorities. They have abused the Liberal ministers and members, or allowed them to be abused by their stumpers and newspapers, accusing them of being sold, cowards and traitors to their race and religion, in consequence of the attitude of the Liberal party on the question of schools in Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. Nay more, one of these ministers the hon. Ministers of Public Works, carried his zeal in the cause of minorities to the extent of demanding the use of the French language in Alberta and Saskatchewan, although no statute could be found to support his contention.

All or nearly all the French-Canadian members sitting on the Speaker's right and supporting the present government were elected as Nationalists, that is to say as champions of the rights of minorities, having specially promised the people that the greivances of our fellow countrymen in Manitoba would be remedied, declaring everywhere that the school question was not settled and was not as they said dead and buried, that Laurier had nobody left to betray, having betrayed his brothers from the west and Manitoba. 'Elect us,' they said, 'and you will find that all this injustice will disappear.' 'Alas! what a cruel awakening for the trusting souls who believed them.

In vain had we repeated that such declarations were not sincere and that demagogism in its worst form was being used to attain power; in vain did we explain that the government had done the best it could under the circumstances and that no other government could have done as well. The people are now in a position to judge between us. The Bill is before us, but in what manner are the rights of minorities secured? Where are the defenders of Catholic rights in the west? Have they withdrawn from the government? Will those who may have done so at one stage cease to support an administration unfaithful to its promises and which refuses to accept their views on a question that should be for them primordial and vital, being the fundamental principle of their policy, as explained to the electorate of Quebec. Are they trying or will they try to defeat the government? No, they will continue to support the present government; we are safe in predicting that, knowing them as we do. But the day of reckoning will come, and we await it eagerly and confidently.

What has been done to-day by those men who, as the hon. Minister of Public Works, said at Nicolet, (I quote from the report of 'Le Devoir', June 16, 1911):

Parliament has reached such a state of degradation and servility, as everybody knows, that the deliberative character of the House is a thing of the past. No deliberation is possible without freedom of opinion. But such freedom may be said to be non-existent, especially among members of the majority. They are held fast by the chains of party discipline. When the will of the government has been made known, woe betide any partisan who attempts to disobey the orders of the whip. There remains to him no alternative but to commit 'hari-kari,' as the Japanese say, he must commit suicide publicly. (We may be quite sure that the hon. Minister will never commit 'hari-kari'). This party rule is at the present moment one of the most formidable menaces to our liberty and that of the country, other people are aware of it. And I hope that you will elect, at least with our help, only such men as are resolved to throw off that yoke which has become a serious danger to our country and to vote under every circumstance according to their conscience and regardless of that discipline which is admittedly shameful, reducing as it does to impotence the assembly which governs our distinies. When the common good requires it, we must be able to sacrifice personal interests and forget party divisions in deference to the supreme interests of the nation.

What have such men as the hon. the Postmaster General done? I quote from 'L'Action Sociale' of the 11th September, 1911.

'I am old enough to use my own judgment and I stand by the policy of Monk, Bourassa and Lavergne.' and added 'L'Action Sociale,' 'that answer was applauded.'

Where are the men, such as an hon. French Canadian Conservative member whom I cannot name under the circumstances and on account of the rules of the House who said, I quote from 'Le Devoir,' 19th June, 1911, report of the Sorel meeting:

On the other hand, while Mr. Lemieux said that the rights of the French language in the West must be abandoned, Mr. Monk stood for the complete exercice of those rights, and Mr. Borden, convinced that the French language was not guaranteed by the constitution, refusing to listen to the claims set forth by his colleague, Mr. Monk broke away from his party; and thus meeting from the extremities of partisanship Mr. Monk and Mr. Bourassa clasped hands. That alliance will certainly some day bear fruit, and today, says Mr....., we are definitely seperated from the parties.....

It will be asked: who shall lead this free and independent movement. It matters little, says Mr.....Give us independent members in the House, give us good soldiers and leader will appear..... Of course, these also will follow political leaders, but on condition that they shall defend the rights of the Catholic religion and of the French language.

And what does the hon. member for L'Islet think of all this? Will he continue to support the present government, and the Minister of Public Works, he who stated at the Fraserville meeting (I quote from 'Le Devoir's' report of that meeting):

He recalled the memorable days of 1905, when being then a new member of the House, the first voice he heard raised in favour of our brothers in the West, was that of Mr. Bourassa, who, with his friend, Mr. Lavergne, extended his hand over party barriers to Mr. Monk and his few disciples in order to defend those whose rights were denied.

And to-day, once more, we inscribe upon our programme: Justice to the French language.

And what does the hon. member for Joliette think of 'his chief Mr. Monk' as he said, with emphasis, no doubt, on the 26th August, 1911 ('Le Devoir', 29th August, 1911)? Will he continue to support the present government which has been found wanting upon what he declared to be the only, the great question?

What do the electors of the province of Quebec think to-day when they remember having read and heard the words uttered by Mr. Normand, Conservative-Nationalist-opposition candidate in Three-Rivers (Report by 'Le Devoir', 7th August 1911 of the meeting held at Three-Rivers the 6th)?

You have come, he said, to call Mr. Bureau to account for his stand on those great questions touching our national life.

You have come to ask him to render an account of the Manitoba school question which is not settled, notwithstanding the statements of those who betrayed our brethren. (Mr. Normand had certainly not conferred with the hon. Minister of Public Works on the subject) and which remains to-day as it was then a glaring and monstrous violation of the natural right possessed by every man to adore God in the language spoken by his father and mother.

You will require from Mr. Laurier and Mr. Bureau an account of their conduct at the time when contingents were sent to Africa.

How shall the hon. member whose name I cannot now mention suit to his vote on the present bill, his words as reported in 'Le Devoir' of the 6th August, 1911?

The present government (the Laurier government) do not settle great questions, they kill and bury them. (Cries of shame).

Their final method is to say of any such question that it is dead and buried.

Dead and buried indeed the Manitoba schools question notwithstanding the eloquent voice exclaiming: I am the eternally wounded and my grave is a cradle!

What does 'L'Evenement' think, or rather what should it think, being the chief organ of the conservative party in Quebec and the personal organ, as I think, of the hon. the Postmaster General, and having printed in heavy letters on the eve of the election, sentences such as this:

Let us avenge the Catholic and our fellow-countrymen of the West.

Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed and are still witnessing an ignoble comedy, a demoralizing spectacle especially when the actors are men whose first duty should be the moral and intellectual uplifting of the people; I have no doubt that the day of reckoning will come soon for those who have contributed to the gigantic farce of which we have been the unfortunate witnesses.

I do not desire to close my remarks without referring to certain statements made by the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Sevigny). He told us in substance that he would not vote for the amendment submitted by the hon. member for Beauce because he had no confidence in him. His scruples should not be a matter for surprise as he has spoken to us of his conscience. But what must he think of those amongst us who supported the amendment of the hon. member for Yamaska? Does he suppose that we so voted because we had confidence in the mover, especially after the contradictory speeches delivered at two days interval by the hon. member for Yamaska? In the first he stated that after due consideration and after the dissertation of his former professor of constitutional law, he had reached the conclusion that the minority had no vested rights in Keewatin. In the second, he discovered that the minority had vested rights. The duty of the hon. member for Dorchester is clear, there is only one matter for him to consider that is whether the amendment submitted by the hon. member for Beauce is conformable to his principles.

The hon. member for Dorchester expresed a regret that the hon. member for Beauce had not spoken sooner. But had he himself spoken on the question before the speech he has just delivered? As a government member his duty was to give the example. All that the hon. member for Dorchester had done before his speech delivered to-night, was to vote, as we did, for the amendment of the hon. member for Yamaska. The hon. member for Beauce, according to the logic of my friend the hon. member for Dorchester, would thus be at some advantage having spoken first.

Mr. Speaker, I shall say no more and I think that the House has already understood that I will vote in favour of the amendment of the hon. member for Beauce.

Mr. E. PAQUET (L'Islet). (Translation) Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. John and Iberville has asked me if I should continue to support the government on other political questions. I may say to him in reply that I shall always be ready to rise superior to considerations of party politics to defend leaders who best represent my views. In 1905, I defended

the rights of minorities and of the French language. I desire to do the same in regard to this Keewatin question. In 1905, when the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan were being created, I joined hands notwithstanding political lines with Mr. Henri Bourassa and Mr. Armand Lavergne, in order to defend the right of minorities and of the French language in those vast prairie lands opened to civilization by our forefathers. To-day as before, in order to defend the minority rights, I am leaving for the moment those men whom I must approve and admire. My friend from Beauce comes at the last moment, comes with an amendment, asking us to vote for a conference between the government of Canada and that of Manitoba. That amendment should have come sooner. When Sir Wilfrid Laurier prepared this Bill last year he thought of no such thing. I will therefore vote with the government for the reasons given by my friend from Dorchester.

My friend from St. John has treated hon. Mr. Monk with severity. Does he not know of the patriotic spirit of the Minister of Public Works and of the efforts made by him to secure the rights of the minority? I have the greatest confidence in Mr. Monk. Never shall I forget the memorable sitting of the 3rd of February, 1910, when the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, his voice trembling from physical anguish, rose to enter his energitic protest against those who violated the rigths of minorities. I can have no confidence in the men of the Libal party, who endeavour to defend, when in opposition, the sacred rights of minorities betrayed by them in the past.

I left my party on this occasion in order to remain faithful to my past record; but in voting for the government against the motion of my friend from Beauce, I desire simply to show that I have no confidence in the leaders of the Liberal party. The leaders of the Conservative party, Hon. F. D. Monk, Minister of Public Works, Hon. L. P. Pelletier and Hon. B. Nantel will know how to defend in future the true interests of Canada. I made the greatest sacrifice of my political career by voting against the government on the Keewatin schools question. Our ministers are looking towards Manitoba. I hope that they will insist upon our rights in a patriotic manner. I am sure that they will defend the true interests of the country. In so doing they deserve and will deserve my entire gratitude and confidence.

Mr. E. PROULX (Prescott). Mr. Speaker, when Manitoba was admitted into confederation there was a statutory limitation imposed with regard to education and it is the same limitation which I wanted to impose on this new territory now being added to the province. Some hon. members on the other side of the House have made a distinction between creating a new province and adding territory to a province already formed. The only difference is that we must obtain the consent of the legislature of the province to the conditions or terms that we want to impose. We are treating Manitoba very generously. I think we are treating her too generously. We are giving her too much. We are in a position to impose terms and terms should be imposed. The hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) is willing to trust to the mercy of Mr. Roblin and his government. Well, I am not too confident in the government of Manitoba, considering the declarations of an ex-colleague of Mr. Roblin who now sits in this House as Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers). I have here the report of a speech made by the Minister of the Interior at Virden on January 6, 1909, and it reads as follows:

TWISTS TO COMPULSORY EDUCATION ISSUE.

Mr. Rogers. in his speech here last night, tried hard to twist the compulsory education policy which has been advocated in the legislature by the Liberals, into a sinister attack upon the educational liberties of the province made in accordance with deep-laid plans to re-establish separate schools. He declared that certain Liberals had entered into a conspiracy with Sir Wilfrid Laurier to force the issue of compulsory education, the idea being that when it reached a certain point the Dominion government would cut in and give the province the option of re-establishing separate schools in this province or foregoing the enlargement of its boundaries. Mr. Rogers then proceeded to deliver his time-honoured harangue upon the boundary question, displaying, as usual, a series of maps. He represented the province as being persecuted for its devotion to the national school system; and represented Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Manitoba Liberals as engaged in a nefarious plot to compel the restoration of separate schools to the minority. This portion of Mr. Rogers' speech was a skilful and audacious appeal to feelings which are strong in this constituency; and he closed with a fervent appeal to the electors of Virden to rally to the support of the government as defenders of the liberties of the province.

I think that the Postmaster General, when he reposes such high hopes in the Manitoba government, is living in a fool's paradise, and I think it would have been more in conformity with his duty and especially with his previous pledges and promises to his compatriots of the province of Quebec to have voted for the amendment of the hon. member for Yamaska (Mr. Lamarche) and to have thus safeguarded now and forever, the rights of the minority, either Catholic or Protestant, in regard to

separate schools in this new territory. I submit that the Act of 1875 has applied to the Keewatin district since the 31st January, 1907, and, moreover, I think that the ordinances 29 and 30, passed by the Northwest Territories legislature and council and which are found in the consolidated ordinances of 1901 apply to the district of Keewatin. Some hon. members on the other side of the House have maintained that the Catholics have no rights, and the Postmaster General is one of them, because there have been no separate schools in the district of Keewatin. It is true that separate schools have not been in operation, but still the right exists and they could have been organized under ordinances 29 and 30, which were in force before 1907. When the district of Keewatin became part of the Northwest Territories, those ordinances and the laws in force in the Northwest Territories became applicable and in force in the district of Keewatin. I do not intend to speak at any length at this hour, but I was anxious to explain my reasons for voting for the amendment of my hon. friend from Yamaska. I am sorry it did not carry. I would have preferred that it should have carried, but since it could not carry, since a large majority in this House was against it, I think that the best thing we can do now, is to adopt the amendment proposed by my hon. friend from Beauce (Mr. Beland) and not pass this Bill before negotiations have been entered into between the province of Manitoba and the representatives of the minority in that province. The Roman Catholics of Manitoba are to meet to-morrow night. There has been a meeting called of the Roman Catholics from the different parts of the province. This Bill should not pass before they are heard, and before they have had an opportunity of making their representations. The law at present in force in Manitoba is not satisfactory to the Catholics. We heard the other night the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Molloy), who must know the condition of his co-religionists in that province, say that at Winnipeg and Brandon they had to pay double taxes, that they had to pay their taxes to the public schools and at the same time, they had to maintain their own schools. I do not think that the Postmaster General himself thinks that is a satisfactory condition for the Catholics of Manitoba. I think it is his duty and that of the government to leave the Bill in abeyance until a satisfactory understanding has been come to between the government of Manitoba and the Catholics of that province. I shall have very much pleasure in voting for the amendment of my hon. friend from Beauce.

Mr. GEO. H. BOIVIN (Shefford). Mr. Speaker, I have only one word to say upon this question which has taken up so much of the time of the House. I want to give to you, Sir, and to hon. members here present, my reasons for voting against the amendment which was proposed by the hon. member for Yamaska (Mr. Mondou) and in favour of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Beauce (Mr Beland).

I voted a few moments ago against the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Yamaska (Mr. Mondou), because I considered that this amendment was of a nature which rendered it either ultra vires or useless. Many legal minds have given opinions upon this school question, many eminent lawyers throughout the country have decided that it is impossible for the federal government to coerce Manitoba by the inclusion of any amendment or additional clause in this Bill without the consent of the legislature of Manitoba. I agree with these gentlemen, I agree with the opinion which was given in this House by the hon. the Minister of Justice, and that is one of the reasons which led me to vote against this amendment. It is true that it has also been stated in the course of this debate that the amendment did not have any great effect and that the principal reason why it was proposed was in order to place the new territory added to Manitoba under the same school system as the old territory. If that is the case the amendment is utterly useless because there is no doubt in my mind that the school system which exists in Manitoba at present will be extended to the new part of that province. But is that all? I claim that the hon. members who form the present government, the right hon. the Prime Minister and his colleagues in this House, promised the people of Canada more than to give to this new territory the same school system which exists in old Manitoba. I claim that the Prime Minister indirectly and many of his ministers directly promised the people of this country and especially of the province of Quebec that they would give separate schools to old Manitoba, and that is what they are not doing when they present this Bill. It is very true that the Prime Minister very carefully refrained during the course of the last campaign from going into those counties in which the candidates were supposed to be of the Nationalist school and to have as their leaders Messrs. Monk and Bourassa. But he did come into Shefford and in Shefford the Prime Minister had as candidate Mr. James Davidson of Montreal who, on August 17, 1911, published a manifesto signed by his own hand which cannot be denied. In that manifesto he writes among other things:

If I am elected I will endeavour to have the rights and prerogatives of the Catholic French Canadians of all provinces respected and recognized as are the rights of the English Protestants of the province of Quebec

with recognition of their schools, and of the French language, etc., etc.

And on August 30, or 31, the present right hon. Prime Minister addressed a meeting in Granby in favour of Mr. Davidson. Mr. Davidson was unquestionably his candidate and to-day he brings before the House a Bill in which he says not a word about separate schools. I did not vote against the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Yamaska because I am against separate schools. I am in favour of separate schools. I think that separate schools should exist throughout the Dominion, both Catholic and Protestant; but they can only be established in Manitoba by the government of Manitoba, they cannot be forced upon that province by this government. Conferences and conciliation, the policy of the Liberal party for the past thirty years, are the only way that improved conditions can be obtained for the minorities of Manitoba. The hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Beland), asks that a further conference be held and I believe that if ever there was a time in the history of Canada when separate schools could be obtained from the Manitoba government, it is precisely now, when we are passing a Bill to increase the territory of Manitoba giving them thousands and thousands of square miles of territory and millions of dollars. Now is the time to have a conference with the Prime Minister of Manitoba and to obtain from him the passage of some law in the province which would improve upon the Laurier-Greenway agreement of 1897.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Good, good!

Mr. BOIVIN. I say improve upon the Laurier-Greenway agreement of 1897 and I say that because to-night in this House the Minister of the Interior said that agreement gave satisfaction to nobody throughout Manitoba; because it has been heralded throughout Quebec for years that that agreement did not give satisfaction. I say that if the people of Manitoba are not satisfied with that agreement, now is the time to change it. The gentlemen on the government benches are those who should see that the changes are made. Can they do it by coercion, by inserting a clause in this Bill? I say not and that is why I voted against the amendment of the hon. member for Yamaska. But what they can do is to have further consultation and further conferences with the premier and government of Manitoba and obtain from them the passage of some Act by that legislature which will give greater rights to the Catholics in that province. It may be all very well for the Postmaster General and for the Minister of Public Works to say that they have confidence in Mr. Roblin, that they feel sure that after getting all these good things from the people of Canada he will do something for the Catholic minority in that province. But what is their assurance, where do they get it? Do they get it from the interview which Mr. Roblin himself gave to the Montreal 'Star' away back in 1903 when, during a visit to Montreal, he was consulted by a reporter of the 'Star' about the school question. What was the language of his interview? So far as the government of Manitoba is concerned the Manitoba question is closed and neither at the present nor at any future date will it be reopened. He is the man upon whom the Postmaster General and the Minister of Public Works depend to give better and greater justice to the Catholics of Manitoba. I claim that an agreement should be made now before this Bill is passed and that now is the time, before all these things are given to Mr. Roblin, to ascertain what he will do for the Catholic minority. It is for that reason I have much pleasure in voting for the amendment proposed by my hon. friend the member for Beauce (Mr. Beland).

House divided on amendment of Mr. Beland.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Béland,	Lovell,
Boivin,	McCraney,
Bourassa,	McCrea,
Boyer,	McKenzie,
Brouillard,	McMillan,
Brown,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Buchanan,	Marcile (Bagot),
Cardin,	Martin (Montreal,
Carroll,	Ste. Mary's),
Carvell,	Michaud,
Champagne,	Molloy,
Chisholm (Inverness),	Murphy,
Delisle,	Nesbitt,
Demers,	Neely,
Devlin,	Oliver,
Douglas,	Pacaud,
Ethier,	Papineau,
Fortier,	Power,
Gauthier	Proulx,
(St. Hyacinthe),	Robb,
Gauvreau,	Ross,
Graham,	Seguin,
Knowles,	Tobin,
Lapointe	Turgeon,
(Kamouraska),	Verville,
Lapointe (Montreal,	Warnock and
St. James),	White (Victoria,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Alta.)—52.
Lemieux,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Achim,	Lamarche,
Alguire,	Lancaster,
Ames,	Lavallée,
Armstrong (Lambton),	Lennox,

Armstrong (York, O.),	Lesperance,
Arthurs,	Lewis,
Ball,	Macdonell,
Barker,	Maclean (York, O.),
Barnard,	McKay,
Barrette,	Meighen,
Beattie,	Merner,
Bellemare,	Middlebro,
Bennett (Calgary),	Mondou,
Best,	Monk,
Blain,	Morphy,
Blondin,	Munson,
Borden,	Nantel,
Boulay,	Nickle,
Bowman,	Paquet,
Brabazon,	Paul,
Bradbury,	Pelletier,
Broder,	Perley,
Burnham,	Porter,
Burrell,	Rainville,
Chabot,	Reid (Grenville),
Clark (Bruce),	Robidoux,
Clarke (Wellington),	Roche,
Clements,	Rogers,
Cochrane,	Schaffner,
Cockshutt,	Sevigny,
Coderre,	Sexsmith,
Crocket,	Sharpe (Lisgar),
Cromwell,	Sharpe (Ontario),
Crothers,	Shepherd,
Currie,	Smith,
Doherty,	Staples,
Donnelly,	Steele,
Elliot,	Stevens,
Elson,	Stewart (Hamilton),
Fisher,	Stewart (Lunenburg),
Foster (Kings, N.S.),	Sutherland,
Fripp,	Taylor,
Gauthier (Gaspé),	Thoburn,
Girard,	Thompson (Yukon),
Goodeve,	Thornton,
Guilbault,	Walker,
Hartt,	Wallace,
Hazen,	Webster,
Henderson,	Weichel,
Hepburn,	White (Renfrew),
Hughes (Victoria, O.),	Wilcox,
Jameson,	Wilson (Wentworth) and
Kemp,	Wright.—108.
Kidd,	
Lalor,	

PAIRS:

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Osler (Sir Edmund)	McLean (Sunbury),
Northrup,	Loggie,
Aitkins,	Guthrie,
Marshall,	McCoig,
Edwards,	Turriff,
Baker,	Kay,
Smyth,	Clarke,
McCurdy,	Mclean (Halifax),
Foster (Toronto)	Sinclair,
Bristol,	Charlton,
Stanfield,	Pardee,
Clare,	Clark (Red Deer),
Fowler,	Pugsley,
Boyce,	Lanctot,
Haggart,	Gordon,
White (Leeds),	Emmerson,
Carrick,	Lafontune,
Forget (Sir Rodolphe),	Wilson (Laval),
Nicholson,	Cash,
Davidson,	Lachance,
Tremain,	Martin (Regina),
Bennett (Simcoe),	Law,
Rhodes,	Macdonald,
McLean (P.E.I.),	McNutt,

Amendment negatived, and Bill read the third time and passed.

Mr. BORDEN moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What will be the business at the next sitting?

Mr. BORDEN. It is expected the Minister of Finance will make his Budget speech.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 4.05 a.m. Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 13, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR GENERAL—SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Hon. W. T. WHITE presented the following message from His Royal Highness the Governor General as follows:

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending on the 31st of March, 1912, and, in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, the Governor General recommends these estimates to the House of Commons.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds) moved that His Royal Highness' message together with the estimates be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

VOLUNTEER BOUNTY ACT, 1908, AMENDMENT.

Hon. ROBERT ROGERS (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 137) to amend the Volunteer Bounty Act, 1908. He said: When the original Volunteer Bounty Act was passed in the month of July, 1908, the limit of time within which to locate land certificates issued thereunder was fixed as the 31st December, 1910. This was considered amply sufficient as it gave the claimants a period of eighteen months within which to exercise their rights of location. A very large number of the claimants complied with the requirements of the law in this regard, but in the spring of 1910 it was felt that those who had not been able to make proper selections should be given a further oppor-

tunity to do so, and with that end in view the Act 9-10 Edward VII., chapter 60, was passed, extending to the 31st December, 1911, the time within which certificates could be located. Evidently, most of the claimants realized that they had thus been liberally treated by the government, because it is found now that when the time expired on the 31st December last, 250 certificates only, out of a total of 7,258, had not been redeemed by the department in exchange for land. Of these 250 certificates 188 are held presumably by the original volunteers themselves, the remaining 62 having been transferred to substitutes prior to the 31st December last.

The object of the present Bill is to afford an opportunity, until the 31st day of December next, to the original volunteers to exercise their right of location, provided they are willing to remain on the land themselves and earn title thereto. The right of appointing a substitute, as provided under the original Act, will not apply to these volunteers, because it is considered that it would not be fair to the rest of the claimants who have made their selections within the required time, if the government were to extend more favourable treatment to those who have been dilatory in this regard.

The Act further provides that as regards the outstanding certificates, whether held by the original volunteers themselves, or by their substitutes, the government will undertake to redeem the same by a cash payment of $500 in each case. While it is quite true that in the case of scrip issued to the volunteers of the Rebellion of 1885 extensions for location were granted by parliament from time to time till the year 1908, such a policy would not appear to be in the public interest, as instead of protecting the interests of the volunteers originally concerned the action of the government has rather been to stimulate speculation in favour of persons who had no direct interest in the settlement of the public domain. It is true that the redemption of the outstanding certificates may involve an expenditure of perhaps $125,000, if all these certificates are exchanged in this way, but the lands that will thus remain vested in the government will more than compensate for the expenditure.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Is provision made in this Bill for the recognition of the services of the volunteers who served in repelling the Fenian Raid of 1866?

Mr. ROGERS. The Bill does not contain anything in that regard.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 133) respecting the Methodist Church.—Mr. Aikins.

Bill (No. 134) respecting the British Columbia and Dawson Railway Company.—Mr. Goodeve.

Bill (No. 135) respecting the Vancouver Fraser Valley and Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Stevens.

Bill (No. 136) to incorporate the Prince Edward and Hastings Railway Company.—Mr. Hepburn.

Bill (No. 138) to incorporate the Winnipeg and St. Boniface Harbour Commissioners.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

DISMISSALS.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax):

1. Has Lawrence Braine, Esq., M.D., medical attendant for Indians at Chester, N.S., been dismissed from office?
2. If so, upon what grounds was such dismissal made?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Yes.
2. Active political partisanship.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Has S. W. Hagerty been dismissed from the position of inspector of the new railway station which is being erected at Mulgrave, N.S.? If so, why?
2. At whose instance was this dismissal made?
3. Will an investigation be granted?
4. Has any one been appointed in his place? If so, who and on whose recommendation?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes. For participation in revision of voters' list, Mulgrave, February 20, 1912.
2. G. A. R. Rowlings and Edgar L. Hadley.
3. It is not considered necessary.
4. No. No inspector is required as the work is practically completed.

Mr. BOYER:

Was Alderic Gauthier, employed as a painter on the Soulanges Canal, dismissed? If so, who requested his dismissal, and who has replaced him?

Mr. COCHRANE. Alderic Gauthier, painter, on the Soulanges Canal, was suspended by the overseer, for repeatedly absenting himself from his work without leave. He was temporarily replaced by Stanislas Houle.

Mr. BOYER:

1. Is Doctor E. Montpetit the dispenser of patronage in Vaudreuil?
2. Has he sent to the Postmaster General a petition signed by the residents of the

municipality of Point Fortune, praying the minister not to dismiss William Brown, the postmaster of that place?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. In the Post Office Department as well as in the other departments, appointments in the County of Vaudreuil and elsewhere are made by the minister.
2. No such petition has been received.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax):

Was Henry Fritz, fisheries overseer in Annapolis, removed from office? If so, for what cause and at whose request was the dismissal made?

Mr. HAZEN. Yes. For offensive political partisanship, at the request of and on the complaint of Mr. A. L. Davidson, M.P.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax):

1. Has Wesley Goucher lightkeeper of Margaretsville, Annapolis county, N.S., been removed from his position? If so, what was the ground of dismissal and upon whose complaint?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. (a) Yes.
(b) Owing to age, and very violent political partisanship.
(c) A. L. Davidson, M.P.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—REPAIR SHOPS.

Mr. BURNHAM:

1 Were repair shops to be erected at Quebec and Winnipeg for the National Transcontinental railway by the late government?
2. If so, were they to be erected at the public expense?
3. Were such repair shops intended to be for the use and benefit of the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Grand Trunk railway?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes. The erection of shops near Winnipeg was commenced in 1909. No shops have been erected at Quebec, but a site near that city is now in course of preparation.
2. Yes.
3. Yes.

SUBSIDY TO ST. JOHN VALLEY RAILWAY.

Mr. MICHAUD:

1. Does the government intend to grant a subsidy to assist in the construction of the St. John Valley Railway to Grand Falls?
2. If so, will the government require that the contract be signed so that it will be built to Grand Falls before any subsidy is granted to help out any portion of said railway?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. A subsidy was granted in 1910 for a line of railway from Grand Falls to St. John, New Brunswick.
2. Any subsidy granted by the Governor in Council must be in accordance with the provisions of the Subsidy Act.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—LOAN OF RAILS.

Mr. FOWLER:

What quantities of rails are on loan or have been advanced from the Intercolonial railway to the Hillsborough Branch railway or the Albert Manufacturing Company of Hillsborough, N.B.?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Two thousand and ninety-five decimal four (2,095·4) tons of rails and plates and fifteen thousand five hundred and ten pounds (15,510) second-hand bolts were delivered to the Salisbury and Albert railway, under an agreement by which they were to pay at the usual rates, or in the event of the government taking over the railway as a branch line, the amount to be deducted from the purchase of the railway.

No rails were loaned or advanced to the Albert Manufacturing company, of Hillsborough; they paid for the rails delivered to them, at the usual price.

RURAL MAIL ROUTES.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. What rural mail routes have been established by the present government?
2. How many requests have been received by the Post Office Department for the establishment of rural mail routes?
3. Have all applications been granted? If not, what is the reason?

Mr. PELLETIER:

This question had better take the form of a motion for a return.

NATURALIZATION OF F. P. GUTELIUS.

* Mr. MURPHY:

1. Is there any record of the naturalization of Frederick Passmore Gutelius in any department of the government?
2. If so, what is the date of such naturalization and of the departmental record thereof?
3. Did the Minister of Railways and Canals obtain in the Department of Railways and Canals the information contained in his answer to question No. 6 on page 4323 of Unrevised 'Hansard,' 1912?
4. On what date did Messrs. Gutelius and Lynch Staunton begin their investigation of the affairs of the National Transcontinental railway?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Yes.
4. Mr. Gutelius began his investigation on February 1, 1912, and Mr. Lynch Staunton on February 5, 1912.

VOTE BY BALLOT IN DIVISIONS.

Mr. BURNHAM:

Has the government considered the advisability of introducing vote by ballot during divisions in the House or otherwise, instead of open voting as at present?

Mr. BORDEN. No.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—CONTROL BY RAILWAY COMMISSION.

* Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Has the Minister of Railways received any resolution or memorial from the Montreal Board of Trade asking that the Intercolonial railway be placed, as regards its freight and passengers, under the control of the Railway Commission?
2. Does the minister intend to introduce any legislation for this purpose?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes.
2. Not at the present session.

MR. G. N. DUCHARME.

* Mr. LEMIEUX:

Has Mr. Guillaume Narcisse Ducharme tendered his resignation to the hon. the Minister of Public Works as a member of the Commission of Inquiry? If so, at what date and was it accepted?

Mr. MONK:

No. There is nothing in departmental records.

RETURNING OFFICER, COUNTY OF JOLIETTE.

Mr. GUILBAULT:

Has the Returning Officer of the county of Joliette in the election of 21st September last, received full payment of his account? If not, when will this account be paid?

Mr. ROCHE:

The returning officer for the county of Joliette has not received full payment of his account. A payment of $629.72 was made on the 22nd of November last, and items amounting to $99.25 were placed in suspense. Upon explanations received from the returning officer, a further payment of $63.20 was made on March 12.

An amount of $32.40 still remains in suspense, and if satisfactory explanations are received from the returning officer, part of this amount may be paid.

Mr. ROCHE.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all papers, correspondence, telegrams, &c., concerning the dismissal of Joachim Godbout, lighthouse keeper at St. Laurent, Isle of Orleans, county of Montmorency.—Mr. Lemieux.

For a copy of all papers, letters, telegrams, &c., concerning the appointment of Guillaume Narcisse Ducharme as a member of the Commission of Inquiry?—Mr. Lemieux.

For a copy of all letters, papers, documents, memoranda, telegrams and correspondence relating to the resignation of Donald E. McLean, late postmaster at Inverness, N.S.—Mr. Chisholm (Inverness).

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—MORNING SITTINGS.

Rt. hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister) moved:

That on and from Thursday, the 14th instant, and until the end of the session, the House shall meet at 11 o'clock in the morning, and that in addition to the usual intermission at 6 o'clock, p.m., there shall also be an intermission every day from one to three o'clock, p.m.; and that the House shall meet on Saturdays, on and after the 16th instant to the end of the session, subject to the same rules; and that the order of business on Saturdays shall be the same as on Thursday.

He said: I propose to amend this motion by striking out all the words after 'Three o'clock p.m.' It is found that there might be some inconvenience from taking next Saturday.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) that it would perhaps be inconvenient to many members if morning sittings were commenced to-morrow. Generally, there is more notice given to members so that those who leave for their homes on Saturday may make their preparations accordingly. If my right hon. friend would agree to it I would suggest that the morning sittings commence only on Monday. Before we pass the motion, if it suits the view of my right hon. friend, I would ask him if we have now before the House all the measures which are to be brought down by the government. I understand that there is, on the part of the government, a desire to prorogue at an early date and we have no desire at all on our side to interfere with that laudable intention. At the same time, it would be more satisfactory to all on both sides of the House if we knew whether the government had anything more to bring down. I understand that supplementary estimates for this year are to be brought down. I would ask my right hon. friend if there are to be supplementary estimates for the coming year ?

Mr. BORDEN. There will be supplementary estimates for the coming year and they will be brought down as soon as possible. It is for that reason I am proposing not to take Saturday for the present.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is the coming Saturday ?

Mr. BORDEN. Yes, we are omitting that. I would have liked to commence the forenoon sittings to-morrow, if it had been convenient. However, if my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is really anxious that they shall not begin to-morrow, I will acquiesce in his proposal to postpone them until Monday. As far as measures are concerned, I think it is probable that one or two other measures will be introduced, but I do not think there will be anything of an important character. I hope to give my right hon. friend full information in regard to them not later than Monday. I beg to move the motion which may be amended by substituting 'Monday, the 18th' for 'Thursday, the 14th.'

Motion as amended agreed to.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

On the orders of the day being called.

Mr. KNOWLES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) to a certain return in connection with papers, etc., that have reference to the filling of the vacant post office inspectorate at Moosejaw. The House ordered this return on the 22nd of January last, almost two months ago now. A week ago last Monday, nine days ago, I called the attention of the minister to the return and he said he would try to expedite it. There was no word of it to-day, and I asked by telephone of the minister's private secretary at the minister's office about it, and that gentleman, after consultation with the Postmaster General, said that all that was left for me to do was to bring it up in the House again. That is all I do now, but if it is not brought down very soon I shall speak about it at greater length and in a more effective manner.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, don't.

Mr. KNOWLES. That is a promise, not a threat.

Mr. PELLETIER. The papers will be brought down as soon as they are ready.

Mr. KNOWLES. The Postmaster General was courteous enough to answer my question by saying that the papers would be brought down when they are ready; a kind of answer that, speaking from an experience of a good many years in this House, I have never yet heard given by a minister to a member.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. KNOWLES. I have a question to ask; am I out of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PELLETIER. The hon. gentleman is not putting a question; he is commenting on an answer which has just been given.

Mr. KNOWLES. And I am not done commenting on it yet; some other day I will comment further on it. I want to ask the Postmaster General if he can give me any information as to when the papers will be ready to be brought down?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. All that the rule provides is that it is the duty and the right of a minister of the Crown, or of a private member, to answer a question in his own way and according to his own judgment.

Mr. KNOWLES. I have asked the Postmaster General a question now, Mr. Speaker, and if he has no wisdom and no judgment in the matter, he need not answer.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. That statement is a reflection on a member of the House and is scarcely permissible. I think the hon. member (Mr. Knowles) ought to retract.

Mr. KNOWLES. Of course I bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker. However, I do not understand the ruling; if I did understand it I would be——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The rule is that no member can reflect upon any act of the House, nor can he attribute improper motives to any member of the House in regard to what he does.

Mr. KNOWLES. Very good then, Mr. Speaker, I would ask permission to say that I did not make a reflection. I understood you to say that a minister of the Crown might answer according to his judgment and wisdom a question asked. I asked the Postmaster General a certain question, which was not answered, and I say if he answers that in his wisdom and judgment well and good; and if he has no wisdom and judgment on it, well and good also.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. Knowles) is not a young member of the House and he ought to know that he cannot evade the plain rules of the House in an indirect way, when he cannot do so in a direct way. It is not in accordance with the rules that an hon. member should take an indirect method of reflecting on the conduct of another member of the House.

CENSUS RETURNS FOR PROVINCE OF SASKATCHEWAN.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell), if the census returns for Saskatchewan have yet been fully completed, and if so, has any detailed or official information been given to any one in that province?

Mr. BURRELL. I will look into that question. I would like the hon. gentleman to have put it in the form of a question on the order paper, as I do not quite gather the drift of it. We have had some correspondence, but I believe it has all been finished, and that the returns giving every detail have been compiled up to date. I am not aware of any subsequent alterations, but if the hon. gentleman will ask me for it I will get all the information from the department.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would draw the attention of the House to the fact that I have noticed during the present session a tendency to ask a great many questions which can only properly be asked, according to our rules, and the English rules, after they have been put on the notice paper. It is scarcely fair to expect that ministers of the Crown shall be prepared on the spur of the moment, without previous notice, to answer any question that may be asked. Therefore, I think it would be advisable if hon. members on both sides would observe that good rule as far as possible.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Mr. ETHIER. Mr. Speaker, I think it is only right that I should call your attention to the record contained in 'Hansard' of last night's vote. I see by the official report of the debates that the hon. member for Montreal, St. James (Mr. Lapointe), voted 'yea' on the amendment moved by the hon. member for Yamaska (Mr. Lamarche), while on the same page—5038—he is set down as being paired. In the list of pairs the name of Mr. Lapointe appears opposite that of Mr. Carrick. It is apparent that there is a mistake. I do not intend to blame anybody, but if the hon. member for Montreal, St. James, voted 'yea' he could not be paired with the hon. member for Rainy River and Thunder Bay (Mr. Carrick), so, I think, in the absence of my hon. friend from Montreal, St. James, that I should ask to have this corrected. There is another question. On the same page I see:

Amendment negatived, and Bill read the third time and passed.

For myself, I understood—and I think a great many other hon. members on this side of the House, perhaps not on the other side, also understood—that the third reading of the Bill concerning the Keewatin boundary was passed on the same division as that of the amendment. Yet it appears in the 'Hansard' that the Bill was read a third time and passed. I understood it was passed on the same division as that of the amendment. I wished to record my vote, and had I understood the contrary I would have asked that the division be taken in order that hon. members who voted on the Bill might have had an opportunity of recording their votes, and thus showing their own ideas on the question.

Mr. SPEAKER. In reference to that, I think the question was asked whether it was the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion, and I did not hear any one request that it be adopted on the same division reversed. Therefore, I declared the motion carried.

Mr. BELAND. I made that request.

Mr. SPEAKER. It may have been made but in the confusion and excitement which usually prevail after the taking of a vote sometimes the Speaker cannot hear what is said, and I presume that this has been an example of it.

Mr. BELAND. Well, it ought to be corrected, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think it can be corrected now, unless by moving a formal motion.

Mr. ETHIER. I hope that the record of the vote of my hon. friend from Montreal, St. James, will be corrected.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand that the House takes no cognizance of pairs. That should be arranged between the whips and the 'Hansard' reporters.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ethier), will get satisfaction by the statement which he makes today.

CATTLE QUARANTINE AT BEAUCEVILLE.

Mr. BELAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire from the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell), if he has received a copy of a resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Beauceville, in the district of Quebec, for the establishment of a quarantine for animals at that place. The reason I make the inquiry is that the letter which transmitted to me this resolution states that it was addressed to the Minister of Customs, and as it was

addressed the day before yesterday perhaps the minister has not yet received the copy.

Mr. BURRELL. I cannot recall the receiving of such a letter, but I will make inquiry in the department.

Mr. BELAND. I have a copy of it, and if the minister does not receive it to-day or to-morrow I shall be very glad to send it to him.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

Hon. W. T. WHITE (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee of Ways and Means. He said: Mr. Speaker, for the first time it becomes my privilege to present the annual statement of the financial affairs of the Dominion commonly known as the budget speech, and I trust, Sir, that standing as I do in the place of so many distinguished and experienced predecesors, myself a new member of the House and with but a limited experience in office, it may not de deemed unfitting if I request a reasonable degree of indulgence in the discharge of the important and responsible duty which now devolves upon me. And, at the outset, I desire to congratulate the House and the country upon the abundant prosperity, which, under Providence, this great Dominion continues to enjoy in ever-increasing measure. In these congratulations, I am sure that all the members of this House, irrespective of party affiliations, will heartily join as loyal and patriotic Canadians rejoicing in the welfare of our common country. Under the circumstances of the present session, it is necessary in considering the finances of the Dominion, to cover three periods, namely, the fiscal year 1910-11, the fiscal year 1911-12 and the fiscal year 1912-13. As the accounts for the year 1910-11 were not finally closed when the budget speech of 1911 was delivered by my predecessor on April 4 last, an estimate of the result was placed before the House. Since then the accounts have been completed and issued and have been made public for some time, so that a review need not be of an extensive character. The fiscal year 1911-12 nominally closes on the 31st of March, but an extension of at least a month is necessary to complete the payments for the services of that year. It will be some time after that before the accounts are finally closed, and the ultimate outcome is a matter of estimate, based upon experience and a knowledge of the characteristics of the various services for the period yet to elapse. The estimates for the fiscal year 1912-13 have been placed before the House and supplementary estimates have yet to be brought down. It will be obvious that with regard to a year not yet begun there can be no such reasonable certainty of approximate calculation as exists in the case of the current year. Reviewing now more particularly the several periods under consideration, and beginning with the year 1910-11, it will be found that the general financial results for that year did not materially differ from the anticipations of the last budget speech. Dealing, in the first place with what is known as Consolidated Fund, or what might be regarded as the ordinary revenue and ordinary expenditure of the country, it will be found that the actual revenue for 1910-11 amounted to $177,780,409.78 against an estimate of $117,500,000 and the expenditure to $87,774,198.32 against an estimate of $87,000,500. The follcwing tabulated statement shows the result :

REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE—CONSOLIDATED FUND, 1910-11.

	Actual.	Estimated.	Greater than Estimated.	Less than Estimated.
Revenue	$117,780,409 78	$117,500,000	$280,409 78	
Expenditure	87,774,198 32	87,000,000	774,198 32	
Surplus	30,006,211 46	30,500,000	.....	$493,788 54

I should like to point out to the House that the revenue for the year 1910-11 was a record figure, and it may assist us to some extent to appreciate the increase in the revenue in recent years to say that this revenue of $117,780,409.78 is more than double the revenue received in 1901-02.

The difference between the ordinary revenue and ordinary expenditure—$30,006,211.46 was available for what have been known as Capital and Special charges.

The expenditure of $87,774,198.32 is more than double that of the year 1899-1900. The sources from which the revenue of the year was derived and the amount from each respectively, and their comparison with the preceding year were as follows :

	1909-10.	1910-11.	Increase.
Customs	$ 60,156,133 98	$ 72,965,394 46	$12,809,260 48
Excise	15,253,352 65	16,869,837 36	1,616,484 71
Post Office	7,958,547 72	9,146,952 47	1,188,404 75
Railways	9,647,550 69	10,249,391 94	601,841 25
Miscellaneous	8,488,125 89	8,548,833 55	60,707 66
Total	$101,503,710 93	$117,780,409 78	$16,276,698 85

It will appear from this that of the total consolidated revenue fund 62 per cent was derived from customs and 14 per cent from excise, that is to say these two services accounted for over three-fourths of the revenue. In the case of customs the increase over the previous year was at the rate of over 21½ per cent. Excise and post-office revenue increased at the rate of 10½ per cent and 15 per cent respectively. On the total revenue the rate of increase was 16 per cent. The increase in the customs revenue of course arose from the increased importations for the year.

The total imports entered for consumption in 1910-11 were $461,951,318. The amount of increase over the previous year was $86,118,302. The average rate of duty on these imports, both dutiable and free, was 16·145 per cent. The average rate of duty on dutiable goods entered for consumption in 1910-11 was 25·797 per cent. I may say that very little change has taken place in these average rates in recent years.

The revenues from excise are mainly derived from spirits, tobacco and malt. In the case of each of these there was an appreciable increase over the revenues derived in 1909-10. Although the total consumption has increased to some extent it does not appear that the per capita consumption has increased materially.

With regard to post-office and railways the revenue shows a substantial increase due, to the general increase in business throughout the country.

We turn now to the expenditure for the year. On account of consolidated fund it reached the sum of $87,774,198.32. That was an increase of $8,362,451.20 over the expenditure for the previous fiscal year. This is a fairly large increase but I think it only fair to say that in 1910-11 there were included in consolidated fund expenditure certain items which in preceding years had been made a charge against capital. These items were: militia, $1,372,405.09; Dominion lands, $976,024.94. To these may be added expenditure upon naval service, which was of a new character, and amounted to $1,790,017.16. In addition to the expenditures which I have mentioned and which are called consolidated fund expenditures, that is the ordinary running expenditures of the country, there were very large and substantial outlays charged to capital and special accounts. In detail these were as follows:

National Transcontinental Ry. ..	$23,487,986 19
Other railways, canals and public works..	7,364,977 19
Railway subsidies..	1,284,892 04
Bounties..	1,597,663 48
Various miscellaneous items, including cost of loans..	1,286,911 39
Total..	$35,022,430 29

I do not propose to criticise any of these amounts that have been charged to special account, but I wish to make the observation—and I am glad to learn that my predecessor was finally led to come to the same conclusion—that bounties in my judgment should have been charged to consolidated fund expenditure.

There is another item to which exception might be taken, but I do not take exception to it now because, to be frank, I am not quite clear in my own mind with regard to it, that is the item of railway subsidies. I am aware that not only with the late government, but with preceding governments, there has been a practice of charging to special accounts, in the nature of capital accounts, railway subsidies, I suppose upon the theory that these subsidies are a benefit to railways and railways benefit the country for years to come, and that consequently railway subsidies might be looked upon as, in a sense, a contribution to what might be deemed national assets. There is very much to be said for that view and there is a clear distinction not only in private but in company and, I believe, in national finance between capital expenditure and ordinary expenditure. I believe that sometimes that has been disputed, but I think it can hardly be seriously disputed. In national finance we have to expend very large sums of money upon great undertakings, such as government railways, canals and terminals, public buildings of a costly character for national use which may be truly designated and described as permanent assets, and which will remain for the benefit of the nation practically for all time, or at all events for a great number of years. Now it would seem to me very unreasonable that out of the revenues for the year we should expect to meet the expenditures upon national undertakings such as I have described. and, therefore, so far as my judgment goes it is proper that there should be a distinction observed between capital expenditure and consolidated fund expenditure. That distinction has been observed, I think, not only by the late government, but by practically every government since confederation. Coming back to the fiscal year under consideration it will be necessary in order to arrive at the net result of its operations to set off against the capital and special expenditures which I have mentioned amounting to $35,022,430.29, the excess of revenue over running expenses, commonly called surplus, amounting as above stated to $30,006,211.46, also the expenditure on account of the investments for sinking funds which represents an outlay for the purchase of securities

to be retained practically in our own hands. The expenditures for sinking fund are made from the consolidated fund account, and amount to the sum of $1,203,416.40. Then there were sundry refunds to the amount of $39,296.73, making a total of $31,248,924.59. Now deducting this amount from the total capital and special expenditures, which I have given of $35,022,430.29, it will be found that the net debt of the Dominion was increased as the result of the year's operations, that is to say the operations of the year 1910-11, by the sum of $3,773,505.70. I must say that I regard that from the financial standpoint as a satisfactory condition: it shows how the very large capital and special expenditures were substantially met by the revenues of the year. The increase of debt, namely, $3,773,505.70 is certainly not large. It may be properly described, I think, as comparatively small. I come now to the revenues for the year 1911-12. Nominally the year will end on the 31st March current, but under the provisions of the law a period of three months is allowed for finally closing up the year's business, which period, I understand, has been gradually cut down in practice to about a month, so that it will be over two months before the books are finally closed. I will, however, endeavour to give an estimate, or to indicate my anticipations, with regard to the outcome of the year. Up to the end of February we received by way of revenue the sum of $120,645,616.85. To this must be added the revenues of the current month, and also the revenues attributable to the current year, which will be received after the 31st March and during the period which I have mentioned, because it takes some time to finally close the accounts in a country of such large distances as we have. Now basing my estimate upon what was received for the corresponding period of last year, with a proportionate increase in keeping with the increases of the past few months, I anticipate that for the current fiscal year, when the books are finally closed, the revenue will reach a total of $136,000,000.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I am very glad indeed to hear hon. gentlemen on both sides express their appreciation of this estimate of $136,000,000. If the estimate is correct, and I believe it will be found to be substantially so, it is a matter of congratulation to both sides of this House and to the public, that the abounding revenues of this country have kept up as they have. As I say, we must drop party affiliations in connection with the budget and rejoice in the welfare of our common country. Up to the end of February 1912, there has been an expenditure of $77,145,824.97, an increase of $6,557,953.20 over the corresponding expenditure at the end of February of last year. The supplementary estimates have been laid to-day on the table of the House, and taking them into account, and the requirements for the balance of the fiscal year, I think it will be found when the books are closed that the payments on account of the consolidated fund will approximate the sum of $97,000,000. The estimated revenue for the current year, with which I am now dealing, being $136,000,000, there will therefore be a surplus of consolidated fund revenue over consolidated fund expendture of $39,000,000 available for capital and special outlays; I am sure I can congratulate both the House and the country upon what is undoubtedly a record year for the Dominion. I do not know how to quite share that congratulation up, but as my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) came into power on the 6th of October, and my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition was in power prior to that date, there is probably glory enough to go round, and it would be the judgment of Solomon that each be entitled to one-half, at all events to a part of the credit for the return which I am now presenting to the House.

Mr. BELAND. Let us say one-tenth.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Of course we must not forget that we must give due credit to Providence, to our great natural resources, to the rich fertility of this wonderful country, to our vast stretches of agricultural land, to our mines, our forests and our fisheries, and we must not overlook the people of this country and their character and energy, and enterprise and ability. Having done that, whatever glory may be left, whatever credit may be attributable in any measure to legislative agency, let us apportion, as I have suggested, let us divide it up half and half. The capital outlay for 1911-12 have been extensive on account of the large undertakings now being carried on. It is estimated that the capital and special outlays for the Transcontinental railway for the different railways, canals, and public works, for railway subsidies and for the various other items in this category will total $34,000,000.

To this must be added whatever is paid to the credit of the Receiver General on trust account by way of implementing in cash the guarantees under the terms of the National Transcontinental Railway Act and the Act of this session in this regard. Assuming that amount to be in round figures $5,000,000, the total will be increased to $39,000,000.

Now let me say with regard to this large amount of $5,000,000 which, as I say, will be paid into the credit of the Receiver

General in trust, that I considered very carefully whether we would be justified in deducting that from the consolidated revenue fund, that is to say, in paying it out from the running expenses of the year as distinguished from capital and special charges, and I came to the conclusion that it would not be quite fair to do so. True, it is in the nature of a loss, a loss that the country must pay; on the other hand, it may be regarded as analogous in some measure to a railway subsidy; and as I desire to be absolutely fair in the presentation of the budget, I came to the conclusion that it would be better to treat the $5,000,000 as a special account, as if it were analogous, so to speak, to a railway subsidy. Therefore, I add the $5,000,000 which will be paid to the credit of the Receiver General in trust, to the $34,000,000 of capital and special expenditure which I have mentioned, and I reach a total of $39,000,000. Now, taking the revenue of the year, which I have mentioned, and taking this capital and special expenditure of $39,000,000 into consideration, on this basis the net outcome of the year would be a reduction of the debt by $1,150,000, on the following computation:

Revenue		$136,000,000
Add sinking fund		1,150,000
		$137,150,000
Consolidated Fund expenditure	$97,000,000	
Capital and special expenditure	39,000,000	
		136,000,000
Reduction of debt		$ 1,150,000

Now, Mr. Speaker, what does this mean? It means that out of the abounding revenues of this country, we shall provide for the ordinary current expenditures of the Dominion, for all those large capital outlays which I have mentioned, and which this growing country has required during the year for services of every kind, and at the same time that we shall be able to make a reduction of the public debt to the extent of $1,150,000. That means, we have more than paid our way, and our surplus has been such that all capital and special charges have been extinguished. Now I am aware that exception may be taken to a statement of that kind. It may be said that the surplus is too large, that it is not proper that we should be able to pay off all the current expenses of the year, and at the same time take care of such a large capital expenditure as has been made during the past year. Personally I am in favour of a substantial surplus, and I give the House my reasons.

In the first place, we are not certain that we shall always have the present prosperity. I trust we shall, and every hon. gentleman in the House trusts we shall; and I see no reason whatever to suppose that there will be any change in the immediate future, or even for some years ahead, so far as I can foresee. I see no reason for believing that the present prosperity will not continue. But at the same time there is always the possibility, and, therefore, I think it well that the country should have such a revenue in excess of the current expenditure that we may take care to some extent, and even in large measure, of the capital expenditures which are necessary in the constructive period of a country such as this. Now if we had to borrow for all such capital expenditures the national debt of this country would be greatly increased, and if the national debt were greatly increased it would follow, it seems to me, that our national credit might be to some extent impaired. None of us, I am sure, would like to see that. Not only so, but if there should come, by any chance, in the distant future an adverse period, when times are not as prosperous as they are at present, it would be well indeed if we should have the credit of the country at the highest possible standard in order that we then might be able to borrow. Because I believe in national finance, that we should provide for capital expenditures in times not only of prosperity, but in times that are not prosperous, when money is cheap, when great national undertakings may be carried on by the use of the credit of the country, because that helps us to tide over a period of depression; and if the money is widely expended you have national assets, you have the national undertakings from the money obtained upon the strength of the credit.

Now coming to the fiscal year 1912-13, which begins on the 1st day of April next, at this date, of course, it is impossible to do more than state in general terms the prospects as to the revenues on the one hand and the expenditures on the other. With regard to the former, there appears to be every hope that during the fiscal year 1912-13 they will show an appreciable advance over the estimated amount of $136,000,000, for the current fiscal year. As to the expenditures, the main estimates for 1912-13 have been before the House for some time. They amount to $149,789,677.68, composed of $104,119,304.86 for consolidated fund service and $44,870,372.82 for capital outlay.

These expenditures will be increased, of course, by the supplementary estimates to be brought down. I expect to bring these down probably in the course of a couple of weeks. It is possible also, on the experience of the past, that further supplementary estimates may be brought down later in the year when parliament again meets,

but, of course, I have no certainty as to that. Between the total estimates for all services for 1912-13, therefore, and the anticipated revenue of the same year, there would be an appreciable, even a large, deficiency to be provided for. But it must be borne in mind there is a difference between estimated and actual expenditure. That is well illustrated in the case of the last fiscal year. Experience shows that of the total amount estimated, very considerable sums lapse. That is the experience of every year. In some years, of course there are more lapses than in others; variation takes place according to the closeness of the estimates and the ability to expend in the respective cases. For example, take the year 1911-12. The estimates already voted amount to $156,079,538.73. These were the estimates of the late government partially adopted by this government last fall. If we add the supplementary estimates which I have to-day laid on the table amounting to $2,600,000, we find the total—the appropriations for 1911-12—to amount to $158,679,538.73. The anticipated expenditure for consolidated fund services and all capital and special outlays, is as I estimated, $131,000,000, showing the very large amount of upwards of $27,000,000 which will remain unexpended, and will lapse. Therefore, notwithstanding that the total amount of the main estimates for 1912-13 is $149,789,688.68—which, I may say, is less by $8,000,000 than the total appropriation for the present fiscal year and which we shall have to supplement by estimates this session and by further estimates, as I have said, in the coming fall—I feel confident that at the end of the present fiscal year the revenues of the country will have proven sufficient to meet not only the current expenditures, but to provide at least a part, and, I believe, a substantial part of that class of expenditures which have been known as capital or special expenditures and for which, so far as the capital expenditures at least are concerned, the government would be justified in borrowing.

It will be observed in connection with the estimates for the coming fiscal year that very liberal expenditures have been provided for. We are in the growing period of the nation and the government must do its part. The increase of our transportation facilities, improvements of and extensions to our canal and railway systems, the deepening of our harbours and waterways, the continuation of adequate terminals at our great ports—all these with other necessary minor public works are the proper subject of public expenditure; and I believe that for these purposes generous appropriations will be approved by the people of Canada. The greatest problem we have to-day, in my judgment, is the problem of transportation—to give our people access to the markets of the world. We have to-day a congested situation in the west. There was a late harvest. The railways have been overtaxed. Hon. gentlemen representing the west and indeed hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House are anxious that we should provide more railway accommodation for the west, more spouts—to use a common expression—for the western traffic. The government is committed to the project of building the Hudson Bay railway. The Canadian Northern Railway Company is extending its transcontinental line to Vancouver. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, part of the National Transcontinental system, is pushing on to Prince Rupert. In time, we shall have the opening of the Panama canal. Questions will arise as to moving the wheat to the west and providing terminal facilities for that traffic. Great capital expenditures will be required to provide facilities both on the Atlantic and on the Pacific. We must provide adequate expenditures for all these purposes. And if, as I have said, the money is expended wisely and economically, I believe that any government of Canada at this stage of the country's development will have the hearty support of the people in making those expenditures.

Now, I have dealt with the three fiscal years with which it was necessary I should deal in presenting to the House the financial affairs of the Dominion. I come now to the question of the Dominion debt. The net debt of Canada, as at 31st of March, 1911, was $340,042,052.03. This figure is arrived at by taking the gross debt which amounts to $474,941,487.42 and deducting therefrom the assets amounting to $134,899,435.39. These assets are as follows:

Sinking funds	$ 11,196,825 90
Sundry investments	27,501,851 20
Province accounts	2,296,429 12
Miscellaneous and banking accounts	16,940,258 65
Specie reserve	74,472,977 17
Cash	2,491,093 35
Total	$134,899,435 39

The estimated population of Canada on the 31st March, 1911, as revised by the census office was 7,158,000, that the debt per head at that date amounted to $47.51.

The sinking funds in this list represent, of course, purchases made of our own securities in the market in connection with the sinking fund attached to the several loans. They are held by trustees for the Dominion. Personally, I believe not only in connection with municipal or provincial finance, but also in connection

with national finance, that a sinking fund should be attached to every loan. I know it may be said that the credit of the Dominion is high, the resources of the Dominion are so great, that we do not need a sinking fund. But my judgment, is that it would be an unwise policy not to attach a sinking fund to every loan. I believe my predecessor took the same view—I am not quite certain as to that—but if he did, I am glad to agree with him; for a sinking fund puts in process the liquidation, to a certain extent at all events, of every loan; the financial position is improving continually by reason of the sinking fund.

Just a word as to our specie reserve. The House will observe from this statement that on the 31st March, 1911, we held the large sum of $74,472,977.17 in gold. That gold is held at the several offices of the Receiver General throughout Canada. In connection with our savings bank and our Post Office savings department, we are obliged by law to keep a reserve of 10 per cent. In connection with the note circulation of the Dominion—that is Dominion ones, twos, fours, and soon to be, five dollar bills and notes of the larger denominations we require by our legislation to keep gold reserves, not to the entire amount, however, outstanding, but for the first thirty million dollars of note circulation we require to keep 25 per cent in gold or in securities of the Dominion guaranteed as to principal and interest by the Imperial government. As a matter of fact that 25 per cent is held in gold. So that, we have $22,500,000 of free money for which there is as security the credit of the Dominion. But against the $7,500,000 which is not free money, which forms part of the $30,000,000 and is all the outstanding circulation in excess of the $30,000,000, we hold dollar for dollar in gold. The basis, therefore, substantially, of the Dominion note circulation is gold and in so far as the banks of Canada hold Dominion notes as part of their assets, the basis is also gold. It is just as if they had the gold instead of the Dominion notes. Under the Bank Act, we are required to keep at the several offices of the Receiver General notes for gold and gold for notes. The process is continually going on of exchanging gold which we receive from the banks for notes going out into circulation among the public and for what are known as 'legals' as between the banks in making their clearances. That process is going on all the time and the only reason I have adverted to it is not because I am not aware that most of the members of the House are entirely familiar with the facts, but that some may not have turned their minds upon it, may not have obtained the information, and they may be interested to know that the basis of our calculation, in so far as the Dominion is concerned, is not to its credit, although its credit is high, but substantially gold.

Now, I come to the question of loans. It is probably within the knowledge of most members of the House that for some years past Canada has been passing through a period in which her loans, contracted at earlier dates, have been maturing and provision has had to be made from time to time for their renewal, or to meet the maturities. Under normal conditions this would not be a difficult task for a country with the high standing and credit in the markets of the world of Canada. A loan to which I desire briefly to refer was placed upon the market by my predecessor in November, 1908. The year 1908, succeeding as it did, the very trying year of 1907, was, I understand, a rather difficult year in which to finance, and instead of issuing the standard security of the Dominion, my predecessor, in November 1908, when a loan fell due issued, in order to meet this and some other obligations, a short date loan of £5,000,000. The rate of interest was 3¾ per cent. It was effected in June, 1908, and was repayable on the 1st of May, 1912. In connection with that loan, an offer was made to the holders of conversion into 3 per cent inscribed stock due in 1938 and a portion amounting to £120,850 was so converted. A portion held in the sinking fund of another loan was cancelled and there remains a total of £4,681,870 12s. 4d., to be provided for on the 1st of May. For some time past, or ever since last fall, although it is usual to make provision not more than two or three months beforehand, we have been closely watching the London money market, expecting a favourable opportunity of making a flotation. The conditions at the end of 1911 were decidedly adverse. International complications were thought to be threatening last fall, and in consequence, there began a withdrawal of gold. In order to meet the situation, the Bank of England, following the practice adopted in cases of the kind, advanced the bank rate to 4 per cent. At the close of the year we had the Bank of England rate at 4 per cent, while the European situation was anything but reassuring. The market improved somewhat for a portion of the year, but the outlook was still unfavourable. We were in constant touch with our financial agents, the Bank of Montreal, and as soon as the Bank of England rate dropped, as it did recently to 3½ per cent, and especially in view of the fact that labour conditions looked rather threatening, we decided to make an issue for the purpose of refunding and taking up that £5,000,000 short loan, to which I have referred, upon maturity. Accordingly, we issued on the 24th of February

last upon the London market, a prospectus. We had underwritten this loan at 98, that also being the issue price. I cannot help but congratulate the government and the country, especially in view of recent occurences and their probable effect, at all events, upon the immediate future, that wewere able to obtain under such unfavourable conditions such a good price, as 98 for our 3½ per cent standard security. This security, as I have indicated to the House, is what we call the 1930-50 security; that is, it matures in 1950, with the privilege reserved to the government to redeem it at any time after 1930.

Shortly after the loan had been underwritten and offered to the public, the strike of the miners broke out in Great Britain, and that strike, is still hanging gloomily over the entire economic and financial situation. My own opinion is (it is only an opinion) that it must be speedily adjusted, but nevertheless it will be some time before its effects disappear, so far as the financial world is concerned. Therefore, I feel particularly fortunate—although I claim no merit except in acting promptly upon the advice of our fiscal agents—I feel that we are particularly fortunate in having placed our loan at the time we did. So far as the market reception of the loan is concerned, the public took thirty-five per cent, and sixty-five per cent remained in the hands of the underwriters. Now, it is possible to draw an altogether improper conclusion from the amount of securities which are left in the hands of the underwriters. Of late years there has rather grown up a habit in Great Britain on the part of the public, of waiting, in some cases, at all events, until after the public issue, in the hope that a comparatively large amount may be left in the hands of the underwriters and with the expectation in consequence of obtaining the securities offered at a somewhat lower rate. I believe, in connection with the last six million pounds sterling loan of the Dominion (a very large loan issued some two or three years ago) forty-three per cent was taken by the public and the balance left with the underwriters, although shortly afterwards this security went to a premium. In this case, I believe our loan is at a slight discount to-day, which means, of course, that the price, having regard to conditions, was all that we could have hoped to obtain.

Mr. NESBITT. Will the minister state whether that 98 was net or not?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). 98 was the price at which the securities were underwritten and offered to the public. From that 98 must be deducted, as has been the case in connection with all our loans, the expenses of underwriting and all the other expenses connected with the issue which will, without doubt, be considerable. The question is often raised as to whether loans should be underwritten at all, and I have heard the query on more than one occasion as to whether undue commissions are not paid in connection with underwriting. Let me say to the House, as most hon. members know, underwriting is simply insurance. It is absolutely necessary that loans should be met when they become due, and as we must have the money for this maturity on May 1st, if we had to rely only on public subscription for this loan we could never be certain that the money would be available at that date. No man, I do not care who he is, can foretell the market. One man's opinion may be a little more valuable than that of another. but nobody can foretell whether the public will or will not take an issue of securities. Not only that, but conditions may intervene which may change the whole financial situation almost over night, and have a profound bearing upon the question of whether or not a loan will be taken by the public.

Mr. NESBITT. I do not at all question the action of the Finance Minister in that respect.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I am very glad to have the assurance of my hon. friend on that point. My own view is that underwriting—and I am glad my hon. friend (Mr. Nesbitt), agrees—is absolutely necessary in order that the money will be available at the time it is required. Now, it is no doubt within the knowledge and observation of the House, that high grade, low interest bearing securities are not in the favour they once were. A few years ago only, the standard security of the Dominion was a three per cent security, but now it is a three and a half per cent security. Hon. gentlemen know what a great fall has taken place in the price of English consols, which are certainly among the best, if not the very best, securities in the world. What has been the cause? Is it that the credit of Great Britain is less high than it was; is it that the credit of the Dominion of Canada is less high than it was a few years ago? What is the cause for the increase in interest which nations must now pay in order to obtain the money required by them? My own opinion is that good times have a great deal to do with it.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). What about bonused stock?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). We will come to that in a minute. Good times, the demand for money all over the world, the more general investment in industrial enterprises; these are the chief factors, I be-

lieve, in the increase in the rate of interest and in the fall that has taken place in the price of high-grade low interest bearing securities. Then, in addition to that, there is the matter referred to by my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean), there are the opportunities for investment in many other fields, and notably, let us say, tramway companies, railway companies, electrical companies of various kinds, the bonds of which seem to, and as a matter of fact do, give first-class security at a higher rate of interest than can be obtained by investment in municipal, provincial, or government securities, while, at the same time, they afford a greater prospect for appreciation. I think too, that with the increase of wealth, people not only desire to obtain a higher rate of interest, but they are willing to take a little more risk. At all events, many factors enter into the situation; the demand for money, investment in railway and tramway and electrical companies, and other industrial companies; all these various undertakings and enterprises have entered into competition with the high-class securities of the world, and the result is that these high-class securities have fallen to a certain extent in price.

I shall deal now with one other matter, which has been frequently talked about, and which it is in the interest of the Dominion, should be discussed. It has been pointed out that the guaranteed securities; the securities of railway companies guaranteed by the Dominion, do not stand at as high a figure on the London market as they should, having regard to the price at which the Dominion's own securities stand. As I pointed out recently to the House, a guaranteed security never sells at quite as high a rate as a security which is a direct liability of the guarantor, and, notwithstanding that the guarantee of the Dominion in connection with these securities is unconditional and absolute, it cannot be expected that they will sell at as high a price as the securities of the Dominion which constitute a direct obligation. In addition to that the Dominion securities are trustee investments, and the securities of a railway company guaranteed by the Dominion are not trustee investments. The result is that the securities of the Dominion are in demand by trustees, who control immense sums of money in the old world, whereas the same conditions do not apply with regard to the loans of railway companies guaranteed by the Dominion.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). What is about the net difference in price?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Take, for example, the case of the Grand Trunk Pacific, because it was with special regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific that I brought the matter to the attention of the House. The Grand Trunk Pacific securities are 3 per cents, and they are selling at, I think, from 80 to 82. That of course seems a very large discount from par. Our own securities which we have sold on the market at 98 are 3½ per cents. In order to make the comparison, therefore, we must put the Grand Trunk Pacifics on a 3½ per cent basis. For my own satisfaction, I had this calculation worked out, and I found that a rate of 82 on a 3 per cent security 50 years maturity, is about the equivalent of 94 on a 3½ per cent basis.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). What is the rate of the Canadian Northern Ontario loan?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). The Canadian Northern Ontario guaranteed by the Dominion, was issued at 93 on the London market, at a time when the Canadian Northern Alberta, which was guaranteed by the Dominion government, was quoted at 93½ to 94½, and there was in that amount, I should think, about one point of accrued interest so that the issue of Canadian Northern Ontario guaranteed by the Dominion was just about on a parity with the Canadian Northern Alberta guaranteed by the Dominion. If you have a quotation on the London market, we will say, of 93 or 94, for a guaranteed security, and if you have a quotation of, we will say, 100 for a Dominion security, if you offer to the public any considerable amount such as £5,000,000 or £7,000,000, you must reduce from the nominal quotation one or two points, that is obvious. With a nominal quotation at par, we will say 100 or 100½ or 101, there is usually a narrow market, but when you come to put on a large amount offered to the public you must reduce that quotation by one or two points. The Canadian Northern Ontario was put on to the public at about 93 and having regard to the quotation of the Canadian Northern Alberta guaranteed by the Dominion at the time, it seems to me that the figure, so far as the offer was concerned, was fair and reasonable.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Was the government guarantee of the Canadian Northern Ontario railway issue all made at one and the same time, that is the whole $35,000,000?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Under the legislation of last year, the securities of the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company for the line of railway between Port Arthur and Montreal a total of 1,016 miles, securities to the amount of £7,000,000 were authorized to be issued by the railway

company bearing the guarantee of the Dominion government. The legislation provided for the execution of a trust mortgage in the usual form providing for the issue of the securities. It is usual in connection with a trust mortgage such as that to provide that the securities may be sold and the money paid in to the credit of the Receiver General of Canada to be paid out from time to time as progress certificates are presented, approved of the Railway Department for the purpose of meeting the expenditures on the line. Therefore, so far as the legislation is concerned, the Dominion's guarantee attached to the entire issue of £7,000,000.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). My question was whether the government were justified in attaching their guarantee to the whole issue at one time and giving that large amount to the public. There was possibly a danger that that $35,000,000 issue of bonds of one railway company guaranteed by Canada might hurt the general credit of the country for general purposes. I want to know if the minister does not think this should be done at different times?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). My hon. friend does not quite understand the situation. The £7,000,000 bonds guaranteed loan of the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company was not placed upon the market by the Canadian Northern Railway Company. It was sold to a London house for a net figure of 90¾. I need not now delay to show that if the amount of commission which usually runs from 2 per cent to 2½ per cent is added to the 90¾ an issue price of 93 is reached.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I am not objecting to the amount realized. I think I am correct in stating that under the statute authorizing this guarantee, authority was given to the Minister of Finance to use his discretion as to whether or not he should attach the guarantee for the whole amount at one time or to different amounts at different times. There was, of course, a possibility of danger to other Canadian borrowers, in placing the whole amount on the market at one time.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). My hon. friend, I think, has not read the trust mortgage as carefully as he should have done. If he will read the trust mortgage he will find, that the securities belong to the railway company, and are to be sold in such amounts at such a premium or at such a discount and to such persons as the railway company may determine, subject only to the approval of the minister or the government. Bear in mind that these are the securities of the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company and that the Dominion is guaranteed as against its guarantee also of the Canadian Northern Railway Company which is a different corporation. Now what is the position? Is it in the interest of the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company, to get the highest possible figure for their securities; the direct liability of the Canadian Northern Railway Company and the contingent liability is the liability of the Dominion.

Now, the negotiation for the sale of the securities is not with the Finance Minister but with the railway company, and without going into all the papers which have been asked for by my hon friend, and which will be brought down, let me say that the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company, desirous of having funds in hand to carry out without delay this great enterprise so much needed, especially by the west, of constructing a through line of 1,016 miles from Point Arthur to Montreal, in view of the international situation existing last fall which I have mentioned, and in view of the fact that they have borrowed large sums for construction already entered upon and other expenditures to a large amount in connection therewith, came to the conclusion that it was in their interest, in order to ensure that the money would be available for the construction of the line, to accept the offer which was made to them by a prominent and strong house in Great Britain to purchase the entire £7,000,000 of their securities guaranteed by the government, with payments to come in over a period of two years as they might be required for the construction of the line. Now, my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) has called attention to the large amounts; let me point this out to him: If he had looked at the legislation under which this trust mortgage was executed he would have ascertained that the rate of issue is about $35,000 per mile. Now, what does that mean? It means a very expensive, a very costly, construction. It means an expensive right of way, and expensive construction along the north shore. The Dominion guarantee on the prairie section of the Grand Trunk Pacific is $13,000 per mile.

Mr. NESBITT. I am not objecting to that.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). What I want to point out to my hon. friend is this: That for every mile of Canadian Northern Ontario railway line of construction, almost three times the amount would be required, as far as the government's guarantee securities are secured, as for one mile of the prairie section of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Now, the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company estimate that this year probably in the next few months, they will spend from $15,000,000 to $20,000,000 upon

this line, working at it at various points acquiring their right of way, and constructing their line. Let me ask my hon. friend if the judgment of the president of that company in selling his securities at the time he did has not been abundantly justified in view of the economic and financial situation as we see it in Great Britain to-day? It is of the utmost importance to this country that this line should be built. If that issue had not been made, if these securities had not been sold, the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company would have been delayed and hampered in its operations in building its line of 1,016 miles from Port Arthur to Montreal. It is in the interest not only of the province of Ontario, but of the Dominion of Canada as a whole, west and east, that this line should be built without any delay whatsoever. As a result of the sale of the securities by the president of the Canadian Northern Railway Company at the figure mentioned and on the terms which I have indicated, the money for the construction of this line is available from month to month as construction proceeds so that there will be no delay whatsoever; and I am sure from information in my office, which I am sure will satisfy my hon. friend, this line will in all probability be completed some time next year at the latest

Mr. LALOR. Does the government retain any control in the amount actually expended per mile?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Let me explain that to my hon. friend. A contract is entered into for a certain standard of construction in connection with these lines, and when the guaranteed securities are sold, the money is paid into the credit of the Receiver General with certain banks. As construction proceeds, accounts are paid out not exceeding $35,000 per mile, in this particular case from those proceeds upon certificates of expenditure approved by the Railway Department, through its engineers, so that in that sense the government does retain control. In other words it retains control of the funds until satisfied that the money has been expended for the purposes for which it was authorized.

I have gone quite a distance afield, and I must return to the question of our loans. On 1st October next there falls due a sum of £1,235,000 of the 4 per cent loan issued in December, 1907, for which care will be taken to provide on the date of maturity. It may be of interest to this House to know that only two loans will then remain to be provided for until 1930, or during the next 18 years. Of these two loans, one is a 4 per cent loan of 1878, guaranteed by the imperial government for £1,700,000, and a 3¾ per cent loan of 1914-19, so called, of £6,000,000. The former is due on the 1st October, 1913, and the latter between 1914 and 1919, on the government giving three month's notice. I have thus indicated to the House the financial position of the Dominion so far as the maturing of loans is concerned and I must say it appears to me, as I am sure it does to the House, having regard to these maturities, to be satisfactory.

Now I come to another matter in which I bespeak the attention of the House as it deals with the Transcontinental railway, or at least the eastern division of that line, and I have thought it well when dealing with the liabilities of the Dominion and our future maturities, to advert briefly to this portion of the Transcontinental which is our chief national undertaking at the present time. The heavy cost of the eastern section of that railway, so greatly in excess of the estimate of the late government might prove, and I know it has proved to a certain extent, somewhat disturbing to the House and to the public. Up to the 31st March, 1911, there had been expended in cash upon this undertaking the sum of $95,422,533.44. For the current year it is estimated that the outlay will amount to about $22,500,000, so that at the end of the present fiscal year the Dominion will have expended nearly $118,000,000. Now, in view of this large outlay, and I think probably that at least $100,000,000 additional will be expended before completion, I have thought it advisable in the financial interest of the Dominion to present a statement of capital and special expenditures from 1904 onward, that being the first year of the expenditure on Transcontinental railway account, dividing them into outlays on the railway on the one hand and on the other the capital and special outlays for other purposes. Against these I have set the increase and decrease of debt for the respective years, and from the statement it will be found that from the year 1904 to the 31st March, 1911, Canada expended $95,422,533.44 on National Transcontinental railway account. On other capital and special expenditures the outlay amounted to $123,362,714.56, or a total capital and special expenditure of $218,785,248. I am giving this statement not from any partisan standpoint, but in the interest of the Dominion, because I do not desire that there should be any disturbance or misgiving with regard to the very large amount of capital expended upon this road.

I have said that during these years, the total capital and special expenditure was $218,785,248. During that period the increase of debt was $78,435,063.16. If to these figures we add the estimated results of the operations of the year 1911-12, we have the following:

Estimated outlay for Transcontinental Railway to 31st March, 1912	$117,922,533 44
Other capital and special expenditures	134,862,714 56
Total estimated expenditure	$252,785,248 00
Total estimated increased debt during the period from 1904 to 31st March, 1912	$ 77,285,063 16

I desire to say, both to those of our own Dominion, and to those in Great Britain, if there be any, who have felt misgivings as to the very large amount of estimated expenditure upon the eastern section of the National Transcontinental and the burden entailed upon the country in consequence, that I think it will be reassuring, completely reassuring, to know that, great as the cost has been, and will be, a large proportion of that cost for the past, has been and for the future, (if conditions continue as I believe may very well be expected), will be liquidated from the surpluses of consolidated revenue account and will not become a charge upon the future. I think we are all glad that we are able to make that statement. The following is the summary of the capital and special expenditure, to which I have referred:

CAPITAL AND SPECIAL EXPENDITURES.

Year.	National Transcontinental Railway.	Other than N.T.C. Railway.	Total.	Increase or Decrease of Debt.
	$	$	$	$
1904	6,249 40	16,635,965 53	16,642,214 93	— 739,270 27
1905	778,491 28	14,705,964 63	15,484,455 91	5,356,448 00
1906	1,841,269 95	14,195,730 82	16,037,000 77	818,811 15
1907	5,537,867 50	8,698,109 98	14,235,977 48	— 3,371,117 79
1908	18,910,253 58	17,026,974 70	35,937,228 28	14,288,999 88
1909	24,892,351 23	24,484,940 68	49,377,291 91	45,969,419 33
1910	19,968,064 31	16,015,962 27	35,984,026 58	12,338,267 16
1911	23,487,986 19	11,599,065 95	35,087,052 14	3,773,505 70
	95,422,533 44	123,362,714 56	218,785,248 00	82,545,451 22
				— 4,110,388 06
				78,435,063 16
1911-12 (Estimated)	22,500,000 00	11,500,000 00	34,000,000 00	— 1,150,000 00
	117,922,533 44	134,862,714 56	252,785,248 00	77,285,063 16

I come now to the consideration of the trade of the Dominion. And I am sorry that I have occupied so long a time in this speech. But I must leave a part of the blame at least, with my hon. friend, the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) for introducing matters which, if not irrelevant, at least are of a kind that I would rather have dealt with some other day.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). The hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) is the man to blame for that.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean, Halifax), is such a genial member that I bear him no illwill, by reason of the interruption, especially as it is possible that the information I gave, may have been of service and of interest to the House. Now, as to the trade of the Dominion: According to the statistics our trade continues to show substantial increase. For the first ten months of the present fiscal year, our total trade was $711,199,802 as against $634,431,075 for the corresponding period of the last fiscal year. The comparative figures for the past three years are as follows:

Year.	Total Imports into Canada.	Total Exports from Canada	Total Trade.
	$	$	$
1909	309,756,608	261,512,159	571,268,767
1910	391,852,692	301,358,529	693,211,221
1911	472,247,540	297,196,365	769,443,905

It is interesting to note that the volume of our trade has just about doubled since 1900. A noticeable feature in connection with this expansion is that, while the imports have increased in that time by almost 150 per cent. the exports have increased by only about 55 per cent. In all the main lines of produce the exports

have increased except in the one principal item, 'animals and their products' which shows a decline, due, I have no doubt in large measure to the greatly increased demand of the home market. The following comparative figures will be of interest as showing the increase of our trade with the mother country in the last five years:

TRADE WITH GREAT BRITAIN—MERCHANDISE ONLY.

Fiscal Year.	Imports for consumption from Great Britain.	Exports to Great Britain.	Aggregate Trade.
	$	$	$
1908	94,417,314	134,477,124	228,894,438
1909	70,682,101	133,745,123	204,427,224
1910	95,336,427	149,630,488	244,966,915
1911	109,934,665	136,962,971	246,897,636
9 mos. ending Dec. 31, 1911.	85,046,132	126,733,235	211,779,367

Now, I wish to touch very briefly on the question of immigration.

Mr. LEMIEUX. May I ask if the hon. gentleman has the figures of trade with the United States. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. minister. If he will merely place the figures on 'Hansard,' that will be all I desire.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I have the figures here. They are as follows:

TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES—MERCHANDISE ONLY.

Fiscal Year.	Imports for consumption from United States.	Exports to United States.	Aggregate Trade.
	$	$	$
1908	204,648,885	96,920,138	301,569,023
1909	170,056,178	91,022,387	261,078,565
1910	217,502,415	110,614,327	328,116,742
1911	274,844,858	112,208,676	387,053,534
9 mos. ending Dec. 31, 1911.	244,190,508	83,495,234	327,685,742

I was about to deal with immigration. The figures of immigration for the past three years are as follows:

Year.	Great Britain and Ireland.	Other countries except United States.	United States.	Total.
	$	$	$	$
1908-09.	52,901	34,175	59,832	146,908
1909-10.	59,790	45,206	103,798	208,794
1910-11.	123,013	66,620	121,451	311,084
Total ..	235,704	146,001	285,081	666,786

I am sure it will be gratifying to us all to have this stream of immigration flowing into this country. I think we depend for our continued prosperity in this country upon continuous immigration of the right sort and upon a continuous flow of British money. Therefore, we should use every effort, as we do now, to promote the flow of immigration into Canada, and also to enhance the credit of this country in the money markets of the world, that these two great forces, joined with the enterprise, energy and character of the Canadian people, may develop the great natural resources of this country.

Now, it will also be gratifying to observe that of this immigration 235,000 are of our own kinsmen from Great Britain and Ireland. I have no doubt that the immigration from other countries is, much of it, desirable; it comes of the hardy races, they are men who will take hold here and become part of our Canadian citizenship, and assist in our development. I believe myself in the absorptive and assimilating power of a country such as Canada, and I have no fear that these men, coming as they do from hardy races—though I believe in a selected immigration—will make good citizens and good Canadians. In regard to the United States, 285,081 immigrants came in during the last three years from the republic to the south, and 111,706 came in during the ten months of the present fiscal year. In my belief these are most excellent settlers. They are intelligent men, they are experienced farmers, they have capital, they have enterprise, they have character. They know what to do, they go at once to work, and they are good farmers, and add greatly to the productivity of our country. It is gratifying to me that we have such a stream of these settlers coming from the great republic to the south. They are men who have sold their higher priced farms in that country, and have come here to acquire lower priced lands, though equally good, if not better, and who will do their part in the development of our great west.

Now in connection with immigration, let me say that while in the west the land has

been the lure, and of course is the great attraction to the home seeker, at the same time I am glad to say that it is the policy of this government to encourage immigration to the other provinces of Canada. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers), has been taking the matter up with the several provincial governments with a view of bringing in desirable immigrants suited to the purposes of each province. There is much to be done in the way of intensive farming in the eastern provinces, much to be done in the way of dairy farming, much to be done in the way of fruit farming. In addition to all that, one of the great needs of the farmers of this country is intelligent help on the farms of the east, because we know that the east has been drained to a large extent to build up the west. An intelligent immigration policy directed to supplying as far as possible the great needs of eastern farmers, to procure for them the help which they require on their farms, will be a great boon to them, and I think will be much appreciated.

Now, I have some statistics here as to railway mileage, as to our chartered banks, their deposits and discounts, as indicating the prosperity and advance of the country during the past two years:

RAILWAY MILEAGE.

The railway mileage reported in operation on the 30th June, 1911, was 25,400, or about double what it was in 1889, and an increase of 669 miles over the previous year. The statistics of the Railway Department indicate further nearly 1,600 miles of railway in actual operation on the 30th June, but officially regarded as still under construction. In addition, the department says it may be fairly assumed that 2,500 miles were surveyed and located, or in process of being surveyed, on the 30th June last.

For the year ended 30th June, 1911, the volume of freight traffic showed an increase of 7·2 per cent over the previous year.

BANK STATISTICS.

As evidencing the remarkable progress of the country over decades the following statistics with regard to chartered banks may be of interest to the House and the country.

Deposits by the Public in Chartered Banks.

On 30th June, 1881	$ 83,666,139
" " 1891	142,633,216
" " 1901	315,775,429
" " 1911	874,672,408
On 31st January, 1912	913,784,136

Discounts of the Chartered Banks of Canada.

On 30th June, 1881	$134,113,252
" " 1891	202,692,481
" " 1901	318,240,549
" " 1911	786,743,770
On 31st January, 1912	851,027,845

Paid-up Capital Chartered Banks.

June 30, 1881	$ 59,384,987
" 1891	60,742,365
" 1901	67,095,718
" 1911	101,065,306

Now I come to the question of the tariff. In view of the legislation of this session providing for the creation of a Tariff Commission, whose duties it will be to obtain and submit for the information of the government evidence and data from which the question of customs duties may be considered with greater certainty of knowledge than has been possible in the past, we have no tariff changes to propose at the present session.

There have been, of course, many requests for such changes and much could doubtless be said in favour of legislation with regard to certain articles and commodities either by way of reduction or increase in tariff rates, but in our judgment there is no case of such urgency as may not without hardship await the consideration of the commission. The inadvisability, also, of lightly interfering with the tariff in times of such prosperity as we now enjoy must be patent to all.

Mr. MACDONALD. Do I understand that my hon. friend does not mean to propose any resolutions in regard to the tariff bounties on iron and steel?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). My hon. friend understands correctly that it is not my intention to propose any resolutions in regard to the tariff or bounties. Now I shall advert briefly to the matter of the reciprocity proposals. The economic and political feature of the past year was the rejection by the Canadian people of the reciprocity agreement negotiated with the United States by the late government. This subject has been so fully discussed, not only in Canada, but in Great Britain, and the United States, that I shall content myself by saying that the causes for rejection were both economic and national. In a period of the greatest prosperity our people were naturally loth to enter upon an experiment the alleged advantages of which appeared to them to say the least dubious. With the great growth and development of Canada under the policy of protection to the farmer as well as the manufacturer, the people came to fully realize the advantages of their home market and of our interprovincial trade built up at enormous cost of energy and capital on lines rendered necessary by the economic conditions under which the country has developed during so many years of growth and progress. That they also feared the loss of their fiscal independence was clearly apparent. The rejection implied no hostility on their part to the great republic to the south. On the contrary I believe the re-

lations between the two countries will continue in the future as in the past to be of the most friendly and neighbourly character.

It will, as I have said before, be gratifying to all that the material prosperity with which we have been so highly favoured still continues to be our portion. Despite the serious vicissitudes through which the western wheat crop has passed and the unusual heat experienced in the province of Ontario during the past summer, the field crops of Canada show a bountiful yield and with the high prices prevailing for practically all its products the great basic industry of agriculture continues in a flourishing condition. Almost every department of trade and commerce shows expansion. Our mines are wonderfully productive. Our coast fisheries, notably the Atlantic, have enjoyed a good catch and high prices. Our manufacturers are thriving and new industries are springing up throughout the whole Dominion. Railway construction, especially in the west, proceeds apace, preparing a way for settlement in districts not yet opened up and for trade with other markets than we now enjoy. Our increased bank deposits, clearings and circulation, the amount of public and private building evidenced in municipal and business structures, extensions to manufacturing plants and residences in almost every part of the country, all attest that the general prosperity of Canada at the present time is very great.

Our Dominion continues to be the land of hope and promise to the home seeker. During the last year, as before shown, our immigration from Europe and the United States reached an average of nearly a thousand a day, bringing their capital, their intelligence and their energy to assist in the great task of developing the resources of Canada and building up her nationality. Much has been said in the past with which I am in accord as to the selection of immigration as far as possible with an eye to the quality and character of our future citizenship. Notwithstanding the large stream of immigration, labour conditions are good and extreme poverty, from any reason other than incapacity or direct misfortune, is hardly known.

Under the favourable conditions which I have described, and with every prospect for their continuance, the future of Canada looks bright indeed. In the enjoyment of peace, plenty and prosperity her energetic, loyal and patriotic people look forward with hope and expectation to an ever great and greater future.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, it was but natural of course, though perhaps unnecessary, that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. White), should beg the indulgence of the House and of his fellow members in submitting for the first time his budget to parliament, a task performed for years by a long line of eminent predecessors. Notwithstanding the many hurricanes which the heat of political discussion sometimes generates, there is always an agreeable measure of political comradeship in this House which generously recognizes an honest effort on the part of a public man to perform a public duty devolving upon him. I am sure, therefore, that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, as well as hon. gentlemen opposite, will join with me in congratulating the Minister of Finance upon the lucidity, moderation and fairness with which he has presented the budget this afternoon. We, on this side of the House, proffer these congratulations most sincerely and cordially, although it has happened, and will happen in the future, that upon many subjects which come before this House for consideration we cannot see eye to eye with the Minister of Finance.

The remarks delivered this afternoon by the hon. gentleman did not contain very much of a controversial nature, relating largely, as they did, to a presentment of financial and fiscal data for which, to a large degree if not wholly the hon. Minister is not responsible. It was only natural that we, on this side of the House, should heartily join with the Minister of Finance in congratulating ourselves and Canada upon the prosperous condition of the country and its finances. The delivery of the budget this afternoon was rendered comparatively easy, I venture to say, by reason of the splendid financial statement that the Minister was able to present to the House. He was but, after all, describing the harvest planted by others. The statistics furnished this afternoon regarding our revenue particularly are most satisfactory. One of the primary functions of a government is to find ways and means whereby to procure revenue to carry on the many public services of the state in the least burdensome manner possible. In this country since confederation we have obtained our revenue by excise taxation and by import duty exactions, and, judging from the results during the past fifteen years at least, it has been entirely successful. The fiscal policy of the late government has been very severely criticised in the past by hon. gentlemen opposite, but I submit to them, that, judging from the results from the standpoint of revenue, its value is indisputable and perhaps indicates that we have reached a point when

with profit to the country and its people there might come a diminution in taxation.

It is hardly necessary, Sir, that I should devote any considerable time to the financial statements of the three fiscal periods referred to by the hon. gentleman this afternoon; at least it is hardly necessary that I should devote much time to the financial statement of the year ending March 31, 1911. When Mr. Fielding presented his budget for that fiscal year on the 4th April, he was able only to estimate the expenditure and revenue. He did estimate the revenue at $117,500,000 and the expenditure on consolidated fund account at $87,000,000, leaving an estimated surplus for the year of $30,500,000. As the Minister of Finance intimated to us this afternoon, and which knowledge came previously to us from the public accounts, the revenue appears to be $117,780,000, a slight increase over the estimate of Mr. Fielding, while the expenditure was slightly over the estimate, amounting to $87,774,198.32 and leaving a surplus for the fiscal year 1910-11, as stated by the Minister of Finance, of $30,006,211.46. This is gratifying to the country and to those of us at least upon this side of the House. The Minister of Finance also congratulated the country upon the financial statement for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1912. The late Minister of Finance, in his last budget, while not estimating in figures the probable revenue and expenditure, predicted such a substantial revenue as would meet all income and capital expenditures. His estimate for that period has been verified in the statement which has been given us by the Minister of Finance this afternoon, and we find that the revenue has been sufficient for the year 1911-12 to meet all expenditures chargeable to consolidated fund account, to meet every dollar expended on capital account representing over $25,000,000, I think, and to provide for a reduction of debt to the extent of $1,150,000.

It was with pleasure that we on this side of the House heard the announcement this afternoon, from the Finance Minister, of a magnificent surplus of thirty-nine million dollars on the financial operations for the year 1912. It is further gratifying to us on this side of the House to know that the last year of the administration of the financial affairs of this country by the Hon. Mr. Fielding, ended with such success as did every other fiscal year while he occupied the office of Finance Minister. I trust I do not offend the susceptibilities of the Minister of Finance when I say that in all fairness the Liberal party may claim credit for the major portion if not the whole of the success of the financial operations for the year ending 31st of March, 1912. There is also this to be observed, that during the fiscal year now about ending, there were unusual expenditures in connection with consolidated fund account. In the first place there was a very considerable expenditure in connection with the decennial census, while other payments were made out of the consolidated fund on account of bounties, Dominion lands, militia and other items, which in years past, were charged to capital account. In order to impress upon the House and the country the splendid record of the late government, so far as surpluses are concerned, I shall give in the following tabulated statement, the surpluses for each financial year since 1897, they are as follows:

ANNUAL SURPLUS UNDER THE LIBERAL GOVERNMENT.

1897-98	$ 1,722,712.23
1898-99	4,837,749.00
1899-00	8,054,714.51
1900-01	5,648,333.29
1901-02	7,291,398.06
1902-03	14,345,166.17
1903-04	15,056,984.12
1905-06 (9 months)	12,898,719.12
1906-07	16,427,167.20
1907-08	19,413,054.22
1908-09	1,029,131.81
1909-10	22,091,963.81
1910-11	30,006,211.46
1911-12 (Estimated)	39,000,000.00

Altogether, the surpluses from 1897 down to the end of the fiscal year 1911-12 aggregate nearly $200,000,000. Thus, it will be seen that the Finance Minister of the late government was ever since 1897, able to show a gradually increasing annual surplus, ranging from one and three-quarter millions to thirty-nine million dollars for the present year. This two hundred million dollars of surplus, was available for the reduction of additions to the public debt on capital expenditure. To put it in another way, from 1907 to 1912 capital expenditures were made to the extent of $250,000,000, while the net debt of Canada increased by seventy-nine million dollars to the end of 1911. Were it not for these successive large surpluses contained in the budgets of Mr. Fielding, together with the surplus for this year, the increase of the public debt would have been about $270,000,000 instead of seventy-seven millions as it now is. I would also remind the House of the fact that only on six occasions in the financial history of this country, have there been actual reductions of the debt, namely, in 1871 when Sir Francis Hincks was the Minister of Finance, and when the reduction was $503,000; in 1872, when Sir Leonard Tilley was Minister of Finance, when the reduction was $1,734,129. These were the two occasions in which there was reduction of debt, under Conservative administration, but in the years 1900, 1903, 1904 and 1907 under a Liberal administration, there were reductions of the debt amounting to $15,112,128.

If to this the reduction for this year is added, then we find that under the administration of the Minister of Finance in the late government, there was a total debt reduction of approximately sixteen and a half million dollars which is another fact of which hon. gentlemen on this side of the House naturally feel proud. It might possibly be of interest, were I to give some facts in connection with the financial and material development of the country during the time the late government were charged with the responsibility of administering our public affairs, and I may say that I shall quote from the latest available statistics for the year 1911, the statistics for the present financial year not being yet available. The population of Canada has grown from 5,141,508 in 1897, to 7,207,122 in 1911, due largely to the vigorous immigration policy of the Liberal Government which was so severely criticised by the Conservatives when they were in opposition but which was so highly approved by the Minister of Finance this afternoon, and which we were delighted to hear it was the intention of the government to continue in the future. In 1897 our revenue was $40,555,000 and in 1911 it was $117,780,000.

This increase of revenue was obtainable without any increase in the rate of taxation, but rather after a slight reduction.

In 1897 our net debt was $261,538,000. In 1911, it was $340,143,000. While the debt per capita in 1897 was $50.87, in 1911 it was only $47.21, and in the financial year ending March 31, 1912, there will be a further diminution in the net debt per capita of this country.

Our import trade grew from $137,950,000 in 1897 to $290,000,000 in 1911, and our total trade expanded from $257,168,000 in 1897 to $769,440,000 in 1911. For the year ending November, 1911, it amounted to $817,000,000. It will be of interest also to notice that our total export trade to the United Kingdom in 1911 was $136,000,000. In the United Kingdom our products meet with world-wide competition and our export trade to the United Kingdom alone last year was practically equal to our total export trade in 1897, which was, in round figures, $137,000,000.

Inasmuch as our export trade is an accurate barometer of our real productive and industrial strength, because it is in that trade that we meet the world's competition, it would perhaps be not uninteresting to give to the House a summary of the development of the increase of our chief items of export trade. The comparison is graphically shown in the following table:—

Fiscal Year.	Great Britain.	United States.	Other Countries.	Total.
	$	$	$	$
Exports of Agricultural Produce—				
1897	13,507,342	2,419,814	2,055,490	17,982,646
1911	61,393,720	10,385,705	10,821,859	82,601,284
Exports of Manufactures—				
1897	3,617,128	3,213,677	2,691,209	9,522,014
1911	6,973,820	16,524,005	11,785,293	35,283,118
Exports of Fisheries—				
1897	4,366,081	2,998,655	2,949,587	10,314,323
1911	4,435,981	4,980,741	6,258,912	15,675,544
The Mines—				
1897	354,769	10,533,581	410,565	11,463,256
1911	6,726,015	33,129,505	2,932,041	42,787,561
The Forest—				
1897	14,059,585	15,435,759	1,643,385	31,258,729
1911	11,965,131	28,785,427	4,688,499	45,439,057
Animals and their Produce—				
1897	33,600,891	5,081,811	562,550	39,245,252
1911	40,636,575	10,063,544	1,544,055	52,244,174

I wish to point out to hon. gentlemen this further fact that of our total export trade of $290,000,000 in 1911, $238,000,000 was the products of the farm, the mine, the forest and the sea. It will thus be seen how essential it is to our material development to have a sufficient market for the expanding natural markets of this country.

Hon. gentlemen on this side of the House review with gratification these facts which record the development of Canada during that period of time when they were charged with the responsibility of administering the affairs of the country. I submit that it discloses a record which, when viewed dispassionately and without prejudice, is one of which we on this side of

the House may and do feel justly proud, and one which the country, I believe, will also regard as commendable. It may become more impressive when reviewed in the future comparatively with the financial and national development which will take place in this country under the ægis of the present government.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). At six o'clock I was observing that the record of the late government, during the period of fifteen years in which they were charged with the responsibility of administering the affairs of this country, was one of which Liberals justly and properly felt proud, and one which would be considered by the country generally as commendable. The advent of the Liberal party into power in 1896 was the occasion for dismal, doleful prophecies of chapters of financial and industrial stagnation in this country, and the arrest of the national development. History and experience, I submit, have disproven these prophecies of hon. gentlemen opposite and I would like to remind hon. gentlemen that although the electorate of this country have dismissed the late government and placed upon the treasury benches hon. gentlemen opposite, yet that in an important and critical period of the country's history, the late ministry did much for everything of national interest, and during its régime of power inaugurated and carried out well measured and courageous policies and calculated to accelerate the development of Canada and to help her to achieve that which is her manifest destiny.

I now wish briefly to refer to matters which relate strictly to the fiscal period of 1912-13. In common with other hon. gentlemen, I was pleased to note that the Minister of Finance anticipates being able to announce at the end of that period, or when he delivers his next budget, a very satisfactory year financially, that he expects sufficient revenue to at least meet all charges upon the consolidated fund. I was rather inclined to think that the Minister of Finance did not speak too hopefully of the financial results of 1912-13. However, I trust for the good of the country that the financial results to be announced by him when delivering his next budget, will be such as we can congratulate him and the country upon. The main estimates presented to parliament for the next fiscal year contemplate an expenditure of $104,919,000 on consolidated fund account, and $44,789,000 upon capital expenditure, to which there must be added the amount to be contained in the supplementary estimates which have not yet been presented to parliament. I regret very much that the Minister of Finance was unable this afternoon to announce, even approximately, what would be the amount of those estimates for the next fiscal year. I am not in a position, nor do I imagine is any other hon. gentleman, but the Minister of Finance himself and possibly the members of the government, to say what are likely to be the sums contained in the supplementary estimates. I would not be surprised if they total at least $20,000,000 or $25,000,000, and if they do, that will bring the total contemplated expenditure for the next fiscal year up to the sum of $170,000,000 or $175,000,000, which will be considerably in excess of the approximate expenditures of this year, which in round figures amounted to nearly $100,000,000. I would submit that for a new and young ministry who a few months ago pretended bewilderment at the late government's expenditures, the proposed expenditures for the coming year invite surprise, if not astonishment. To use words which the Minister of Trade and Commerce frequently used when criticising the predecessor of the present Minister of Finance: 'That is going some.' I must admit that a large proportion of the expenditures contemplated for 1912-13 contain financial commitments of the late government, and accordingly it would be unfair to charge them wholly upon the present government. However, I wish to remind the Minister of Finance of some things, and to warn him of other things in connection with public expenditures. It is true that the public expenditures under the late government increased very considerably, and to such I do not think the country will, or did object. The Liberal party will not object to any liberal expenditure made by the present government, nor in fact to any expenditure, calculated to develop the country and improve the condition of our people. But, the Conservative party when in opposition protested in parliament and out of parliament against the rising expenditure. The Minister of Trade and Commerce, I remember particularly, fulminated against the growing expenditures which were made by the late government, and he often told parliament many dismal stories of what was going to happen in this country by reason of such increased expenditures. I might paraphrase some of the criticisms which he made of our expenditures. He often told the late government that they were marching to financial disaster by reason of their increased expenditure, that he trembled at the thought of the weight and magnitude of our obligations, that we were not making provision for the days when 'men's souls would be tried,' that we were heaping up ordinary and capital

expenditures and making no provision for the days of stress which he always saw falling upon us, and that we ought to set our sails against the breakers which were looming ahead. In all of these criticisms he had the endorsement of his party, and I wonder this evening if the Minister of Trade and Commerce is dreaming such dreams now. Is he seeing such visions at the present time when he contemplates the increased expenditure proposed by the government for the next fiscal year, or does it happen that place and power give a different colouring to his outlook? I would like to place on record some statements by the Minister of Trade and Commerce condemnatory of our expenditures in the past, and I do submit, that if hon. gentlemen opposite were sincere in their protests against the expenditures made by the late government, surely they should implement the position they then took and make some reduction in those expenditures, or at least give parliament and the country reasons for their not doing it. If the present Minister of Finance wishes to carry out the policy and the promises of his present colleagues in connection with public expenditures, he must pay some heed to the criticisms which were made against the expenditures of the late government in the past. Now will the Minister of Finance kindly listen to this statement by his present colleague the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who was the severest critic of the Minister of Finance in the last parliament? In 1909-10 that hon. gentleman spoke as follows:

> The expenditure of this country in 1896 for all purposes was $41,000,000; in 1897 the expenditure was $43,000,000, a very slight addition; but in 1909 the expenditure has gone up to the enormous sum of $133,000,000, a little more than three times the expenditure of 1896. It is altogether easy and just as futile as easy, to say that the expenditure increased because the country has grown. The country is growing and the country's expenditure must grow. But here is a growth in expenditure which exceeds all corresponding growth in population, or in any other way that you may mention. It is an inordinate increase in expenditure.

I wonder what the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) would say this evening, were he speaking here, when he considers the fact that next year the Minister of Finance (Mr. White) proposes to make expenditures of from $170,000,000 to $175,000,000. Again, the Minister of Trade and Commerce said, in speaking of the amount of money expended by the Dominion from confederation up to 1897:

> Four and a half million people in twelve and three-quarters years has handed over to this government 828 million dollars, or an average of 65 millions per year. Now, the Minister of Finance may make his divisions and calculations with regard to the net debt, and set forth how much it is per head. That proves nothing. The point is: 'What are you taking out of the taxpayer of the country? What are you taking out to-day?' $11 to $12 per head, whereas in 1896 we took out a little less than $5.50 per head. This money you took out is money that comes from the man's earnings, it is so much abstracted from his capital. There ought to be no reason in the world for taking it, except that it is absolutely necessary that the aggregate of the people of the country should be governed, and that they should pay for it. Yet you have taken this immense amount of money, $65,000,000 per year during the last twelve and three-quarter years, or a total of $922,000,000, and in addition to that are the borrowings you have provided for.

I wonder what the Minister of Finance (Mr. White) would say to the Minister of Trade and Commerce if that hon. gentleman were to confront him with the criticism he levelled at the Minister of Finance in 1910. The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. White) this afternoon takes a contrary position. He asserted that it was proper to take from the people more revenue than was required for consolidated fund expenditure, to take sufficient, not only to meet these expenditures, but also such expenditures as are made on capital account. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) persistently and insistently made this criticism of the late government, as did his friends throughout the country, and to some degree, I have no doubt, they made an impression upon the country. And I say that the Minister of Finance, in taking the position he took this afternoon, takes a view which is directly the opposite of that which the party with which he is associated to-day, took when in opposition. Let me quote again from the Minister of Trade and Commerce. In 1906 he spoke as follows:

> Do gentlemen opposite ever stop to think of the years into which they are heading; of the tremendous responsibilities which they are soon to take up, and for ten years to continuously carry, whether this country be prosperous financially or whether it be in depression —do they know that they are marching into the teeth of a financial problem which should make every staid and shrewd financier almost tremble at the thought of the weight and magnitude of the obligations? But these gentleman are perfectly lighthearted. They are making no preparation for the coming day which may try men's souls in the Dominion.

Again the Minister of Trade and Commerce, in 1905, speaking on the subject of taxation, said:

> You can go up to a certain point with the taxation of your country, but when you go beyond that, you overburden the country. When you exceed that, you are spending the people's money unprofitably, and you are actually taking from their earnings capital

which, if not taken out, would be liable to produce itself ten, twenty, thirty—a hundredfold. The axiom is as true as the gospel that every dollar of unnecessary expenditure you take from the people is so much extracted from their remuneration and productive capital, which otherwise they would employ in the constant processes of production and reproduction.

Such were the protests of the Minister of Trade and Commerce against taxation which then probably amounted to $60,000,000 or $70,000,000 per annum. What would the hon. gentleman say if he were criticising the present Minister of Finance regarding the taxtion this year amounting to practically $100,000,000? I wonder what he would say of the taxation next year, which I estimate will amount to probably $120,000,000 from customs and excise.

Now, in order to show that the Conservative party, when in opposition, took a firm and pronounced stand against the increased expenditure of the government of that day and the amount of taxation taken from the people will hon. members opposite, and especially the Minister of Finance, listen to me while I read a portion of a campaign document which was widely circulated in this country in 1908? Possibly the Minister of Finance (Mr. White, Leeds) did not quite see eye to eye with that party in that year, but I am sure he will not object to my giving it to the House, and possibly it may convey to the hon. Minister a lesson respecting expenditure and taxation. This part of the document was headed 'Time for a Change.' A portion of it read as follows:—

TIME FOR A CHANGE.

Liberal-Conservatives do not claim that Canada can be administered without a reasonable increase in expenditures. As this country expands and develops, the demands for works and improvements multiply and must be reasonably met.

But with an increase of some 13 per cent in population, and granting a generous response to the call for improvement, no sane man can justify the headlong reckless rush of the past 12 years.

The immense taxation has been extracted from the earnings and savings of the toilers in such sums as stagger the thoughtful elector—27 millions in 1896 and 73 millions in 1908, and in these eleven years and nine months $229,000,000 more than would have been taken on the basis of 1896.

And still both taxation and expenditure go up by leaps of millions yearly.

Is it not time to turn over a new leaf? Mr. Borden and the Liberal-Conservative party stand for moderate taxation—reasonable expenditure.

That was the policy of the Conservative party in the campaign of 1908. Year after year until their accession to power they repeated this portion of their political gospel. I say that the country today might reasonably have expected an announcement from the Finance Minister something concerning a reduction in taxation and a reduction, or at least a halt, in expenditure. However, there was no such announcement; on the contrary there is information of increased expenditure if not increased taxation. In 1907, our customs and excise taxation amounted to $73,000,000; in 1908, it was $62,000,000; in 1909-10, it grew to $91,075,000, in 1911 to $89,000,000, and for 1912, I estimate it at $100,000,000, and I should not be surprised if it reached the sum of $120,000,000 next year. And still hon. gentlemen opposite seem to accept the situation quite contentedly, and we shall probably find no opposition on the part of the Minister of Trade and Commerce or any other gentleman opposite.

When I considers the high cost of living in this country, when one considers that it has increased so rapidly during the past few years, increasing even since the beginning of this year, I say we might have expected some intimation from the Minister of Finance that he proposed shortly to do something in the way of a diminution of taxation, in order if possible to bring about a reduction in the cost of living. Now I ask hon. gentlemen, were all their criticisms about expenses but partisan frothings, after all, and are they going to do that which they condemned in opposition? It looks that way. Everything indicates that. A bad start has been made. Let me issue to the Minister of Finance a warning that the party to which he belongs has a marvellous capacity for making large financial requests, that some of his colleagues are very expensive gentlemen indeed. They may have come in by the front door like the Minister of Finance, but while they had favours to seek, they apparently had requests to make. At least it looks that way to me, and I would like to give the minister some of the reasons which appear to me to support my fears.

Now the present government think it their duty to be interested in provincial affairs to an amazing degree, at least in those provinces having Conservative governments. Let us see how this has worked out up to date. It happened late last year that the general elections in the province of Prince Edward Island took place, and the Conservative party there looked to Ottawa for assistance for telegrams, for letters, for expenditures or promises of expenditures. The request was made for the establishment of a car-ferry service across the Northumberland Straits, a request was made that the Prince Edward Island Rail-

way should be made as wide as the Canadian Pacific railway or other roads, in other words standardized, and the Prime Minister promised the same. I am not protesting against the expenditure, but what amazes me is the shocking wickedness of the Prime Minister of this country in making this promise at a time when the Prince Edward Island provincial elections were about to be held, and what is more shocking still to me, he made this promise, not to the government of Prince Edward Island, not to the Premier of Prince Edward Island, but to a member of this House supporting his government. Now who would have believed this of the Prime Minister of Canada, he who, in the past, was always so correct, so circumspect, and so proper in such things.

But more shocking still, this telegram was made public. I can hardly believe that the Prime Minister intended that this telegram should be kept secret, and its contents locked in the bosom of the recipient. I do really think that the Prime Minister thought that this would be made public, and it was. Now, I submit to the Finance Minister that this will cost the country something. It is not the proposed expenditure that I object to so much, as it is the intent to encourage requests for expenditure. I submit that the Minister of Finance hearafter, will do well to keep watch upon his leader in matters of expenditure.

Then last fall Sir James Whitney thought the time opportune to ask the people of Ontario to renew its confidence in his government. In his manifesto, he told the people of Ontario that, a Conservative party being in power at Ottawa, the provincial government would receive more generous financial aid for the many public services of that province. I think it was said, if not by Sir James Whitney, then by some friend of his government, that the Ontario government contemplated asking the federal government for the ordinary railway subsidy for the Ontario government railway. I dare say this will come. It will cost something to have my hon. friend the Minister of Railway and Canals, the old colleague of Sir James Whitney, in this government. The Minister of Railways will remember his provincial leader. I have no means of computing what it is going to cost this country to have the Minister of Railways here, but I have not the slightest hesitancy in saying that it will cost something at least.

But it is when we come to the province of Manitoba that we find political friendships do cost something. When the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers) forsook his political fireside at Winnipeg, everybody in this country knew that it would cost Canada something. We know it now. We have an idea of what it has cost up to date. In round figures it is about $2,175,000. That is what it has cost Canada to get the Minister of the Interior, and that is what Mr. Roblin gets by losing the Minister of the Interior. A pure gift, a gratuity, with absolutely no consideration whatever, is about to be awarded to the province of Manitoba. And worse still, it does not perturb the Minister of the Interior in the slightest degree. He was as calm, and placid and cool when he was assisting the other day in transferring this $2,100,000 from Ottawa to Winnipeg, as he is when he places a contribution upon the offering plate in the sanctuary upon the first day of the week. He was so unperturbed, that I fear he is probably meditating another attack upon the treasury. It may be true that the government of Manitoba needed the money, perhaps they need more. But it is the costly colleagues of the Minister of Finance against which I wish to warn him. There is evident everywhere an intent to make financial attacks upon the federal treasury by the provincial governments favourable to the present ministry.

But a still greater danger is looming up before the Minister of Finance of which I wish now to give him warning. When that young, debonair statesman, **Mr. McBride**, leaves his capital on the Pacific coast, and crosses the mountains and prairies and comes to Ottawa to make his demand upon the Dominion treasury, he will prove a very costly political ally.

He was promised arbitration some years ago. He will insist on a substantial amount. If Manitoba, which elected a few Liberals, cost this country $2,100,000, what will British Columbia be entitled to which did not elect a single Liberal member? That is a political and mathematical problem. I cannot figure it out. I do not know what the end will be.

Why, Mr. McBride, will say to the Minister of the Interior: My mountains are greater than yours, my coast line is greater than yours and the Minister of the Interior will say: Aye, aye. I say that he will cost the treasury of this country a great deal and if the Minister of Finance had been listening to me very carefully as I pointed out to him the costly colleagues and friends by whom he is surrounded he would have been thinking, when figuring in his own mind the possible cost of the friendship of the British Columbia government, of a few lines of the famous hymn of Cardinal Newman:

> I do not wish to see the distant scene,
> One step enough for me.

The hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) was 'in extremis' during the last election, or at least some of his friends were. In his county or some near-by constituency

some friends of the Conservative party felt that the Dominion government should reimburse to them the losses that they suffered by reason of the failure of the Farmers' Bank. Immediately the Minister of Labour proceeds to make such people feel that they have a legitimate claim upon the treasury of the country for reimbursement of their losses. He promised them a commission of investigation. A commission has been appointed and I am sure that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and I think people generally in the country, will agree with me when I say that the appointment of such commission will be both useless, and mischievous and that it is to be regetted that the government ever appointed such a commission for such a purpose. The commission will cost something and, therefore, I say that the Minister of Labour is another expensive colleague. The hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Hughes) is engaging in extraordinary expenditures in his department. He is arming the youth of the land. He has recently made the purchase, I believe, of twenty-four automobiles for the general staff and I suppose that next year he will be purchasing automobiles for the boy scouts and air ships for the generals. I warn the Minister of Finance that he must keep an eye on the Minister of Militia as well as his other colleagues.

There are one or two other instances which I might give to the Minister of Finance to indicate the marvellous capacity of his political friends to make requests for expenditures.

His leader, the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) during the last election, made it one of the planks of his platform, that the government would liquidate the medical charges and the cost of medicine required by the shore fishermen of this country, and, by the way, that is one of the promises that we have not heard anything about being implemented by the government. The Prime Minister evidently has a capacity to promise, and I warn the Minister of Finance that his capacity of promising will yet prove costly. Again, the governments of Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick sent a delegation here approaching the government with the request to refund to such provinces a portion of the award to the Canadian government under the Washington Treaty amounting I think to about $5,000,000. I do not know what portion these two provinces claim. I only mention this, as I do these other matters to indicate that the Minister of Finance is in company with political friends who are very free to promise and who will make serious inroads into the revenue of this country if permitted so to do. I do not wonder that the Minister of Finance this afternoon was unable to speak glowingly in his estimates of revenues and expenditures for the fiscal year 1912-13.

I cannot help but say that I regret the statement made by the Minister of Finance this afternoon respecting the National Transcontinental railway. I do not propose to discuss the cost of this railway. The Minister, however, spoke as if the late government were guilty of expenditures of money in this connection, which were decidedly open to criticism, and he apparently wished to reassure the public abroad that this expenditure, though improvident and unnecessarily excessive need cause no concern. I deny the right of any man in this country to say that the cost of the eastern section of the National Transcontinental railway from Winnipeg to Moncton is unnecessarily excessive. I say that no man who wishes to debate this matter fairly and honestly can make such a statement. The statement submitted to parliament by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) some few weeks ago, was a very unfair one, and when I mention to the House the fact that in that cost was included the first seven years' interest, I point out how manifestly unfair the statement was. The country expected that possibly and probably the National Transcontinental railway would be unable to earn interest during the first seven years, and believing it to be a work of great necessity, they were willing to pledge the additional credit of the country to the extent of paying the first seven years' interest.

It is absurd for any one to urge that the first seven years interest is a part of the cost of that railway. I challenge any hon. gentleman in this House to name a railway that originally was constructed up to the standard of the National Transcontinental railway and that was built for less money, bearing in mind the nature of the country traversed, labour conditions, and costs generally. The average capitalization of American railways to-day is about $60,000 per mile which merely represents the present outstanding securities, but the history of seventy-five per cent of American railways is that they have passed through the receiver's hands not once but several times, and in many instances many series of securities were wiped out. Then again, it is worthy of note that the average capitalization of European railways is from $175,000 to $250,000 per mile. I resent the imputation frequently made by hon gentlemen opposite that the cost of this railway has been unduly and improperly augmented. No

railway that I know of was ever in its original construction up to the high standard of the Transcontinental, and when it is once completed it will require very little indeed for betterments. I was speaking the other day to a railway man of experience concerning that portion of the Transcontinental railway located in New Brunswick, the value of which the hon gentlemen opposite have cast doubt upon, and he assured me that he would be willing to take that section of the road over tomorrow and to pay interest upon the cost of construction.

I wish now to refer to a matter which, on the 21st day of September last carried joy to the hearts of hon. gentlemen opposite. For what reason I cannot understand, whenever the subject of the late election is mentioned in this House hon. gentlemen opposite are fond of saying: drop your talk about reciprocity, whereas one would assume that if in their judgment it was extremely unpopular in the country they would be very much interested in having us talk of it. The late election, in an unusual degree engaged the interest of the public and it terminated in a change of ministry.

The real issue involved in that campaign was one of taxation and markets and was concreted in the form of a tariff convention made with the United States, subject to change by either party to the agreement at any time, and, that agreement related almost entirely to the interchange of natural products. The government of the day unable to secure parliamentary ratification of this agreement, and upon challenge from the opposition, submitted the issue to the people. Whether, in the election it was, or was not possible to avoid the intrusion of other issues, it is difficult to determine, but it is undeniably true that the introduction of other issues in the different provinces militated against a mature, thoughtful, and fair consideration of the issue, which both parties agreed for submission to the people. To that extent the result was indeterminative and unsatisfactory. Further, this tariff agreement with the United States, lent itself to the invocation of passions and prejudices, and influences which were not calculated to secure a reasoned judgment upon an international agreement. Interests in the United States, hostile to the competition of their Canadian neighbours in their own markets, transferred to this country their opposition, and by a strange irony of fate, on the other hand, ambiguous utterances by many prominent men in the United States, friendly to the agreement, also brought about consternation. Further when one considers how keenly and aggressively a new party in the province of Quebec, (then recently affianced to the Conservative party, but now about to be divorced) captured the popular imagination in that province upon other issues; when one considers that undeniably racial and religious prejudices were raised in another great province, and that other extraneous issues in other provinces precluded in varying degrees a fair expression of public opinion, I say notwithstanding all these considerations, the Canadian people by a small vote, defeated the issue. However, the result of the election is, that the people of Canada are taken to have declared against this international agreement to revise concurrently with the United States the tariff of both countries. I do not take it that the people of Canada have pronounced against wider markets for the purchaser, and consumer alike in certain commodities. I take it that the people of Canada have not pronounced against economic conditions which would ensure wider opportunities for certain classes of producers to sell, and wider opportunities for certain classes of consumers to buy. The desire of men, as well as of nations, is to produce and to interchange trade, in order primarily to satisfy human necessities, and, in the second place, to accummulate national and individual reserves of wealth, which is the natural ambition of all peoples and countries.

Hon. gentlemen opposite are correct in saying that this agreement is dead because it was defeated, fairly or unfairly, but I say most sincerely that that agreement was at least pregnant with tremendous advantages to Canada and her people, and its essential features will be and are to-day a living issue in this country. The agreement was negatived, it is true; one political party was disappointed, another was made happy, but I do say that if that agreement had been defeated by a more sober, fair, truthful and intelligent campaign directed against it, the verdict would have been received with more acceptance by a large section of the Canadian people who believed in it.

It was not an unnatural thing in the past to find Canadians seeking better and wider trade relations with the United States, a nearby country. The government of to-day when in opposition continuously taunted the then government with not obtaining reciprocity, particularly in natural products. I remember that when the French treaty was under discussion in 1909, almost every gentleman of prominence in the then opposition ranks, from you, Mr. Speaker, down, protested that it might be dangerous to put into force this French treaty as it might eventually prove an impediment in obtaining reciprocity with the United States.

I remember also that in 1910 when there was under discussion in this House the question of a revision of our tariff in

order to render it possible for the president of the United States to declare that the maximum features of the Payne-Aldrich tariff should not be imposed against this country, hon. gentlemen opposite, then in opposition, declared most stoutly that some form of reciprocal trade with the United States, in natural products especially, was absolutely essential to the development of Canada. It was secured, and our friends opposite said the measure was dangerous. The House will remember that Canada was the only country that was to receive any benefits under that particular trade agreement, at least it did not apply to any other country. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite was it all bad, or was it bad in parts? Will they undertake to eliminate or separate the good features from the bad, and obtain such an agreement from the United States, if it is obtainable, in any part? They object to formal trade agreements or conventions with countries, but I say there is a large section of the Canadian people to-day who desire larger markets than we now possess, and I ask hon. gentlemen opposite will they obtain for our people these wider markets, and if so, from whom will they get them? The Liberal party, I take it, believe in increasing as much as possible the markets for our productions, particularly our natural productions which must increase in tremendous proportions. It believed that by reciprocity we could obtain this without doing any violence to any interest in this country. We did not believe that it was dangerous to the national existence or the hegemony of the race to increase our trade with a country with whom we do one half of our total trade. I say that such ideas, with all due respect to the judgment rendered by the electorate, were but the figments of the feverish fancy of those who seek political power or those who seek restriction in trade for their own good alone. In the very nature of things trade north and south on this continent is inevitable. That is the case to-day but of course it will be limited for many years to come to certain classes of production. Communication between nations is as valuable and as desirable as communication between men. It is unfortunate that old and historical misunderstandings create in Canada and the United States an instinctive inclination towards separation or hostility, but is it wise? Will this view stand the test of time? What will be the judgment of the people of this country in years to come? In Canada, our fiscal policy is founded upon tariffs. It was but natural that in this country the tariff should be made the means of raising revenue. Any other form of taxation was almost impossible, at least it would not be popular. According to the view of many, it is the most costly form of taxation, but after all I think I can fairly say that it was the most available and the most popular. That being our fiscal system in Canada it was only natural that into the tariff should creep the element that we denominate as protection, particularly in manufactured products. The Liberal party was not hostile to the industrial development of this country. There is no evidence to be found of that attitude in the fifteen years of administration given to this country by the Liberal party. The development of industries in Canada during the period of their administration is proof of this. True, some reductions were made in the tariff, reductions perhaps very much more substantial than most people recognize. There was a gradual diminution of, ending in the cessation of some bounties, as well as tariff reduction, but when these reductions were made there were compensations in the way of reductions of duty on raw material or otherwise. A revision of a tariff does not mean necessarily the extinction of a tariff. I repeat that there was no evidence of hostility against the industrial interests of this country in that agreement which was submitted to the electorate last year, but rather, on the contrary, there were tokens of carefulness to abstain from the inclusion of the products of manufacturers lest any danger by competition might befall our industrial life in competition with a much larger, stronger and older country. The offer of inclusion, I understand was made by the United States, but was refused on the grounds I have stated, and I deny what was apparently the conclusion of many manufacturing interests in this country, that in the recent election, restricted reciprocal trade mostly in the natural products with the United States meant danger to the industrial life of this country.

On the contrary Liberals believed it meant greater contentment among the producers of exportable surpluses of natural products, which include a majority of our population. They believed it meant the enhancement of the producing and purchasing power of that class, thus automatically working towards the development of our industrial life, and thus increasing the producing and purchasing power of the community. The government say that freer trade relations with the United States of any kind is impossible. There was not a single article mentioned in any one of the schedules which they did not object to, and I suppose, speaking frankly, that any form of reciprocity of tariff or trade arrangements which might be made with the United States would be objectionable to hon. gentlemen opposite. But I say the

problem to-day confronts them of finding for the producers of this country a market for their surplus products which are growing rapidly and for which a market must be found somewhere. The Minister of Finance said this afternoon that this agreement was defeated on national and economic grounds. I do not quite understand what he means by national grounds, but at any rate I do not propose discussing the point. It might be well, however, to inquire briefly if the economic reasons advanced by some people in Canada for opposing this agreement at the last election, obtain and find favour in all parts of the Dominion to-day. I wish to deal briefly with the question of markets prospectively for our surplus products, particularly in the western portion of Canada, and I want to inquire how far the interests present and future, of that section of Canada have been affected by the judgment expressed by the electorate of Canada last September. I suppose I might discuss some matters which relate chiefly to my own province. It would be a very easy matter for instance, to discuss the matter of our fish production in the maritime provinces, and as to how they might be affected by placing those products upon the free list in Canada and the United States. In my province the Conservative party stated that reciprocity in fish would be a bad thing for Nova Scotia. I deny the ability of any man to present a single intelligent argument in support of that contention. I deny even that it is arguable.

Mr. CURRIE. Does the hon. gentleman think that free coal would be a good thing for Nova Scotia?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). That is another matter altogether. Free coal did not figure in any of the schedules to which I refer. Let me put to you in two or three words the position of the maritime provinces in so far as fish is concerned. I will take my own province as an illustration, a province which produces and exports several million dollars worth of fish products, and which does not import any. Then consider the condition of affairs in Canada and the United States generally. The United States imports about $14,000,000 worth of fish annually, and exports about $7,000 chiefly composed of canned salmon, and which come from the Pacific coast. She imported $5,000,000 worth of fish from Canada, a great portion of which comes from the maritime provinces. Now can any hon. gentleman suggest to me the possibility that the removal of the tariff upon fish products in the United States and Canada could adversely affect the fishing interests of the province of Nova Scotia? Let no hon. gentleman believe that any section, or any county, in the province of Nova Scotia declared against reciprocity on account of the belief that it would be disastrous to these interests. Hon. gentlemen opposite could not argue against it; they did not pretend to do so. They resorted to misrepresentation of the issue. They said: 'Reciprocity in fish was all right, but many things would happen.' They said for one thing, that the Island of Porto Rico was not a part of the United States, which was an obvious untruth. They said that the agreement surrendered our territorial waters to the American fishermen, which was absolutely incorrect. They said the agreement imperilled the fishing bounties granted to the Canadian fishermen, which was absolutely absurd. They said the agreement would result in the colony of Newfoundland, by legislation, preventing our fishermen from obtaining bait in the waters of that colony, which was absolutely impossible. And, upon these several false positions it is true, they caused a considerable portion of the electors of the province of Nova Scotia to believe that possibly the agreement in so far as fish was concerned was not in their interest. I wish now to discuss this matter from the view point of the western portion of Canada, and particularly the three prairie provinces. I would ask hon. gentlemen if they believe that everything is well in the provinces of Manitoba, Alberta, and Saskatchewan. A few evenings ago, the Minister of Finance said that the west was the commercial hope of Canada. The unusual prosperity we have enjoyed in Canada in recent years has been largely, if not wholly, due to the development of the three prairie provinces. The story of the west in the last few years shortly told, is simply two words: 'Immigration' and 'production.' The west grew and the industries of the east grew as a consequence. The western country produced at a low cost and with little capital, grain, the surplus of which, was exported out of the country, and thus helped to meet our indebtedness to other countries from whom we purchased. We have been inducing into that western country immigrants by the thousands, and the Minister of Finance this afternoon, said he hoped they would continue to come in the same numbers in the future. I want to present to the House some evidence of the growth and development which has occurred in these three provinces of recent years, and later to inquire how that future may be affected by the want of markets for their surplus production. That is only a fair question for me to put to the hon. gentlemen opposite, because only a few months ago, they were arguing that it was absolutely unsound to send our surplus natural products, into the United States. In order to lay down certain premises, from which I may later

draw a conclusion, respecting the development of the country, let me give the House a few figures respecting the population of the prairie provinces to show how it has grown, how its productions have grown, and to impress upon the government if I can, the serious problem of markets which confronts them in the three provinces referred to. The following is the population of the three prairie provinces in the years 1901, 1906 and 1911, which I give to the House for the purpose of indicating the great increase of the farming population in these provinces. Just what proportion is rural I cannot tell. It will indicate however a great increase in the number of producers :

1. POPULATION.

—	Alberta.	Manitoba.	Sask.	Total.
April 1, 1901	73,022	255,211	91,279	419,022
" 1906	185,412	365,668	257,763	808,843
June 1, 1911	374,663	456,614	492,432	1,322,709

Now, I wish to give some figures respecting the increase in production and acreage of production in these provinces, not only as a matter of interest to hon. members, but that it may be of record:

ACREAGE AND PRODUCTION OF OATS IN MANITOBA, SASKATCHEWAN AND ALBERTA.

	Manitoba.		Saskatchewan.		Alberta.		Total.	
Year.	Acreage.	Production in bushels.	Acreage.	Production in bushels.	Acreage.	Production in bushels.	Acreage.	Production in bushels.
1895	482,658	22,555,733						
1900	529,108	8,814,312	96,173	1,604,561	77,616	2,625,581	702,897	13,044,454
1905	1,031,293	45,484,024	449,936	19,213,055	242,801	9,514,180	1,724,030	74,211,259
1910	1,486,436	42,647,766	2,082,607	63,315,295	492,589	12,158,530	4,061,632	105,963,061
1911	1,260,736	57,893,000	2,124,057	97,962,000	1,178,410	56,964,000	4,563,203	212,819,000

ACREAGE AND PRODUCTION OF WHEAT IN MANITOBA, SASKATCHEWAN AND ALBERTA.

1895	1,040,276	31,775,038						
1900	1,457,396	13,025,252	382,540	3,443,671	30,361	583,806	1,870,297	17,052,729
1905	2,643,588	53,761,416	1,130,084	26,107,286	107,527	2,306,524	3,881,199	82,175,226
1910	2,962,187	39,916,391	4,664,834	72,666,399	592,960	7,904,524	8,219,981	120,487,310
1911	2,979,734	60,275,000	4,704,650	97,665,000	1,616,899	36,143,000	9,301,293	194,533,000

Since 1906 there has been an average annual increase of 20 per cent in the total wheat yield of Manitoba. Saskatchewan and Alberta. In the same period there has been an average annual increase of 16 per cent in the acreage under wheat cultivation. Providing that this rate of increase is continued, the yield for 1915 will be in the neighbourhood of 403,383,628 bushels, and the acreage under cultivation 16,841,283 acres.

Now, hon. gentlemen opposite, I say, are confronted with this condition of affairs—that by 1915 or 1916, if the percentages of past years continue, that country will be producing 400,000,000 bushels of wheat. I dare say that this will be accomplished or nearly so. It must be remembered that conditions in the west to-day compare more favourably, than in the western states of the United States in their earlier days, for rapid increase of production. Transportation is much more accessible for intending immigrants, and improved agricultural machinery enable the farmers to reclaim a greater acreage than was possible in any one season years ago. What will become of this surplus

production of wheat, is the question I submit to hon. gentlemen opposite? They talk as if Canada was about the only country in the world which produces a surplus of wheat and that the question of markets for Canadian grain was a trivial matter. Let me read to the House the names of countries which produce wheat, and oats and barley as well, in excess of their own needs, and some of which produce for export far more than Canada:

PRODUCTION OF WHEAT, OATS AND BARLEY IN VARIOUS COUNTRIES, 1911.

Country.	Wheat.	Oats.	Barley.
	Bush.	Bush.	Bush.
United States	658,567,000	792,917,000	142,871,000
Russia (E)	629,300,000	866,801,000	436,496,000
British India	370,413,000	...	
France	320,142,000	329,675,000	50,956,000
Canada	204,634,000	368,153,000	51,559,000
Hungary	192,691,000	90,616,000	75,898,000
Italy	192,397,000	38,561,000	10,880,000
Spain	156,640,000	31,996,000	89,802,000
Roumania	95,657,000	26,929,000	26,378,000
Prussia	86,265,000	317,884,000	71,703,000
Great Britain and Ireland	63,646,000	174,809,000	60,165,000
Japan	20,572,000	4,364,000	94,523,000
Algeria	17,821,000	12,865,000	23,612,000
Belgiuim	14,617,000	38,921,000	4,595,000
Tunis	6,625,000	2,685,000	7,340,000
Netherlands	5,648,000	17,426,000	3,664,000
Denmark	4,646,000	47,916,000	24,656,000
Switzerland	3,606 000	4,646,000	462,000
Luxemburg	641,000	3,259,000	69,000
Swe	...	69,196,000	15,335,000

Hon. gentlemen opposite argued during the last campaign that the object of the western farmer should be to sell more in the British market, they seemed to argue that the people of the United Kingdom could and would consume the total surplus wheat production of Canada. Let us see what that market consumes. The United Kingdom consumes about 200,000,000 or 210,000,000 bushels of wheat annually. For the eleven months of the year ending November, 1911, its imports of wheat from the leading countries of the world were as follows: From India, 28,000,000 bushels; from Russia, 27,000,000 bushels; from Argentina, 25,000,000 bushels; from Australia, 22,000,000 bushels; from Canada, 22,000,000 bushels, and from the United States 18,000,000 bushels. It is quite evident that Great Britain will in the future purchase wheat from all the countries from which she buys to-day so long as they have any to sell. For instance, it is an improbable thing that the United Kingdom will not import from Argentina, a country in which she enjoys a great volume of trade and in whose development she is financially interested to a very great extent. Considering the United Kingdom's consumption of wheat to-day, is limited and not likely to increase, I ask hon. gentlemen opposite, what will become of the surplus production of wheat in this country when it reaches, say three or four hundred million bushels? The Englishman is rather a determined character, and I do not think it possible that the Conservative party of Canada can force him to eat 400,000,000 bushels of wheat when he only requires 200,000,000. 'What we have we'll hold,' is one of the mottoes of the Britisher; but while he insists upon holding what he has, he will be just as strong in refusing to take what he does not want. It is impossible to expect that the United Kingdom can consume or will purchase any large proportion of the surplus wheat that this country will have in a few years. Our population, no matter how rapidly it grows, can consume only a small portion of our total production. Hon. gentlemen opposite said during the last election that our wheat must not be exported to the United States, and that it was a bad thing to have wheat trade run in that direction. If that were true, the United States could injure Canada instantly, simply by removing their duty upon Canadian wheat, thus allowing our wheat to flow into that country as demanded. According to hon. gentlemen opposite that would be disastrous to this country. How helpless we are to prevent this event if the United States simply re-

moved the duty upon wheat. Now, what has happened since September last? Do hon. gentlemen opposite entertain the same views that they did a few months ago?

I do not think so. It is only a few weeks ago now, that the Minister of Trade and Commerce, was compelled to ask the Inter-State Commerce Commission of the United States to fix a freight rate for wheat for export, later to fix a traffic rate for wheat for milling in bond, and later to fix a traffic rate for wheat exported to the United States for consumption. That hardly agrees with the position which hon. gentlemen opposite took a few months ago. If that direction of wheat trade is a necessity and is proper to-day, why was it so objectionable a few months ago? Hon. gentlemen opposite attribute this circumstance to what they call unusual conditions. Well, there were some unusual conditions. The harvest was late, it is true; and the railways were unable to handle the whole quantity of wheat available for export. It is true, the conditions are unusual. But the unusual conditions are, that western Canada is producing grain and other products at a rate which no other country in the world has done, and these unusual conditions I submit, will prevail in the future. I say it is an improbable thing that the Canadian railways for a great number of years to come, will be able to handle the surplus productions of the west, which will be available for export.

Now, hon. gentlemen opposite in the past taunted the Liberal party for not securing markets for the surplus productions of this western country. As I have said, the opportunity came and they attempted to secure the same. The west, the commercial hope of Canada, needed additional markets for its surplus productions, and the late government sought a remedy for this condition of affairs. Hon. gentlemen opposite opposed their efforts, with the result that this possible remedy has passed away from the Canadian west. I would like hon. gentlemen opposite to tell this House and this country how they are going to meet the necessities of the three western provinces for a market for their surplus productions, which are very great this year, and which will rapidly grow from year to year. Is it to be wondered that there is unrest in the west to-day? Can you expect them to be satisfied with a restricted purchasing market after refusing them the right to extend their selling markets? Is it any wonder they are restive under our tariff exactions? I think they have a substantial grievance. It calls for a remedy. Now, Sir, in the year 1910, the present Prime Minister, while speaking upon the address at the opening of parliament, discussed the similarity between the conditions in western Canada and the conditions in the western States. He was referring to the matter of the recent visit of the present leader of the opposition to that western country, and was commenting upon the addresses which were made to him. The present Prime Minister said:

> So I come for a moment to the visit of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister to the west. I observed that he was met in western Canada by some of these very problems to which I have alluded. One of the very first questions which he encountered in meeting various delegations and assemblages of the people in that country was that of the tariff, and I am bound to say that in some of the addresses which were presented to him, and in some of the speeches which were made to him by the spokesman of these various delegations, the Prime Minister found as I have no doubt, a very close and perhaps very interesting reminiscence of some speeches which he delivered in that great western country in the year 1894.

He continues:

> Well, the farmers of the west were so much bewildered by what my right hon. friend said out there that they are coming down here 500 strong on the 16th of December to find out what it all means. When they arrive, I hope he will have something a little more definite to tell them than what he told them in his speech to which I have just alluded.
>
> Speaking of his policy, he said at Saskatoon:
>
> It will aim, having in view the commonweal of our common country, to go as far as may be justifiable towards the trade policy of England.
>
> That is exactly what the west complains of. It complains that his policy has only been aiming for the past 15 years and up to the present has not hit anything—certainly not hit anything in the shape of what the right hon. gentleman submitted as his policy in 1894.

Well, I submit Sir, that under that agreement, which was the issue in the recent election, the then Prime Minister and his government did make an honest endeavour to obtain some additional markets and to meet the claims of these western provinces in some degree in the way of tariff concessions. The present Prime Minister will hear the western farmers. Again the Prime Minister says:

> But the farmers of the west say something more. They say there ought to be lower duties on agricultural implements, that they are paying higher prices for Canadian implements than these implements are sold for abroad. I say the government is derelict in its duty in not having brought down to parliament direct and positive information on this subject, and I say that if the claims that are made are true there ought to be a remedy. And I want to know from the government whether they believe them to be true or not. If they say that they do not know, I ask why they have not taken means to know; if they say that these claims are not true, I ask upon what

evidence they base that assertion and what they propose to do in the premises.

Well, now, one would expect that the present Prime Minister after taunting the present leader of the opposition, and his party, thus, for not having obtained that which the west was then demanding, namely, markets, taunting the then government for not having something to say respecting the wishes of the farmer, respecting the cost of agricultural implements, one would expect, I say, from the Minister of Finance, speaking on the behalf of the government, to hear something on the matter of markets and tariffs, both of which are of such interest to the prairie provinces. One might have expected to hear from the government a statement to the effect that they had made some investigation as to whether agricultural implements manufactured in Canada were selling at higher rates in the Canadian west than in the American west, and if they found that to be the case that they were providing a remedy such as they said the present leader of the opposition should have found.

Hon. gentlemen, when they were in opposition, promised this country time and time again that they could find ample markets somewhere for our surplus products. They condemned the late government for not doing so. I have in my hand a campaign document of the Conservative party. I would just like to refer to it and when I have finished it I will conclude my remarks. This political document is entitled 'Where are the new markets'? That is a question that is quite apropos to be asked of the government to-day. That is a question that a great number of people in this country, and particularly in the west, are asking themselves:

> The Liberals were to open up markets for farm produce in the United States and other countries. Have they done so?

Well, we tried to but failed. The government party opposed our efforts. Hon. gentlemen opposite now have their opportunity. Will they obtain markets in the United States or in any other country?

> The British market is free as before, but no more so. The embargo against Canadian cattle remains, and will be harder to remove because of our freer quarantine relations with the United States.

Hon. gentlemen promised this country to obtain preferential rates in the British market. Will they do so? Will they undertake to obtain the removal of the embargo against Canadian cattle? A preference in the British market upon food products is a thing that I do not anticipate can be brought about by the present government nor do I believe it is likely ever to happen. As my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) remarked the other night, at the opening of the British House of Commons a few days ago the Prime Minister asked the leader of the opposition, Mr. Bonar Law, what had become of the usual amendment to the address respecting tariff reform. He asked him if tariff reform had gone on a long journey or if it was taking the rest cure. However, hon. gentlemen opposite have been promising this country for many years that they could obtain preferential treatment for Canadian products in the United Kingdom. It is up to these hon. gentlemen now to implement their promise and they boast constantly of their ability and intention to implement their promises. This pamphlet goes on to say:

> The United States duty on our farm products is still prohibitive.

Are hon. gentlemen opposite going to obtain a reduction? Are they going to diminish the prohibition or will they remove the prohibition altogether? Then it says further:

> The German market, which will take millions of our farm products, has been absolutely closed to Canada by the surtax added to the high tariff.

That difficulty has been removed. We will not trouble hon. gentlemen with that task. The statement goes on:

> The West Indies have raised their duties against us in spite of our preferenec to them.

Within a few days there will meet in conference in Ottawa with members of the Canadian government delegates from the West Indies, and one of the purposes of that conference is the discussion of a preference tariff rate on Canadian exports in the British West Indies. I trust the conference will be successful and that when it has concluded they will be able to announce an arrangement by which Canada may export her products to the British West Indies under a preference tariff rate. But, I doubt very much whether it is possible of accomplishment. There are one or two matters which will develop Canadian trade with the British West Indies to a very much greater degree possibly than a tariff preference; I refer particularly to the improvement of transportation and reduction of cable rates. But, if we were to obtain increased markets in Australia and the British West Indies, as the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) desires and hopes, it means ultimately very little, and by no means will it satisfy the demands of the Canadian people for increased markets.

I am sure that the country will be much disappointed to-day that in the first budget presented by the government to parlia-

ment and the country, there was not some intimation from the government or from the Minister of Finance that they were about to implement their promise to reduce public expenditures, and to reduce the rate of taxation. There will be great disappointment in the country that they did not announce what is to be the tariff policy of the government in the future.

Mr. EMMERSON. What is the date of the document from which the hon. gentleman quoted?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). 1908. We shall soon learn, I assume, whether the government will practise in the future what they preached in the past, and we will soon be in a position to determine whether they can give to this country the many things they promised.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a good deal of interest to the new Minister of Finance (Mr. White) making his first deliverance in this House, and I have also listened with interest to the first deliverance of the new financial critic of the opposition (Mr. A. K. Maclean). I intend to take little notice of what either of them said, other than to compliment them on the way they presented their cases. But, I wish to say that while I agree largely with what has been said by the new Minister of Finance in regard to the financial condition of Canada, I was disappointed on account of the absence of any reference to a matter of the greatest importance.

In that speech there was no reference to the question of Canada's participation in Imperial defence, and that is a question which to my mind stands out away and beyond and above any question which has come before us for discussion this session. For some years past the British Empire has been in jeopardy; her supremacy has been threatened, and the British people are concerned as to the fate of that glorious empire in the great war which seems to be impending. That is the one and supreme question of the day for loyal Canadians as well as for all other British subjects, and hence it is that I regret a reference to it found no part in the speech of the Minister of Finance. The hon. gentleman told us that the progress of Canada depended on the rush of immigration and on the rush of money from Britain for purposes of development. England is the fountain-head of our money supply, and unless England is maintained supreme in her political power and in her commercial wealth, then England cannot supply the money for the development of the resources of the associated states of the empire. The financial requirements of Canada to-day are not millions but billions. Millions are required to complete our railway systems, to increase railway accommodation in the Canadian west, to establish the great steamship lines that have become absolutely necessary in the interests of our trade, to build our ocean terminals, to develop our natural resources and to increase our expanding industrial enterprises. From the motherland alone can we obtain that money, and should that threatened war come to-day or to-morrow, and should Great Britain be compelled to spend vast sums for her defence, then will the supplies of money from the motherland to Canada be cut off and consequent disaster overtake our enterprises. The Grand Trunk Pacific, the Canadian Northern, the Canadian Pacific railway, our great steamship companies, our municipalities, our provinces, the Dominion itself, have to go to the London market to secure the money they need, and for our own self-preservation, if not in furtherance of the higher Imperial ideas which ought to actuate all British subjects, it is necessary for us to join in the maintenance of the supremacy of the British Empire. We were told to-day in the budget speech that for three successive years, we have had a surplus of $30,000,000 a year, and would it be too much to ask of the people of Canada that they should donate five million or ten million dollars a year of that surplus for Imperial defence at this time of momentous crisis in the history of the empire? Would it be too much to ask Canada that she should vote ten million dollars a year to help maintain the supremacy of the British fleet, and also to maintain what I believe in, a Canadian navy in this country. If we borrowed five hundred million dollars from the old land (and we will have to borrow it within the next year or two) we could get that money at say, four per cent, and at four per cent the interest on five hundred million dollars would be twenty million dollars annually. Would it not be a wise step if we gave an additional two per cent., or say six per cent in all, on five hundred million dollars and contributed the extra two per cent. of $10,000,000 a year in the shape of an insurance fund, to secure the maintenance of the British navy. I say that the best investment this country could enter on, would be to join in sharing the cost of maintaining the British navy, and by thus securing the supremacy of England, ensure for ourselves that supply of capital which is so essential to our national development. The disaster which might result from a great war in Europe, would stop that settlement which is now proceeding apace in the west; the market for grain might or might not be improved, but the lack of those supplies of money which we now get from England would cause a tie-up from one end of Canada to the other.

Bad times would be created in the United States, there would be bad times all the world over and if that is so if we have such a full treasury now, is it not on the line of good judgment and of prudence that we at least ought to come forward and contribute something towards the maintenance and security of the empire, and so help to maintain the security of our own country? If we are to remain on this continent and be a power we must have something in the way of sea power. We cannot be on the continent of North America unless we have sea power like every country in the past that has amounted to anything. The problems that are ahead of us are such that we ought to have sea power in order to maintain our position. All countries in the past that ever amounted to anything, that ever made a name in history, developed at some time a sea power and set aside large sums of their revenue for the maintenance of a navy as well as of an army. We in Canada have a magnificent sea position. We have a magnificent opportunity for sea power on the Atlantic, and we must be equal to it. We must protect it if we wish to enjoy it. We are also developing now a great sea outlook on the Pacific ocean, and if we are to realize the future we predict, we must do something in the way of establishing a sea power on the Pacific. We have been talking for years about our being descended from the French and English races and about the approach to America by way of the St. Lawrence and through the deeds of Englishmen and of Frenchmen. We have come to think a great deal of our history in connection with the Atlantic ocean and what might be called the Atlantic outlook. But there was a greater approach to America than either the English or the French and that was the Spanish approach by Mexico across the Isthmus, through South America and by the Pacific. The Spaniards went up the Pacific coast and got as far as California and British Columbia, and eventually we have inherited in British Columbia what they had. What is the prospect there? The outlook on the Pacific is the greatest that any country ever had before it and that outlook is now open to Canada. We are on the Pacific, we are on the Atlantic. We look at Europe on the Atlantic and at an older and greater continent, Asia, on the Pacific. A great maritime future is about to be created in connection with the Pacific. The Panama canal is almost completed and a great maritime development will occur in connection with the Pacific. What is to be our attitude in connection with that? Are we to sit idle? Are we to do nothing in the way of developing sea power, of helping to defend our Atlantic and Pacific coasts. and doing our share in maintaining a navy competent to defend the trade of the whole empire including Canada? People in England are losing confidence in us and even now the taunt is being passed that Canada is sponging on the empire for her defence. The very country that is supplying us with these millions and millions of money for the development of our country is also supplying the money, the navy and the ships of war to defend our country. That should not be allowed to continue any longer. We should do something not only in the way of contributing towards the maintenance of the British navy, but in the way of maintaining a Canadian navy in this country. I know there has been objection in certain portions of this country to having a Canadian navy with the expense it would entail, but if we are to play the part that we ought to play on this continent. we ought to have a navy of our own, we ought to have naval schools, we ought to have naval colleges, and we ought to train our young men to man our own ships. If Canada is to become what she ought to be she ought to start a great ship-building industry on the Atlantic coast. We have the iron and the coal, and we require these great ships. To-day Canada could use three or four lines of the highest class of ship ever built for the conveyance of her commerce across the Atlantic, and a greater commerce is coming on the Pacific, a commerce of which Canada ought to be the centre. Every ship required in that trade, ought to be built in Canada out of Canadian iron by Canadian workmen and as a school for the creation of a Canadian commercial marine and of a great Canadian navy for defence purposes in association with the mother country.

Mr. BELAND. That is besides the money voted for a contribution?

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Besides the money in the way of contribution. That contribution ought to have started a year ago; it should start this year, and it should be an effective contribution.

People say that a navy is not required by a farming community like Canada. Any one who studies history will be convinced that the best security a nation can have is some kind of sea power or at least association with a country that has a great navy. That opportunity is open to us. England has a navy that defends everybody all the world over.

The time has come when we ought to contribute something and we ought to contribute it liberally. Trouble may come any day, trouble that may end in England losing her supremacy, and if she should lose her supremacy, what would come to us in this country? We might lose all our connection with the mother country, we might have to go in with the United States, which I would not like to

see, or we might have some European power assuming a supremacy over us—and we might have a foreign master. As to what Canadians hope for their country, that is not the thing they have been dreaming about, but in some way they have been allowed to go to sleep on this question, they have ignored the question and have declined to face it. They must face it, and must elect what they are going to do in the way of maintaining the British navy and of establishing some kind of navy of our own.

There is something else. We are connected with England in the matter of trade and of interests. She gives us all the money we require at present for our development, but we are connected with England in upholding her institutions as the best political institutions that are in the world to-day.

If England were losing her political supremacy, her political institutions would be in danger, and they would be in danger here in Canada; and, as I said before, the outcome might be, that our neighbours to the south might think that the best thing they could do would be to incorporate Canada. Now our institutions are very superior to theirs. The institutions in the United States to-day are on trial. They have not got the constitution that we have. They cannot deal with their political problems in the way that we can deal with them; and we would find ourselves losing our powers of self-government, losing the splendid system that we have, and in danger of having to adopt another system that was not suited to our country. So that I say from the monetary point of view, from the point of view of getting all the money that we require in this country from England, we ought to contribute liberally to the maintenance of the British navy, and we ought to do something in the way of creating a Canadian navy. We ought to do it now, and do it liberally; and if the word went out that Canada was behind the motherland and was prepared to contribute liberally for the defence of the empire, the peace of the world would be assured. Advantage is being taken of the fact that Canada has failed in doing her duty. If the declaration went out now that Canada was prepared to do her duty, and that a feature of the budget speech every year in this country was a contribution of, to my mind, of at least $10,000,000 a year, there would be very little talk of war in the old land, the other sister states would be encouraged to do the same thing, and those powers that now think of putting an end to England's supremacy in trade and on the ocean, would reconsider their position, and would be prepared to admit that they could not interfere with that supremacy. Mr. Winston Churchill made a most excellent remark the other day, when he was dealing with the British navy. He said: To England a navy is a necessity; to Germany it was a luxury. The same thing is true of Canada. We want some kind of sea power in this country, some kind of navy, if we are to maintain our position on the two oceans, and to build up that great trade that I hope is in store for us. There is a great land trade being developed in this country; we already see the first signs of it; it is overwhelming our railways, and they are not able to provide the needed accommodation. A greater trade on the ocean between Europe and Canada, and between Canada and Asia, is in sight, but our participation in that trade to the hoped for extent, will depend on the fact that we have maritime institutions, and that we develop and cultivate these institutions just as the motherland has developed them. I regard a navy and a contribution to the naval defence fund, as a necessity to Canada. Therefore, it is to me, a matter of regret that the budget statement made here to-day, contains no provision for dealing with these questions, more especially after the incidents of the last two or three years, after the statement that has been made in the Imperial House time after time, where the one question to-day is, how to settle the social problems that are pressing for consideration and how to maintain a navy in such a position so that England will not lose her supremacy and her leadership in trade. It is the question that presents itself every day in England, and every morning when they open the papers, the people there do not know the moment they will read that a great war has been precipitated. England to-day, while she has confidence in her ability to maintain her own defence, sees how serious the situation is, and the question presents itself every day to the people of the old land: 'Is a great war to break out, and is England to lose her supremacy? Is she to fight for her trade and for her life, and even for her colonies?' They do not come to us every day, and say: 'We are in trouble.' They never have yet come to us in that way; but we know that the navy of England is behind Canada. It is the British navy to-day that maintains the Dominion of Canada, and to that is due the fact that we are not under the jurisdiction of what is called the Monroe doctrine. If that is the case, and I say it is so, and if the people of the motherland do feel that their country is in jeopardy, that a great war threatens them, and threatens all Europe, I say that we are unworthy of calling ourselves British subjects, and unworthy of daily putting up a prayer in this House for the maintenance of the King's supremacy, if Canada does not come forward boldly and make a permanent and a large contribution toward the British navy,

and does not come forward and begin to develop a navy in this country. We have made a start towards a navy in this country, and when the right hon. gentleman who leads the opposition introduced a measure for that purpose I supported the proposal. A great many people in this country have not supported that policy, we have been divided about it, but we were divided in Canada on the National Policy for a good many years. Nevertheless once the two parties came to see that the National Policy was essential to the country that division of feeling disappeared. And once the two parties in this country came to see that the naval supremacy of England was as essential to us as to the empire there would be unanimity of sentiment in Canada in favour of maintaining a navy here, and in making a large and regular contribution towards the maintenance of the British navy. Speaking for the province from which I come I can only say there is a widespread feeling in favour of such an expenditure. We are not afraid of it, and we are not afraid of doing our share toward the maintenance of a navy. I believe the feeling in British Columbia is altogether in favour of a strong naval policy, and in favour of the creation of a navy by Canada not only for the protection of trade and the maintenance of naval defence, but as the beginning of a real fighting navy of our own. The people of the maritime provinces are in favour of such a policy; and I believe the people of the province of Quebec if the question were fairly put before them, would be in favour of doing their share in maintaining the British navy, and doing something themselves in the way of establishing a Canadian navy. They come of a maritime people like the rest of the population of this country. They are largely descended from the people of Brittany , they are seafaring folk like the people of our maritime provinces. They would not like to see their sons drafted off to the navy, but I say they are all prepared to share in contributions of men and of money in the direction of maintaining a navy in Canada and doing something for the defence of the empire. It is said, by way of criticism, that Canada would have no voice in the direction of an Imperial navy if she contributed toward it. There is something in that, but the situation will gradually adjust itself. We have this to begin with: That an alliance is made between the daughter states and the motherland for defence purposes, and we, at least, would have as much say in that alliance as Japan and England had when the former country made an arrangement with Great Britain for the purposes of joint defence. We at least are a party to this joint arrangement, and out of that will gradually come some kind of unity, some kind of joint voice, some kind of say in connection with any great war that might arise in the future. The people of Canada are ready to-day to take part in maintaining the defence of this country. All they want is intelligent leadership on that policy, and I am not much in favour of the proposition that a question of that kind should be remitted to the people on a referendum. What is wanted on such a question is intelligent leadership by the leaders of the country and leadership in its parliament. Never will I be a party to a proposition that the question of the defence of this country, and our relations to the empire should be settled by a referendum to the people. That is a question of British responsible government which must be settled in parliament.

I trust this parliament will immediately take up this question of a contribution to the Imperial navy and of doing something to strengthening the navy that we have and make it a force able to assist in the defence of our own country and to join with the British navy in a great war if anything of that kind should come about. I am not speaking here, as I said, in favour of war, or of navies, but in favour of peace. And the thing that will assure the maintenance of peace is giving the nations of the world to know that not only has England the navy that she has and the money she is able to contribute for defence, but that she can command the money of the associated states Canada included, and the men of Canada, and the navy of Canada for her defence. If that goes abroad there will be no fear of war; on the contrary it will help to head off war. That being the case, the best investment this country could go into would be to make a regular and sufficient contribution for the Imperial navy out of these magnificent surpluses we have.

Mr. BELAND. Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) conversant with the scheme proposed by the Montreal 'Star.'?

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). I have seen something of it. I have read portions of it at times. But I am speaking for myself and declaring a conviction that has been steadily growing upon me. We all know what patriotism is, it is some kind of devotion to your own country. There may be a certain selfishness in that, and sometimes in patriotism there is something that you cannot always justify. But a new thing is coming to the British people all over the world and the only way in which I can express it is to speak of it as the Imperial Conscience. And the Imperial Conscience has in it not only the idea of patriotism but the idea of humanity and

brotherhood. And in it there is the belief that the greatest thing that can be done for humanity, brotherhood and progress is to keep a strong British navy which will be devoted not only to the defence of the empire but to the uplift of humanity at large. British institutions to-day, as I have said on the floor of this House, promise more for humanity than any other institutions on earth. And you cannot maintain these institutions and these ideas of brotherhood and humanity unless you have the big policeman and the big ship behind them. I am in favour of the big ship and the big policeman to maintain the peace of the world. That has been proven sound doctrine time and again. But we have not recognized it thus far; we have put it off, we have dallied with it. It was trifled with even in the last election; it is hardly being dealt with even now, though it is the question of supreme moment. And I have risen in my place to-night to direct the attention of this House to this question as one of the greatest before the Canadian people to-day. It transcends all other questions. If you consider the development of our country, I say it is a matter of money, and you must get that money from the people who are willing to lend it to us and who are lending it to us now. But if they lose their supremacy, their control of the sea, they can no longer assist us. Why, we should be financially bankrupt. There would be financial stringency throughout America. It is in the interests of the United States that a great war should be avoided, and the only way to avoid it, I say, is for Canada to let the mother country know that we are behind them and are willing to pay our share. We are a people now of seven millions, we shall soon be a people of ten millions, and, as I said, we look out on two oceans; we look out upon Europe and upon Asia, and we propose to trade with both. And it is my belief—it may be only a vision, but I believe it—that the centre of the great British empire will eventually be in North America. Then, if we have our navy, and if sea power does some day pass from the motherland, it can pass from the motherland to her greater daughter, this Canada which looks out on both the Atlantic and the Pacific. I say that is not a dream. Why, it is coming so fast that we can hardly follow it. The seat of the empire is coming to this northern half of the continent, and this northern half of the continent is qualified to be the seat of the empire. I read a most remarkable article in the 'Fortnightly Review,' not long ago. It described how North Western Europe had controlled the whole destinies of the world for the last 1,500 years—that little corner of Europe, including Great Britain, France, Germany and the Scandinavian countries. And the writer showed that this was the result of geographic and cosmic reasons. One reason was that in that little corner of Europe, where political and commercial power is centred to-day, a man can work for his livelihood every day in the year, and not succumb, but can keep his vigour and energy; a man can work every day in the field in France, Germany or Great Britain, and so he builds up his country. In Spain, for instance, this was impossible; there was indolence there, and enervation, for climatic reasons. But the still greater reason was, that that corner of Europe commanded the seas of the world. The writer made this further remarkable generalization—that there was a similar north western corner in America that would occupy the same position in regard to the Pacific, and that was composed of British Columbia and the states of the American union, immediately to the south. This region, he said, would be the seat of a greater maritime power than even the one that exists to-day in northwestern Europe. Well, if that is our destiny, if we have on our Atlantic seaboard the hardy seafaring people that are there to-day, and if we develop the same kind of people on the Pacific, then as surely as the sun shall rise to-morrow morning, the supremacy of the sea will ultimately have its seat in Canada, on our two seaboards, if we are but true to ourselves, if we realise the importance of sea power and do something to maintain it. It is a destiny for Canada that few of us dream of. Yet, to my mind, it seems near at hand. And it would come rapidly, and we should help to assure its realisation if we but begin the good work that is waiting to be done. It will not do to put it off. That war may come in Europe any day; England may be jeopardized any day; her country may be invaded and even her navy be beaten at sea. She may not be able to fight at sea two great powers combined against her. She is trying to-day to maintain the two-power standard under the idea that some day she may be attacked.

Will we as Canadians, now a people of 7,000,000, soon to be 10,000,000, and with a future that no man can state in figures, are we to continue in this disgraceful position of refusing to do anything, the position of a poor relation towards a richer friend? It is discreditable to us, it must come to an end. A Canadian cannot hold up his head in England to-day, and say that he is justified in availing himself of all the privileges that the empire gives him. I saw a report of a conversation the other night, a Scotchman was coming down to Ottawa on the train, and he fell in with three or four men from Toronto, some of them were army officers. These men were talking about what they had done in South Africa, but the Scotchman

shut them right up by saying, 'We paid for it all.' That is not quite correct, but it comes near the truth. People in England who are poorer than we are, even those poor colliers who are on strike to-day, men who are not getting a dollar a day, some of them in wages, are helping their richer neighbours to pay for the defence of the Canadian people. I say that we Canadians cannot hold up our heads and talk of being loyal subjects of the Crown and of the empire. It is unworthy of us to continue in this position, it is a discreditable position to occupy; and I hope before this session closes we will have some kind of a declaration of policy, other than a suggestion that the matter will be referred to the people by a referendum. I say that out of that $30,000,000 of surplus we have in our treasury to-day we should make a contribution of $10,000,000 towards the defence of the empire, either by building a Dreadnought or by direct contribution. I would like to see a statement that the Canadian navy, such as it is, is to be strengthened, that we are to build ships in our own shipyards out of our own iron, ships of commerce and ships of war. I would like to see a statement go out that the finest naval schools in the world are to be established, one on the Atlantic and one on the Pacific. I read the other day in an American magazine that the greatest university in the United States to-day is their naval university for the training of their young men. There are more good men being trained in the naval college of the United States to-day, competent not only for defence but for useful citizenship, than in all their other colleges. I want naval colleges like that for this country, one on the Atlantic and one on the Pacific. I want to see the young men of the maritime provinces, on both sides of the Dominion, trained in naval schools, that they may be able to serve their country and serve the empire in time of need, trained to serve both in our commercial marine and on our warships, such as we have. I think there will be no difficulty in persuading the Canadian people to do this as a part of their duty to the empire, from this time onward. I wish to see that stigma now resting upon the Canadian people removed, I do not want to see the Canadian people depending for their defence any longer upon the workers of the old country. Our country could not stand for six months unless we had a fighting force ourselves, and had the ships and the weight of the empire behind us. They are talking now in the United States about raiding Mexico. Some day the talk will be about raiding Canada. But they will not talk of raiding us if we are prepared to do something to defend ourselves. The way to ensure our future and develop our country along the lines of safety is to ally ourselves with the old land for the purposes of naval defence. When we are in alliance with the old land, and when we contribute our share towards the creation of the British navy, we contribute something towards the creation of a navy of our own.

Now I leave this question before the House. I have no motion to present in the matter. But I do think that we ought to bring this question up now, in view of the great surplus we have this year, and the still greater surplus that we are likely to have next year, and from now onward. If we have got the money, and if the duty is upon us, I think the time has arrived when we should act the manly part, the patriotic part, and make a contribution that will raise us in the estimation of all mankind. If we refuse to do our duty we will no longer be able to boast of our national manhood, nor of our individual manhood. We will remain in the degrading position of being dependent on somebody else for our defence. For my part I am willing to contribute, and I know the people I represent in this House are willing to contribute their part. I believe my province is willing to contribute its part, and I have confidence that every other province will be willing to contribute its part toward the maintenance of the defence of the empire, towards the creating of some kind of a navy of our own, towards the establishment of naval colleges on our two ocean coasts. I am also in favour of spending liberally in creating a shipbuilding industry. It will be an easy matter to arrange for the transfer of some of the great shipyards of the mother country over to Canada. We have got the iron, and we have got the mechanics, and we have got the money to pay for the development of such a shipbuilding industry. All it wants is a determination of the people to do something, and all the people want is leadership, and an assertion of our manhood.

Mr VERVILLE moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. GRAHAM. Will this debate continue to-morrow?

Mr. FOSTER. The debate will continue to-morrow, and the arrangement is to close it.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.38 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 14, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. J. D. HAZEN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 140) to amend the Fisheries Act. He said: This Bill has reference to the oyster fisheries of the lower provinces. Hon. gentlemen, I think, are aware that in late years these fisheries, which were at one time very valuable, have now become, owing to poor fishing, largely depleted, and the result has been that the fisheries show a falling off in the output year by year. For some years past the Commissioner of Fisheries in my department has been endeavouring to come to some arrangement with the governments of the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, with a view to the improvement of these fisheries. The matter was taken up by my predecessor in the department with the governments of those three provinces, and a proposal was made that fishing leases should be granted by the Dominion Government. Unfortunately that proposition has not been accepted by all the provincial governments, for, while Nova Scotia and New Brunswick have signified their willingness to sign an agreement, the province of Prince Edward Island refused to do so. Some objection seems to have arisen of late also in New Brunswick. The result is that the government is face to face with this condition of affairs, that unless something is done, within a few years time that industry, which was at one time so flourishing and valuable, will be largely depleted, and is in great danger of disappearing altogether. Perhaps the best way to explain the Bill would be to read it:

1. The Fisheries Act, chapter 45 of the Revised Statutes, 1906, is amended by inserting the following section immediately after section 67:

67a. The Governor in Council may, upon such terms and conditions as are agreed upon, authorize the government of any province to grant leases of such areas of the sea coast, bays, inlets, harbours, creeks, rivers and estuaries of such province as the government of such province considers suitable for the cultivation and production of oysters, and any person to whom such leases are granted by such province shall, subject to the Fishery regulations of Canada, have the exclusive right to the oysters produced or found on the beds within the limits of their respective leases; provided that, in the event of such areas, or any part thereof, being in a public harbour, nothing in this section shall prejudice the right or title of the Dominion to the enjoyment and use of such harbour for every purpose other than the cultivation and production of oysters.

In other words, it is proposed that an order should be given to the Governor in Council to authorize the different provincial governments to grant leases of those oyster beds, subject to regulations to be approved by the Governor in Council, and subject to regulations prescribed by order in council under the Fisheries Act of the Dominion of Canada. The view the department takes is that something has to be done to prevent the destruction of those fisheries, and if the provinces themselves will take over those beds, subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, and sublet them to individuals, the effect, it is hoped and expected, will be the restoring and replenishing of those oyster beds. I may say that before taking this course I took the precaution to get the opinion of the Department of Justice as to the effect this legislation might have on any litigation that is now pending regarding fishery rights as between the Dominion and the provinces; and the deputy minister of the Department of Justice has given the opinion that no rights of the Dominion will be prejudiced.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. SPEAKER. I find that question No. 1 on the order paper is improperly put, and therefore I will ask that it stand until it is corrected. It was not brought to my notice before.

Question allowed to stand.

DISMISSAL.

*Mr. REID (Restigouche):

1. Has Wm. Storey, caretaker of the government public building at Campbellton been dismissed? If so, on what date?
2. What was the cause of his dismissal and on whose recommendation was the dismissal made?
3. Has any investigation been held in his case either before or since his dismissal?
4. Who has been appointed to succeed Mr. Storey?
5. Did the Minister of Public Works authorize the following letter to be sent to Mr. Storey?:—

December 27, 1911.

Wm. Storey, Esq.,
Public Building Caretaker,
Campbellton, N.B.

Dear Sir,—I am directed to inform you that your services as caretaker of public building at Campbellton, N.B., will no longer be required by this department after the 31st instant. On that date you will please hand over to Mr. Thomas Downes the keys of the

building and what property belonging to the Dominion government that may at present be in your possession.

January 20, 1912.

Wm. Storey, Esq.,
Public Building Caretaker,
Campbellton, N.B.

Dear Sir,—Pursuant to my letter of the 27th December, informing you that your services would not be required by this department after the 31st of that month, your telegram of the 1st reporting that Mr. Downes, your successor had refused to accept the keys of the building, was submitted to the department and I have been directed to inform you that if you be willing to continue on as caretaker until further orders, you are hereby authorized to remain on the premises and to continue in charge of the building as in the past.

February 24, 1912.

Wm. Storey, Esq.,
Public Building Caretaker,
Campbellton, N.B.

Dear Sir,—I am directed to inform you that your services as caretaker of the public building at Campbellton will no longer be required by this department after the 29th February, On that date you will please hand over the keys of the building and all property belonging to the Dominion government that may at present be in your possession to Mr. Charles Watson.

Mr. MONK.

1. Yes, on 27th December, 1911.
2. Political partisanship, on advice of Mr. W. S. Montgomery.
3. Not considered necessary.
4. Mr. Thomas Downes was appointed on 27th December, 1911, but would not accept; on 24th February, 1912 Mr. Charles Watson was appointed and has accepted the position.
5. The Minister of Public Works authorized the change of caretakers to be made. The letters were written by the chief architect in accordance with instructions.

INSPECTOR OF DREDGING AT LARRY'S RIVER.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Who was inspector of dredging at Larry's river, N.S., prior to September 21, 1912?
2. Was any change made after September 21? If so, why and at whose instance?
3. Who was appointed as such inspector after September 21?
4. If more than one inspector has been acting since that date, what are the names and dates of appointment, and the name of the party who recommended such changes?

Mr. MONK:

1. Mr. Andrew McGillvray from 18th August to 19th August, 1911. Mr. Ernest McPhie from 21st August to 29th September, 1911.
2. Yes; Mr. McPhie had to leave for college at the end of September, and Mr. McGillvray replaced him from 2nd to 30th October.

Mr. REID (Restigouche).

3 and 4. (a) Mr. McGillvray from 2nd October to 30th October. Mr. A. T. Mahoney from 30th October to 2nd December. Mr. Leo. McEchran from 4th December, 1911, to 6th January, 1912.

(b) Appointments are made by District Engineer Millidge.

PRESENTATION TO NATIONAL GALLERY.

On the orders of the day being called.

Mr. MONK. Mr. Speaker, before the House proceeds with the orders of the day, I would like to announce that Her Royal Highness, the Princess Louise, has been pleased to present to Canada, through His Royal Highness, the Governor General, for our national gallery, a valuable portrait in oil of the Duke of Kent, great-grandfather of His Majesty the King. This painting executed by Sir William Beechey, will form a very acceptable addition to our national gallery of art at the Victoria Memorial Museum, where it is on view. The government, in accepting and acknowledging this welcome gift has asked His Royal Highness to convey to the donor, the Princess Louise, the thanks of the Canadian people for her generous remembrance.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Hon. Mr. White (Leeds) for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. ALPHONSE VERVILLE (Maisonneuve). Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the hon. Finance Minister (Mr. White) on the impartial manner in which he has presented the budget to the House. It is the first time in the history of Canada, as I understand, that we have had the announcement of a surplus of $39,000,000. I observe that my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean) last night expressed himself as being very anxious to have $10,000,000 expended on the defence of the empire. I hope before I get through my remarks to be able to convince the Minister of Finance that there are many other places to put that $39,000,000 instead of contributing it to the defence of the empire; I mean by a lowering of taxation as much as possible. We have heard during this present session many arguments on protection pro and con, and from many of the remarks made I for one have come to the conclusion that self-interest seems to have priority over the interest of the masses of the community. A well-read man might believe that we have gone back to ancient history, as some of the arguments used during this debate were put forward almost in the same form as far back as the fifth century.

The protection of Trusts, which is the furnishing to the few the means of getting rich at the expense of the community at large, is nothing new and will continue I suppose as long as the masses which compose this nation allow themselves to be misled into the belief that their interests rest on such a policy.

It is a well-known fact among those who are accustomed to gauge public opinion that this so-called protection as presented is not so popular amongst the masses as it appears to be. The foremost answer to this is, of course, that the people of the country have emphatically pronounced in favour of the same and that it so appears by the last election returns. This, however, is far from conclusive.

Let a policy similar to that presented at the last election, go fairly and squarely before the people; let all the politicians, trusts and manufacturers be honest enough not to mix up things and cloud the issue by screaming treason, waving the flag and appealing to every shade of prejudice, and I am confident that an enormous majority of the people would pronounce in favour of such a policy.

What is this treason of which we hear so much? If any treason exist, it is the conspiracy of the Trusts to compass the ruin of the masses of the people of Canada. Is it really treason of that nature that we hear so much about? I will leave the answer to those interested in combines. Where political parties enter into a fight it should be on a policy; it should be with some higher aim than simply to obtain power, and which ever party follows this doctrine will command more respect in the future.

Kings and Emperors in past centuries had more energy than our much prized popular governments have to-day, for as far back as the year 483 of this era, Emperor Zeno, after contemplating the effects of combinations in restraint of trade and loyal competition, had a proclamation issued to the effect that any one found guilty of preventing such loyal competition on food stuffs or other necessaries of life would be condemned to perpetual exile, whilst on the other hand any one guilty of the same offence in respect to articles of luxury was fined. It is plain to see that even in the 5th century there existed conditions and methods similar to those we have at present, and we find it also demonstrable that this Roman Emperor 1,439 years ago made an enormous distinction, by banishing the criminals for ever in the first instance so as to be sure that they would never return to elude the law.

We are not nearly so enlightened to-day, for the protective policy now in the ascendant seems to favour the very ones who should be severely punished because their only possible ultimate aim must be the accumulation of millions by the impoverishment of the people at large. Shall we allow this? Another glance at history shows us that similar conditions existed in France prior to 1789 and any one who wants to read history will admit that the effects of those conditions were not strange to the revolution of that year. It may be said with some appearance of truth that conditions in our country are not nearly so bad as any of those I have alluded to. I am not sure of that. In all communities it is considered good policy to cover over running sores and all things not pleasant to look upon, and we all know, at all events, that abuses of any nature are bound to bring about sooner or later the same results.

In an article on industrial and commercial conditions in Germany by Consul-General Frank H. Mason, prepared for the forthcoming 'Volume of Relations of the United States.' Mr. Mason said:

> In the report of this series for 1897 the remark was made that as an incident and condition of Germany's perfect organization and industrial growth, its leading productive industries had been syndicated to an extent probably unknown in any other country.
>
> What was true then is still more true to-day. The two hundred Trusts and Syndicates which are in existence in Germany at the beginning of 1899 are increasing in number day by day, until there is scarcely a single important product of manufacture of which the output, prices and conditions of sale are not governed by a combination or understanding between producers. One can scarcely open a German newspaper without finding a paragraph announcing a new combination of this kind or an article pointing to the recent notable multiplication of syndicated industries in England and in the United States as an example of what Germany should do for self protection.

Such is the condition in the great German Empire which on the floor of this House is offered as an example of good administration, and of the benefits of protection.

Speaking on the address in reply to the speech from the Throne at the beginning of the present session, I said, if my memory is correct, that if we kept on looking at Germany until the 12th day of January, we would probably see what the masses thought of this so called model government. Well, the 12th of January has passed, and newspapers have given the results, and some have also commented, but in a very moderate way and why? Because they anticipate in the near future that social conditions in that country may be easily applied to our own.

Oppression of the people by over taxation whether it be by tariff or otherwise,

has the same effect in any civilized country in the world. We may succeed in hampering the movement towards emancipation and freedom for a certain period, but water will find its level and any one who has at heart the wellbeing of his country, and of his fellow men should be in favour of less taxation, less scandalous profits by the mergers and trusts. In any case we no longer live in a time when the people were unorganized masses dependent for their very existence, upon the will of an absolute ruler. Thank God the army of labour is organized and able to defend its rights. The people are awakening to their strength and power and will use it if necessary. They are commencing to understand that protection is a one sided affair as they have no protection for the energy they have to sell: labour.

What is a Trust? The courts of the United States have, in many cases rendered important decisions on this point. In the case of Richardson vs. Buhl, the Supreme Court of Michigan said:

> All combinations among persons or corporations for the purpose of raising or controlling the prices of merchandise or any of the necessities of life are monopolies and intolerable, and ought to receive condemnation of all courts.

Chief Justice Fuller in delivering the opinion of the Supreme Court in the Sugar case (known as the Knight case) said:

> All authorities agreed that in order to vitiate a contract or combination, it is not essential that it shall be a complete monopoly; it is sufficient if it really tends to that end, and to deprive the public of the advantages which follow free competition.

It may be interesting to explain the mode of procedure adopted in the formation of these trusts which are a mere conspiracy to rob the public. We have a good example of these methods in the formation of the Whisky Trust in the United States on July 1, 1898. First of all it is essential to find a promoter whose mission is to carry the operation to a successful end. This promoter must possess two essential qualifications; first, he must be bold and unscrupulous, and second he must have neither conscience nor sense of honour.

To induce a number of industries to amalgamate is sometimes a difficult task; prudence must be exercised. So our promoter will first proceed by persuasion, always exposing the large amount of profits the special industry can realize, and also offering the manufacturer a good price for his co-operation. If he does not succeed he will offer a price far above the value, as is done in almost all cases, and also a special interest in the circulation. If the objections are too great he will spare no promises. If he is unsuccessful he will resort to threats, always arguing that it is of the greatest interest for the manufacturer to join, otherwise the Trust will be formed without him and he will have then to stand the consequences. If not successful with this method he will employ the last means at his disposal which so far have never failed. War will be declared upon the recalcitrant manufacturer, a commercial war to the death. The Trust will sell to his customers the same goods at lower prices and in some cases at cost price, knowing full well that they will be in a position to recompense themselves for whatever loss they may have sustained in the operation. They will go so far as to boycott merchants who will buy from that manufacturer. They will refuse him certain patented goods which he cannot purchase elsewhere and cripple him badly. They will then trace a circle around him and the pressure upon him will become so great that he will fall in the clutches of the Trust in a short space of time. An evident proof of this operation has been given by Mr. Clark who fought for a certain time the Whisky Trust in the United States and this is what he said:

> I entered the first Trust because I was facinated by the gigantic benefits laid before me by the trust, and also by the intolerable persecution to which I was subjected by the organization. It was rather against my principles to deprive myself of my liberty. I was then a young man and well able to look after my own business. At last I decided to join and I felt remorse the very same day, although I gathered in great profits for a long time.

What Mr. Clark tells us, many others could corroborate if they dared, but the power of such organization to control the market and even the transportation in many cases prevents them from doing so. Such is the modus operandi in the formation of a trust.

Let us now examine the financial aspect in the formation of Trusts. We may cite as an example the Whisky Trust that Mr. Clark speaks about, and see how easy it is for them to realize dividends on non-existing stock better known as watered stock. On July the first, 1898, was formed the Whisky Trust. The full value of different individual industries absorbed (allowing a margin for overvaluation) was four million dollars. A corporation was then established with an authorized capital of 24 million dollars. 16 millions dollars in common stock and 8 million dollars in preferred stock. Then the following combination intervened.

A financial syndicate was formed in view of facilitating the operation of the Trust. Each of the owners of the absorbed concerns received in kind full value of their individual enterprises, $4,000,000. They received over and above $4,000,000 in com-

mon stock, thus obtaining a net benefit of 100 per cent. In order to receipt itself the financial syndicate received $4,000,000 of preferred stock plus $6,000,000 of common stock, net benefits 150 per cent.

The promoter for his services of very doubtful value to the consumers, received $6,000,000 in common stock. The formation of some of our Trusts in this country must surely be financed in a similar manner. Indeed we have absolute proof that such is the case. While we profess to be afraid of our next-door neighbours, from the commercial standpoint, it would seem that our great financiers are only too willing to copy in every detail their nefarious system of operations in respect to the formation of Trusts.

It is said that imitation is the sincerest flattery, but I doubt whether the people at large will appreciate such flattery when it is given at their expense, and at that of their feeling and educating their children.

I will now attempt to make a slight analysis of our good kind of Trusts in Canada, and if possible give some slight idea of the burden that the masses have to bear. I would also desire to suggest some material remedy, of course I cannot expect that my suggestions will immediately appeal to all the members of this House. But such as it is, the remedy I outline appears to me the only one available, and as to its urgency, I think that no one will express any doubt on the subject.

After carefully weighing the significance of the following data, still imperfect although collected at considerable pains, the members of the House will see. I hope that some drastic measures must be taken, not only to prevent the formation of new Trusts, but also to prevent the operation of those now in existence.

The 'Monetary Times' of January 6th, 1912, published a list of about 40 mergers, giving in one column the capitalization of the merger and in another the capital of the individual companies absorbed, including bonds. The aggregate capitalization of thirty eight of these mergers, according to figures given by the 'Monetary Times,' stands as follows:

Capitalization of mergers ..	$336,938,266
Aggregate capital of individual companies absorbed, including bonds	123,166,588
We can then conclude that the watered stock is ..	213,771,686

The population of Canada being 7,081,869, according to the last census returns, these thirty-eight mergers represent a mortgage of $47.50 on every man, woman and child in the country, or $250 on every family, of which mortgage more than two-thirds represent fictitious or watered stock. What is more important is that every workman's family has to pay about $23 of interest yearly upon the same. This is a heavy tax; yet it does not begin to show the situation of the Canadian public with respect to Trusts, for it does not include the Ice Trust recently formed, nor the Steel Trust whose capital, according to the 'Monetary Times,' aggregates nearly $100,000,000; nor the Sugar Trusts nor the beef, pork, milk, fruits, cereals, brewing or other food Trusts so detrimental in their present form to the well-being of the people; neither will the Oil Trust be found in the list, nor many of the Trusts on clothing. One that stands prominent is the United Shoe Machinery Company of Canada, with a capitalization of over $45,000,000, and with an annual dividend amounting to $6,117,264, nearly one dollar per head on our population. From all the information to hand, Trusts in Canada as at present constituted already represent an annual average tax of nearly $100 on each family, and this tends constantly to increase.

A glance at the business of the stock exchange of Toronto and Montreal will show this very clearly. McQuaig Bros., of the Montreal Stock Exchange, publish a list of 31 companies and mergers, of which 25 are Canadian, with a total authorized capital of $666,656,975, and a total issue of $932,712,775 which would appear to be beyond the law to the extent of $266,005,300.

Among those will be found the British Columbia Packers' Association, whose net book assets amount to $3,344.871, and whose profits in six years amount to $1,646,422, an average of 20 per cent on their total capital.

The Canada Cement merger is of great importance, as cement is being used more and more in building. If there were no merger, it would be more extensively used by workmen in building their own homes. This merger comprises no less than 10 companies, and appears to be capitalized as follows: Merger capital, $29,000,000; companies' capital, $17,000,000; watered stock, $12,000,000; net profits of merger (1910), $1,177,698.

The Canadian Locomotive Company is capitalized at $5,000,000. For a few years back their average net profits have been about 5 per cent, after payment of interest on their bonds at 7¾ per cent, and other charges. This year it is foreseen that their net earnings, after payment of bonds, will be about 18 per cent.

I need not speak of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. We all know what their capital is, and that a large portion of it came originally from government grants, although their earnings aggregate 17·26 per cent, and they are issuing more stock.

The Canadian Car Foundry Company is capitalized at some $14,000,000. Their profits, after deducting interest on bonds, amounted last year to over 14 per cent.

The Dominion Iron and Steel Company, and the Dominion Coal Company, who are now clamoring for bounties, are rather a poor-paying concern as mergers go. Just fancy only 4·28 per cent on $35,000,000 of stock, after payment of all interest on bonds and expenses. They, of course, also are issuing new stock. The bounties they are now endeavouring to obtain would mean more than $550,000 annually, and bring their percentage of net profits to about 7 per cent on their present stock. In this connection I wish to state the real labour conditions that exist in the Dominion iron and steel industry, as given by Professor McGill, who made an investigation of them a couple of years ago. In his report he says:

The coke ovens.—These are kept going night and day, the men attending them are mostly foreigners—228 come from Europe, 15 from the United Kingdom, 61 from Newfoundland, and 58 are Canadians. Most of the work is such that Canadians do not apply for it. They are divided into shifts. Taking the total, 272 work ten hours and 63 work twelve hours per shift.

The coke ovens have been greatly extended since this report. I am told that 800 men are employed in this department, 90 per cent of whom are foreigners and receive $1.40 per day. Continuous operation, 7 days per week, 365 days in the year.

Open hearth furnaces.—These are kept going night and day, and the men attending them work in two shifts. Taking the totals of the shifts, 306 men work twelve hours each, 7 work eleven hours, and 82 work ten hours. Of the total force about 36 per cent are Canadians, 29 per cent are Europeans, 19 per cent are Newfoundlanders, 8 per cent are British, and the remainder are Americans or West Indians.

In his department I am told the force employed is about 600. Melters, about 20, receive from $4.50 to $5 per day, and helpers $2.50, third helpers, $1.80, general labourers $1.40, the latter class constituting the majority.

The blast furnaces.—These also operate continuously, and the men are divided into two shifts. Taking the totals, 226 work twelve hours, 13 work eleven hours, and 64 work ten hours.

In this department blowers and heaters get $3.50 per day, second helpers $2.50, third helpers $1.80, and about 120 general labourers $1.40.

The mills.—There are about 430 men at work in the blooming, rail and rod mills. Of these, over 350 work in twelve-hour shifts, and the remainder work ten hours. The day force is larger than the night force. About fifty per cent of the men are Canadians, and about twenty-four per cent are from Newfoundland, so that the percentage of European labour is small. The mills are kept going continuously. There is some time lost.

In this department the pay is about the same as the above. There are a few well-paid rollers and heaters, but the majority receive a bare existence, or, to be concise, 14 cents per hour. A new feature has been introduced in the shape of a staff beginning work at nine o'clock Sunday evening, truly a remarkable state of things in a Christian country.

Speaking of the Transportation Department, the professor says:

There are about sixty-four men engaged at the piers loading and unloading vessels. This work lasts only during the summer months. The men are employed only during the summer, differing in this respect from the dock and wharf labourers in Halifax. When there are no vessels at the piers, the men are paid time wages, and the work is cleaning, &c. When the vessels are in, they work two twelve hour shifts, and are paid tonnage rates. It would be impossible for them to do as much in eight hours as in twelve. An eight hour law would mean the employment of three eight hour shifts. This would mean an increase in the force, and if the system and rates of wages remained the same, a decrease in individual earnings. The work, while the vessels are in, is steady, but when there are no ships in, it is light.

There are from 80 to 100 men running the engines, &c., on the company's tracks. These work in two twelve hour shifts.

Regarding work on the piers, it is true the work is seasonal, it is worse, cases have been known of men working 48 hours continuously in loading the vessels.

In the case of the locomotive men, please note that it calls for seven days per week with a 24 hour shift every two weeks.

Yards.—(350 men at $1.40 per day). In the yards, and stables about 200 men are employed. A few of these work twelve hours, and the majority ten per day. Much of the work requires no skill, and a considerable percentage of the labour is foreign. An eight hour day would lead to the employment of a larger number of men, but it is impossible to say what increase would be necessary.

Other Employees.—There are about two dozen gateman, watchmen and janitors, and about the same number of timekeepers and scalemen. All these 'work' twelve hours. An eight hour law would necessarily mean three eight hour shifts.

I am informed that the general labourers in the yards are ordered out on Sundays, on the one hand necessity is the whip and failure to turn out means the 'sack.'

The other employees not mentioned are the innovation of General Manager Butler, to wit: The spies and blue coated gentlemen under the charge of one Noble by name, but otherwise by occupation.

The employees have asked for an investigation by the Labour Department about two years ago, on the grounds that the fair wages resolution applied to the steel company, as receiving grants from public funds. They claim that the company were not paying current wages in the case of bricklayers, carpenters and others as labourers. Mr. Dubreuil, fair wages officer of the Labour Department, went to investigate; he sought an interview with General Manager Butler, who politely told him and the government he represented that they could go to a warmer place than in the ovens of the company, that they would not stand for any interference with their business.

The report continued:

Foreign Labour.—A little over 40 per cent of the employees are Canadians, 28 per cent are from the continent of Europe, 20 per cent are from Newfoundland, 7 per cent from the United Kingdom, and the remainder from the United States and the West Indies. The European labour comes mainly from Poland, Hungary, Italy and France, though almost every European nation is represented. The European labour is found chiefly in the yards, coke ovens and among the helpers at the open hearth furnaces. The Newfoundland labour is found also in these departments, and to a greater extent at the blast furnaces and in the mills. All told nearly 60 per cent of the labour is imported.

Wages.—The majority of the men are paid by the hour. A system of payment by tonnage or bonus has been introduced and is being extended. Between 500 and 600 men were affected by this system during the year 1908.

An anaylsis of the labour cost taken from their own figures of 1908 as being 2.03 which includes superintendence, will show the $1.40 men to be the major portion of the employees of this corporation.

The Mechanical Department.—About 400 men are engaged in this department. Of these 70 work twelve, and the remainder ten hours per shift, the day shift being much larger than the night shift. About 70 per cent of these men are Canadians, and nearly all the others are from Newfoundland and the United Kingdom. The men are machinists, foundry men, boiler makers, blacksmiths, pipe fitters, carpenters, pattern makers, &c.

Regarding the machinists, half of the staff are ordered out each Sunday.

Another incident worth noticing is the percentage of Canadians, which is dwindling, their places being taken by 'British born.'

The schedule for the trades is as follows:

TRADE AND SLIDING SCALE.

Machinist, from 30 cts. to 17½ cts.
Moulders, from 30 cts. to 17½ cts.
Pattern makers, from 27½ cts. to 22½ cts.
Carpenters, from 22½ cts to 20 cts.
Bricklayers, from 40 cts. to 36 cts.
Blacksmiths, from 27½ cts. to 17½ cts.
Boiler makers, from 27½ cts. to 17½ cts.
Pipe fitters, from 25 cts. to 17½ cts.

The policy of the company is to pay perhaps half a dozen in each department the maximum, the remainder having the incentive of the higher pay to lure them into all the pathways of envy, hatred, and uncharitableness. That is how they keep men divided.

The Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, however, has done better than this. The percentage earned on common stock, in 1910, was 10.97 per cent, and if they ever received bounties, this company will be placed on a really handsome basis as to profits.

The Dominion Textile Company, who have been clamouring that it was impossible to pay reasonable wages to men, women and children in their employ, and have tried to convince the Department of Labour that their employers had to submit for the present at least to starvation wages, are capitalized at about $14,000,000, and after payment of all charges the company nets annually some $990,000 to be divided amongst the shareholders, leaving besides a substantial surplus. Last year the holders of their preferred stock received the equivalent of 22.4 per cent on their holdings. In the last few days this company have had remorse and have decided to increase the wages of those poor people who have been clamouring for an increase for so long. I suppose when they are in a position to pay 22 per cent on their stock, which will probably run to 35 per cent or 40 per cent, they feel that they can give a slice of their vast earnings to those who have placed them in a position to earn that money.

The Montreal Cotton Company, Limited, on the other hand, with a capital of about $7,000,000, only shows an average earning of about 10 per cent on all stock.

Let us take the mergers of tramways and see the profits realized by them:

	Per cent.
Halifax	14·32
Montreal (preferred stock)	39·85
Toronto	15·14
Ottawa	15·38
Winnipeg	10

The Quebec Tramway Company is so overcapitalized that they were ashamed to publish their figures.

The holders of preferred stock in the Lake of the Woods Milling Company in 1907 earned 28.53 per cent on preferred stock, but having increased the latter by $1,250,000 in 1908 the dividends fell to 18.81 and 9.45 respectively, but this is far below the average and a mere accident.

As for the Montreal Light Heat and Power Company that very modest company only earned 12.38 per cent last year on a

capital of $27,000,000, but they expect to do much better and pay an average semi-annual dividend of 10 per cent on all stock, which would mean more than 20 per cent.

The William A. Rogers, Ltd., Co., silver plating, capitalization $2,000,000, pay 36.50 per cent on preferred stock although this company is not only operating in Canada but in the United States.

These are a few of the mergers offered for sale by one member of the Montreal Stock Exchange. As will be seen the interest paid to these concerns represents an average of over 18 per cent which is enormous when we consider that the over-capitalization in the aggregate amounts to nearly ⅔ of the total sum. This represents an interest of nearly 54 per cent on the real capital invested.

The number is still increasing, and from an issue of the Dominion Bond Company we see that during the year 1911 nineteen new companies have been formed with a total capital of $23,125,000. It is also remarkable that companies that operate in necessaries of life are consolidating in a scandalous way, and amongst them we see the following:

Ames-Holden-McCready, Ltd ..	$1,000,000
Belding Paul Corticelli, Ltd.....	750,000
Canadian Cotton, Ltd..	1,250,000
Wm. Davies Co., Ltd..	1,850,000
International Milling Co..	1,250,000
Steel Radiator Co..	2,450,000
Sherwin-Williams Co..	525,000
Western Canada Flour Mills....	750,000
Matthews-Laing, Ltd..	1,200,000
Making a total of..	$11,025,000

One half the capitalization in the past year has been for consolidation of interests dealing in food stuffs.

I will now endeavour to expose to the House the capitalization of some of the mergers which it is important for the public to know. The Navigation merger is composed of the Richelieu Navigation Company and other companies with a capital of $10,000,000. The Paper merger is composed of the following companies: Montreal Paper Company, Canada Paper Company, Kinleth Paper Company, Barber Brothers, Toronto Paper Company, St. Lawrence Paper Company, Rolland Paper Company, Northern Paper Company—the capital stock to be $5,000,000.

The Laurentian Paper Company has issued bonds to the amount of $3,800,000.

Another merger which is of the greatest importance for the public to know something about is the bread merger. It is composed of the Breden Bread Company, Stuarts Limited, Geo. Weston, W. J. Boyd, H. C. Tomlon and other companies, with a capacity of 100,000,000 loaves per annum. These companies represent an aggregate value of $575,000, including good will. It is true that we hear of $1,000,000 in cash being put into the enterprise by the promoter. This unusual generosity has been made up to him, however, for he has capitalized other concerns at $5,000,000, thus reaping five hundred per cent.

The flour mills merger is organized under the name of Canadian Flour Mills, and is composed of the following companies: McLeod Milling Company, Canada Flour Mills Company, Campbell Company, Goldie & Company, Rutherford Milling Company, Carter & Company, and others. The united capacity of these mills is 4,500 barrels per day, but we cannot ascertain the amount of their capital which we are told is enormous. The earnings of the International Milling Company, with which this merger is connected, last year were nearly four times the amount required to pay the interest at 6 per cent upon the bonds issued. We can see the details in the 'Monetary Times' of July 1, 1911, page 121; July 15, 1911, pages 321 and 322; July 22, 1911, page 419.

The United Shoe Machinery Company of Canada is not a strange thing for any one, as it has been, and is now being, investigated by a special committee. The report of the 'Monetary Times' of July the 29th, 1911, page 47, gives us some details of the capitalization of the company.

	1910	1911.
Common stock..	$24,635,586	$28,599,434
Preferred stock..	9,490,059	9,515,400
Reserved..	1,500,000	
Surplus..	6,124,756	5,787,107
Total capital..	$41,750,392	$43,901,941
Total dividends..	5,180,690	6,117,264

Number of shareholders, 7,106.

A glance at the number of manufacturing establishments will show the constant increase in capitalization of industries, the majority of which are engaged in preparing or handling necessaries of life. The capital of those establishments was, in 1900, $2,446,916,487, which was increased to $833,916,155 in 1905. This shows clearly the increased tendency toward combinations and mergers, although if we could have the latest facts, it would show a greater increase to 1910

The danger of increasing centralization of industrial interests is proven also by the number of employers' associations formed with similar ends in view:

Trade.	Number of Associations.
Building..	57
Metal..	52
Lumbering..	9
Printing..	8
Clothing..	6
Leather..	1
Paper..	1
Food and tobacco..	18
Licensed victuallers and brewers..	9

Trade.	Number of Associations.
Barbers	5
Agriculturists	14
Transport	5
General employers	20
Wholesale and retail merchants	45
Total	220

This number is now increased to 240.

Among the 39 mergers I have previously mentioned on the authority of the 'Monetary Times,' perhaps one of the most remarkable is The Canada Bread Co., Ltd. of Toronto. This merger is capitalized at $5,000,000. The companies absorbed are the following: Breden Bread Co., Geo. Weston & Co., H. C. Tomlon, Stuarts Ltd., W. J. Boyd. The total capital of these companies was $575,000. The public in the region where this Trust operates will therefore have to pay not only the interest and profits on the real capital invested, but also on about four and one half millions of more or less fictitious capital. At 6 per cent this would represent an annual tax of nearly one dollar per head on the population of Toronto. If we add to the Bread Trust and Milk Trust capitalized at $1,265,000 by the City Dairy Co., Ltd., Toronto, the real capital of which amounts to $175,000, including good will, we have $1,000,000 fictitious capital, or $60,000 per annum more that the citizens of Toronto have to pay without getting value.

This, however, is a mere bagatelle comparatively with the Canning Trust, the Dominion Canners, Ltd., of Hamilton, Ont., with a capitalization of $12,500,000. No less than 45 individual companies are included in this trust, and for the edification of the members of this House and the country, I will read the names of the companies involved. There may be amongst them names well known to the members of this House:—Aylmer Canning Co., Kent Canning Co., Dresden Canning Co., Grimsby Canning Co., Imperial Canning Co., Warehouse Canning Co., W. Boulter & Son, Ontario Pure Food Co., Lowery Bros., Bowlly Bros., L. N. Scherick & Co., Wellington Packing Co., Leamington Canning Co., Aylmer Condensed Milk Co. Ltd., Farmers' Canning Co., Hillier Preserving Co., Napanee Canning Co., Old Homestead Canning Co., St. Thomas Canning Co., Lakeside Canning Co. Ltd., Brighton Canning Co., Delhi Canning Co., F. R. Lalor Canning Co., Simcoe Canning Co., Lakeport Canning Co.. A. C. Miller Canning Co., Port Hope Preserving and Canning Co., Strathroy Canning Co., Miller & Co., Belle River Canning Co., A. B. Taylor Canning Co., West Lorne Canning Co., Amherst Canning Co., Bloomfield Packing Co., Burlington Canning Co., Jordon Station Canning & Preserving Co., Niagara Falls Canning Co., J. H. Wethey Ltd., Tilbury Canning Co.

Their total aggregate capital according to the 'Monetary Times' does not exceed $1,574,000, this would mean $10,000,000 more of fictitious capitalization, a sum of about $600,000 annual tax without value on people buying Canadian goods.

Mr. LALOR. Is the hon. gentleman sure of his figures as to the capitalization, when he says $12,000,000 and some odd hundred thousands? I can tell the hon. gentleman that he is positively wrong.

Mr. VERVILLE. My hon friend will have to blame the official journal from which I have taken the figures. I have taken from the 'Monetary Times.'

Mr. LALOR. As an officer of that company, I may tell the hon. gentleman that the capital is $2,200,000 preferred stock, and the same amount of common. I am glad to correct him in his figures.

Mr. VERVILLE. As I have already said, I am always citing from the 'Monetary Times', which is an official journal, and which has a pretty good standing. Of course I am willing to accept any correction the hon. gentleman may make; but at the same time it would be proper to have the correction made in the 'Monetary Times' likewise, which is a journal scattered over the country. Now if we are well informed a great many of these small institutions have since the formation of the Trust been closed, the consideration of small towns or villages has had no consideration, the consumers have felt to a large extent the formation of the Trust also the producer who has now only one buyer. The Trust I am informed goes further by setting the retail price to the corner grocery store. Here I wish to cite some paragraphs of the agreement which I have taken from the 'Grain Growers' Guide,' not a bad authority. The agreement has already been cited in the House more than once, but there are some things in it which I wish to put on the 'Hansard' in this connection.

I am quoting from the selling contract between the Dominion Canners Limited, and the wholesalers.

In consideration of the terms and conditions hereinafter contained, the wholesaler agrees to purchase exclusively from the company for a period of one year from date, all domestic canned fruits and vegetables which the wholesaler may require in their business of all kinds manufactured by the company and will also purchase at least 50 per cent of their total year's requirements of any other goods of a kind manufactured by the company, such as baked beans, jams, jellies, preserved fruits, condensed milk and evaporated cream, and further agrees not to contract for season 1911-12 or later until after July 1st, 1911.

1. The canned fruits and vegetables shall be sold under two groups known as 'A' and 'B', a list of which shall be published and

sent to the wholesaler by the company, such list price to show the prices at which the goods will be sold in the different territories. The difference in prices between group 'A' and group 'B' being 2½ cents per dozen.

2. All private brands or labels shall be listed in group 'A'. The opening standard brands for groups 'A' and 'B' goods shall be lowest of the season for those brands.

3. On or before December 1st in each year, the prices of all canned fruits and vegetables sold under the brands comprised in groups 'A' and 'B' shall be advanced at least 2½ cents per dozen and may be advanced at other times as the company see fit.

4. The price of said goods shall be payable sixty days after the shipment without discount, or if paid within 20 days after shipment, a discount of 1½ per cent will be allowed. The company have the option as to the terms on which the goods shall be sold.

5. The company will assemble goods for assorted cars where inter-factory shipments are necessary at an extra cost of one cent per case on the whole car. Cars will be loaded at the nearest factory at which the goods can be most conveniently assembled.

6. The wholesaler hereby agrees not to sell or to allow any one in their employ to sell directly or indirectly to any person, who has not executed a similar contract and has not violated the same, either wholesaler or retailer by agent or otherwise, any of the products of the company whether now in stock or owned by them or to be acquired after the date hereof wheresoever or howsoever obtained, at less than the stipulated selling prices and terms in force from time to time as per lists to be issued by the company, a copy of the current selling price lists to be mailed to the wholesaler as soon as issued.

7. The wholesaler also agrees that they shall not give cash or credit notes, discounts, rebates or other benefits upon sales made or to be made of such products, nor shall they give or sell at a reduction or at an advance, other goods in consideration of sales of the products aforesaid which would in any way violate or reduce the selling price.

8. The wholesaler also agrees not to buy domestic canned fruit or vegetables manufactured by any other manufacturer nor shall they sell either on their own account or as agent or otherwise, the product of any other Canadian manufacturer of canned fruit or vegetables.

9. The wholesaler also covenants that they have not contracted for or bought any canned fruits or vegetables of the pack of 1910, put up by any other Canadian manufacturer, and any canned goods which they have in stock at the present time of other brands not listed in groups 'A' and 'B' shall be sold by them at not less than the prices fixed by the company for the sale of said 'B' group of canned fruits and vegetables.

10. The purchase and selling price lists in force from time to time during the continuance of this contract may be changed and other prices established, by mailing them, or otherwise notifying them to the wholesaler; opening prices to be named as late as possible in the season.

Mr. VERVILLE.

11. The wholesaler agrees not to sell or otherwise supply the products of the company to any person or company who have violated their contract with the company, after having received notice from the company that such violation has taken place. The company consents to the wholesaler selling to any other wholesaler who shall have executed a similar agreement hereto at the wholesale price, provided permission is first obtained from the company. The wholesaler also agrees to advise their salesmen of the terms of this contract, and the company also reserves the right to cancel the order for goods or any part thereof remaining unshipped in the event of the wholesaler committing a breach of any of the terms of this contract.

12. The wholesaler further agrees that when called upon, and in any event before payment of the discount hereinafter mentioned, they shall give unconditionally to the company a declaration sworn to by the wholesaler or by any member of the wholesale firm or by any traveller or any one in their employ designated by the company, showing that this contract has been carried out in all its terms. The wholesaler shall not be entitled to the discount until such declaration has been given and all invoices for goods sold have been paid. Said discount shall be forfeited as liquidated damages for failure to comply with all the terms of this contract. The said discount cannot be anticipated by deducting the same from the invoices.

13. In consideration of the wholesaler purchasing exclusively from the company, as hereinbefore set forth and complying with all the terms of the contract, the company agrees to pay and allow them a trade discount of ten per cent upon f.o.b. factory price of all canned vegetables so purchased, such discount to be paid half yearly on the first day of February in each year.

14. All canned fruits and vegetables sold to the wholesaler are hereby guaranteed as to quality.

15. Travellers' order books in quadruplicate will be provided by the company if required.

16. In case the wholesaler shall sell goods outside the province in which their head office is situated, upon request the company will supply them with price lists of the prices ruling in any other province in which they may solicit business, and they agree that in all cases they shall observe the price, terms and conditions ruling in such province.

17. The company reserves the right to introduce a special group at somewhat reduced prices, terms and discounts in order to meet special conditions in any locality or localities, if considered necessary.

18. In the event of a short pack caused by frost, drought or other unexpected causes, and consequent inability to put up a full pack, the company will make to full extent of their pack a pro rata delivery to all buyers whose orders are accepted prior to July 15. On any undelivered portion of 60 per cent of such booked orders the company will pay wholesalers 15 cents per case of two dozen tins. Subsequent orders to be booked subject to pack.

19. The company cannot guarantee delivery of any particular brands from any special

factory, but they will give early orders and shipping instructions the preference.

20. The company agrees to ship the canned fruit and vegetables when ready. Payment shall be made by the wholesaler for goods ordered but not shipped on 1st December, and they will be held by the company for reasonable length of time thereafter, the wholesaler to pay storage at rate of ½ cent per case per month and insurance after that date.

21. The wholesaler agrees that all goods sold prior to December 1, 1910, shall be charged and dated from time of shipment, and that any unshipped portion or order so taken shall be charged up not later than December 1, 1910. The wholesaler also agrees that in the event of an advance being advised by the Dominion Canners or or before December 1, 1910, that all goods sold and unshipped at that time shall be charged immediately upon receiving notice of such advance. On all canned goods sold after the 1st December the wholesaler agrees to charge up to date of shipment at the prices ruling at the time of this shipment. Dated this.....day of .....1910.

.....

An analysis of the business of the Montreal fish corporation will give us another million of watered stock, and $60,000 annual taxation.

Another food trust worth mentioning is the Matthews-Laing Ltd., operating in Montreal and Ottawa. It appears to be over-capitalized to the extent of $5,000,000, the merger capital being $7,000,000 and the three concerns included, namely, Geo. Matthews & Co. Ltd., Park Blackburn Co. Ltd., Laing Packing & Provision Co. Ltd., These aggregate only $2,000,000, which it is said is itself an over-capitalization. In any case this would prove an additional annual charge of $300,000.

These five food trusts which are but a trifling portion of the combining actually accomplished in food, therefore represent $22,500,000 of fictitious values, upon which the people pay without receiving any benefits whatever. Therefore an annual tax of $1,290,000.

There are still a large number of other combinations which could be exposed, but I will leave for other members of the House the task of bringing to light some of their operations.

William Miller Collier, in his book on Trusts, tells us some of the effects of the Trusts on wages, and this is what he says:

> The effects of excessive capitalization, and the attempt to pay dividends upon such capitalization, are a tendency to create artificial earnings upon an artificial capital both by artificially raising the price of the article produced, and by the depreciation of the wages paid. The result to the public from an economical standpoint is objectionable.

The question has more than once been asked: What remedy should be applied to such a state of things, and what action, legislative or otherwise, can be devised in order to prevent this undue development of mergers, every time the answer has been legislation. In my opinion this is a mistake, we have too much legislation on the statute-books at present, and it would take up all the time at the disposal of our courts of justice to enforce the laws already made. Let me mention them:

1. By the British Wages Act, section 91, subsection 2, in the parliament of Canada is vested of legislation in matter of trade and commerce.

2. The Trade Union Act of 1872, re-enacting in substance the British Trade Union Act of 1872, forecasts legislation against combinations in restraint of trade by exempting before hand trade unions from the operation of any such laws. Embodied in the Revised Statutes.

3. In 1889, subsequent to the findings of the committee of the House of Commons and of the Labour Commission of 1888, parliament enacts a law for the suppression of combinations in restraint of trade. Embodied in the Criminal Code, sections 496-498 (Revised Statutes, 1906).

4. The usefulness of the above provisions was materially increased by parliament in 1900, by an amendment omitting the word 'unlawful' in the definition of a conspiracy in restraint of trade, thus shifting the burden of proof upon the accused.

5. In 1895, and again in 1898, the Hon. Dr. Sproule introduced Bills to regulate Trusts, but they are not carried through.

6. The Customs Tariff Act of 1897, section 18, provides that when it shall be established that there exists any trust or combination with regard to any article of commerce, the Governor in Council shall place such article upon the free list, or so reduce the duty as to give the public the benefit of reasonable competition.

7. By an amendment to the Inland Revenue Act (chapter 17, 1904) the minister is empowered to cancel the manufacturing license of any company selling goods under restrictive conditions.

8. Parliament adopted in 1910, 9 and 10 Edward VII, chapter 9, an Act to provide for the investigation of combines, monopolies, trusts and mergers, the object of which is to make the operation of such concerns public through the action of the courts.

Reference can be made to the 'Labour Gazette,' and to some cases of great importance. In Vol. XI, pages 1024, 1028, in the case of the sugar trust, also on pages 1170, 1408, will be found valuable information in that respect. Also a good account of the first attempts at litigation against trusts in Canada is given by Mr. W. W. Edgar in the 'Journal of Political Economy,' 1906, page 427. In 1901, action

was taken against the Canadian Paper Manufacturers under the Customs Tariff Act, 1897, an account of which can be seen in the same journal, 1906, page 431. In 1904, action was taken with reference to the American Tobacco Company and the Empire Tobacco Company under the Inland Revenue Act, as amended in 1904, an account of which can also be found in the 'Journal of Political Economy. In 1907 action was taken, through the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the conditions of the grain trade, with reference to the Winnipeg Grain and Produce Exchange. Explanations can be found in the 'Labour Gazette,' vol. VIII, page 708. We have also the famous case of the United Shoe Machinery Company of Canada, reference to which can also be found in the 'Labour Gazette,' vol. XI, pages 969, 1260, 1272.

Such is the present condition of Trusts in Canada, so far as I have been able to discover it up to the present time. Of course, those who have studied these questions seriously are well aware that the only real and permanent protection that the people can find against such vampires is organization and co-operation. By such means they will paralyze the Trusts. But they must never cease watching. 'Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty'—and of life. However, apart from this permanent and radical remedy which can only be slowly and gradually applied, there are others of a temporary nature, yet efficacious in their way, provided by legislation. The Customs Tariff Act of 1897, section 18, provides, as we have seen, that when it is established that there exists any Trusts or Combines on any article of commerce, that article shall be placed in the free list. This is supplemented by the Combines Investigation Act, and I call upon the government to apply the law to the glaring cases that I have just described. I have reason to believe also, that the workingmen of Montreal and elsewhere will soon be in a position to test the efficacy of the Combines Investigation Act and that full light will be shed upon these conspiracies.

If we stop to consider and compare the actions of the Trusts on the other side of the line, we can conclude why these very same institutions are moving heaven and earth to effect a speedy organization.

The Industrial Commission of the United States, whose report fills some 1,300 pages with valuable information on this subject, shows that one combination is selling 90 per cent of the sugar output; another more than 90 per cent of the tin plate product; that a third controls at times as high as 95 per cent of the production of spirits; that a fourth is selling from 75 to 80 per cent of the total output of steel rods and smooth wire and from 65 to 95 per cent of wire nails; that the same company by its patents has a practical monopoly on barbed wire and woven wire fencing; that another company produces from 90 to 95 per cent of the refined petroleum and all of these monopolies fix their own price.

I believe that I am justified at this present moment in expressing my views and impressions as to the waving of the flag and as to the cry of 'Canada for Canadians.' So much has been said on this subject and with so great an appearance of sincerity that some people might at first sight be impressed by these expressions and actions, but a closer investigation and inquiry will reveal the utter uncertainty of the politicians and others who indulge in them.

Any one who follows the financial transactions of the country would be led to believe that we are selling a good part of the natural resources of Canada, and if there is to be any waving of the flag it should also be waved in such instances. The amount of foreign capital invested in Canada is enormous; still we have not heard any alarming utterances from the so-called champions of the principle of 'Canada for Canadians.'

If we take the last report, we find that we have invested in the country:

From United States	$417,143,220
France	70,750,000
Germany	30,725,000
Belgium	11,675,000
Holland	11,000,000
Turkey	3,000,000
Russia	1,500,000
	$595,893,226
We have then foreign capital.	$ 139,589,650
American	417,143,221
British	1,860,000,000
Grand Total	$2,416,732,871

If this total amount of capital is divided by the total population of the country, we have an indebtedness on every man, woman and child of $341, or in other words, the interest at 6 per cent would mean $20 on every head, an annual charge of over $100 per average family.

American capital seems to dominate in British Columbia. We have 209 branch companies with an average capital of $600,000 or a total of $125,400,000.

Investment in mills and timber	$65,000,000
Investment in mines	60,000,000
Land deals	8,500,000
Packing mostly in British Columbia	6,000,000

According to this statement the Americans would own about 75 per cent of the timber industries in British Columbia; 50

per cent of mining industries are also the property of Americans. We conclude that about one-half of American capital is invested in British Columbia out of the total amount invested in the Dominion. We find that about 25 millions of dollars are invested in land deals in the prairie provinces and 10 millions in lumber and mines in the same provinces. We also find insurance companies with a capital of 43 millions and we know that those companies possess very little real estate.

If we take the report of our Canadian Superintendent of Insurance, we find that for the year ending 31st of March, 1911, the total assets of American life and fire insurances in Canada, was $55,456,527 the two principal items being bonds and debentures. Their assets represented by debentures and stocks are as follows:

Debentures..	$43,293,221
Stock..	162,141
	$43,455,362

Yet from all appearances the country has not been in danger. The prairie provinces, which have less American capital, have clamoured less about being thorough Britishers than British Columbia, where more than half of all capital invested is American. If Trusts are increasing in capital and in numbers also, industries are diminishing in number, which fact shows clearly that with the present system we may anticipate having some day only one Trust; then the whole population of our Dominion will be the subject of that Trust.

At present we have a system of cold storage in the country, which, from its origin, has done more harm than good. At its inception, the cold storage system was built up and subsidized from a humanitarian standpoint, but the invention has been abused, and the cold storage warehouses have furnished the means to overtax our population and to starve them to a certain extent. If it were possible to obtain the number of pounds of food stuffs in cold storage warehouses, the price paid for merchandise stored in the months of November, December and January, and also the retail price paid by the consumers, we would understand the enormous profits made by these institutions.

We are told that millions of pounds of butter and cheese are now in storage in our large cities. Butter that was bought for 24 cents per pound is now being sold for 45 cents. Eggs are being imported, though there is a good quantity now in storage, and they were sold lately for 50 cents a dozen, and they were far from being fresh. Cheese is now being sold at 20 cents a pound. though it was stored at less than 13 cents a pound. Quantities of cereals, fowls and fish have been stored for more than two years. Instead of putting fresh produce on the market, in many instances, it is two years old or more, and then we are wondering why we don't get good food.

If any legislation is to be enacted on this subject, a law should be passed that will prevent any storage company from keeping foodstuffs longer than is absolutely necessary, and for a specific time, as they have in the state of New York They should also be compelled to make a weekly report to the government.

The cost of living is increasing, the purchasing power of money is diminishing, and we are wondering why the masses are not satisfied. Let good enough alone, we say, except when the interests of Trusts and of certain manufacturers are at stake. Well, the time has come when the people will not and cannot stand this any longer. The full weight of the protectionist tax upon the workingman was placed in evidence before the Tariff Commission in 1905, and with the permission of the House I will put on 'Hansard' these facts, which strikingly illustrate the manner in which the workingmen are protected:

The workingman, sleeping peacefully upon a 30 p.c. mattress covered with a 30 p.c. quilt and a 35 p.c. comforter, awakes to gaze upon a 20 p.c. chromo hanging on the wall, covered with a 35 p.c. wall paper, Lifting his head from a 30 p c. pillow, he steps upon a 25 p.c. carpet, where he alights upon a 30 p.c. tack. He lifts a 35 p.c. window blind, removes a 35 p.c. flannel nightgown, slips into a 35 p.c. shirt and 35 p.c. trousers, 35 p.c. socks and 25 p.c. shoes, ties the shoes with 35 p.c. laces and washes himself with 35 p.c. soap. The drying operation is performed with a 30 p.c. towel, and the combing of his hair with a 35 p.c. comb. He adjusts a 35 p.c. collar, after hunting for a 35 p.c. collar button, and probably finds a 25 p.c. pantaloon button missing, necessitating the tightening of his 35 p.c. suspenders The request for the replacing of the button in the proper place is met by his wife in a 35 p.c. corset and other highly protected clothing. She does the necessary stitching on a 30 p.c. sewing machine, with 25 p.c. thread, the final act being performed with a 30 p.c. needle, assisted by a 30 p.c. thimble. Before leaving for downstairs he adjusts his 10 per cent artificial teeth, and then descends to light a fire in a 25 per cent stove with 25 per cent charcoal which he carries in a 25 per cent pail. He may perhaps use some of Rockefeller's 30 per cent coal oil to assist matters. He then sits down on a 30 per cent chair at a 30 per cent table covered with a 30 per cent table cloth, his knees being protected by a 30 per cent table napkin. In due season he has his choice of the following articles of food: apples, 40 cents a barrel; bacon and ham, 2 cents a pound; cheese, 3 cents

a pound; butter, 4 cents a pound; coffee, 10 cents a pound; potatoes, 15 cents a bushel. He assists himself with a 35 per cent knife and a 30 per cent fork, likely soiling his 35 per cent cuffs in the operation. Before he leaves for work he arranges for his children to regale themselves with 35 per cent sugar candy during the day, with 35 per cent dolls; that they shall go to school with 30 per cent school bags and 35 per cent copybooks, decked with 35 per cent ribbons. These things arranged, he daily takes his 30 per cent tool bag filled with 30 per cent nails, 30 per cent tools, 25 per cent axe, carries a 30 per cent crowbar, lights his 35 per cent pipe with his 50 cents a pound tobacco, fixes his 30 per cent hat firmly on his head and hustles off through the dark of the morning guided by the light from 30 per cent gas lamps. His daily routine of work may mean shoving a 30 per cent wheelbarrow and wielding a 30 per cent pick, but he works his nine or ten hours as the case may be, and returns at night to his well protected home. His wife smiles at him through a 15 per cent window, probably thinking of the new 30 per cent bonnet which she has purchased and glad of the fact that her day, too, is over, with freedom from 35 per cent clothes wringers, 35 per cent curtains, 20 per cent brooms, 25 per cent brushes, 35 per cent baby carriages. After a protected supper he adjusts his 30 per cent spectacles, lights the 30 per cent gas, coming through a 39 per cent gas meter, listens to his wife playing a few hymns on a 30 per cent organ, and is warned by a 25 per cent clock that the retiring hour has come. Tired and protected to death he seeks his bed chamber thinking of the struggle of the morrow and succeeding days. After a few years he dies, 20 per cent crape appears on his door, and he is finally buried in a 25 per cent coffin. He is protected from the cradle to the grave. This statement may seem ridiculous, but nevertheless it exposes clearly the well protected workman.

I will now endeavour to expose to the House the cost of living, and also compare it with other cities.

At present the cost of living is higher in Canada than in the United States, while the scale of wages is lower. I am in a position to speak with some knowledge of the cost of living, especially in Montreal, which city can be compared with some American cities of similar population, and I have prepared from data at my command certain statements on the subject which I will communicate to the House. They confirm to a great extent the findings of the Massachussets Commission on the cost of living which reported in 1910. The consumer gets on the average fully as much value, more variety, and in some cases a better article for his money in the United States than in Canada. (Page 355 of the report). I have not found as stated in that report that meats are 10 per cent higher in Boston than in Montreal, but it is quite true that groceries are at least 4 per cent lower in Boston. Bread, the staff of life, was last year 13 per cent higher in Montreal than in Chicago. Eggs are also higher in Canada, millions of dozens being imported from the United States.

United States consular reports confirm this view as to the cost of living in both countries. Prices no doubt vary greatly in different localities, but it will be found that United States export prices for food stuffs are almost invariably lower than Canadian wholesale prices for the same articles. Here are some examples. Quotation from 1911 prices, which have increased since:

	Canadian Wholesale.	U. S. Export.
Boneless bacon	$0 15·4	$0 10·9
Dressed beef	0 10·5	0 10·4
Fowls	0 13·1	0 13·2
Hogs (cwt)	7 29	5 79
Lard	0 13·8	0 10·7
Butter (creamery)	0 28·2	0 29·5
Cheese	0 12·7	0 13·1
Flour (per barrel)	5 00	5 81

It will be seen that prices as a rule are higher in Canada.

This will appear more clearly if we enter into the details of expenditures of a workingman's family. I have prepared such a statement for Montreal, carefully excluding every item not absolutely necessary to prevent weakening and degeneracy. Let us take a family of five living under the very cheapest conditions:

	Per annum.	
Rent, $9 per month	$108 00	
Water rates, 5 per cent	5 28	
Fuel (3 tons of coal at $7, wood, $8)	29 00	
Lighting (½ gal. oil per week)	5 72	
		$148 00
Clothing for man.		
1 suit per year	$10 00	
1 extra pair trousers	2 00	
3 suits of overalls at $1.25	3 75	
2 hats at $1.50; 1 cap, 75c.; 2 pairs of gloves, 50c.	4 75	
1 pair shoes, $2; 3 pairs at $1.50.	5 00	
2 shirts at 75c.; 4 at 50c.	3 50	
4 suits of underwear at $1.50	6 00	
6 pair of socks at 15c.	0 90	
1 overcoat	8 00	
6 collars at 12c.; 2 neckties at 15c.	1 05	
1 pair of rubbers	1 00	
Other necessities	6 00	
		51 00
Clothing for woman.		
1 dress per year	$ 6 00	
2 dresses, common, at $2	4 00	
2 hats at $4	8 00	
1 cape	6 00	

2 pair of shoes at $2, and rubbers, $1	$ 5 00	
Other necessities	14 75	
		43 75
Boy 7 years of age.		
3 suits per year at $2	$6 00	
4 shirts at 30c.; 6 pairs of socks at 20c	2 40	
4 pairs of shoes at $1	4 00	
1 overcoat, $2.50; 3 caps at 40c	3 70	
3 pairs of mits at 30c.; 2 suits of underwear at 75c	2 40	
Other necessities	5 00	
		23 50
Girl of five years	$12 00	
Girl of three years	8 00	
		20 00
Total for clothing		$138 25
Sundries		
School and school books	$ 4 00	
Car fare, 8c. per day, 300 days	24 00	
Dishes, lamps and chimney, breakage, &c., at 5c. a day	18 25	
Sickness, &c	20 00	
Bedding, house linens, &c	25 00	
Church dues	5 00	
		$96 25
Food.		
Meat, 2½ lbs. per day at 14 c	$114 94	
Fish, 1 lb. per day at 12c. for 60 days	21 60	
Bread, 4 lbs. per day at 5c	74 00	
Potatoes, 1 bag per month at $1.50	18 00	
Flour and meal	5 00	
Butter, 2 lbs. per week at 26c	28 60	
Lard, 1 lb. per week at 20c	10 40	
Eggs, 1 doz. per week at 30c	7 80	
Spices and condiments	5 00	
Milk, 1 quart per day at 6c	29 20	
Tea and coffee	2 00	
Molasses	2 00	
Sugar, 2 lbs. per week at 6c	6 24	
Cheese, ½ lb. per week at 16c	4 0	
Fruits, 20c. per week	10 40	
Total		$352 58

Let us now compare this with the report of the Massachusetts Commission (page 72), on the cost of living in Boston and Montreal respectively;

	Boston.	Montreal.
Rent and water rates	$ 126.59	$ 113.28
Fuel	32.72	29.00
Lighting	7.52	5.73
Clothing	94.31	149.30
Sundries	130.45	96.25
Food	345.71	352.58
	$ 737.28	$ 746.13

Making a difference of $8.85 in favour of Boston. It therefore seems that according to the strictest calculation the cost of living for a workman's family is more in Montreal than in Boston, while the scale of wages is lower, as will be seen by the following statement. I am giving in this statement some figures that can be compared, so as to show the difference of wages per hour paid in some trades, in Montreal, Toronto, and Boston. If I were to take the larger cities in the United States the difference would be more; but I have taken Boston because of its population comparing with that of Montreal:

	Boston.	Toronto.	Montreal.
Bricklayers	60	50	50
Carpenters	50	35	35
Plasters	60	50	40
Plumbers	50	42½	35
Stone cutters	60	50	43½
Builders labourers.	35	25	25
Common labourers.	30	20	20
Iron workers	50	45	35
Electricians	45	35	27½
Sheet Metal workers	45	35	30
Painters	45	32½	30
	530	420	368

According to those figures we can see that there is quite a percentage in favour of Boston in the earning power of the workman. He earns, in Boston, 17 per cent. more than in Toronto and 40 per cent. more than in Montreal.

I would like also to give to the House the average earning power of different trades in Montreal, and the figures I am now quoting are still above the average.

Bricklayers	$650
Carpenters	550
Plumbers	650
Structural iron workers	550
Building labourers	450
Sheet metal workers	600
Moulders	750
Stereotypers	500
Printing pressmen	750
Cigar makers	700
Bookbinders	500
Boot and shoe workers	600
Tailors	550
Painters	650
Ship liners	450
Textile workers	450
Granite cutters	750
Laundry workers	400
Masons	550
Plasterers	650
Electricians	600
Common labourers	400
Lathers	350
Machinists	750
Photo engravers	800
Printers	750
Garment workers	500
Upholsterers	500
Blacksmiths	650
Butchers	600
Brass workers	700
Musicians	750
Barbers	600
Longshoremen	400
Stone cutters	750

This statement shows plainly that the earning power of workmen is not sufficient

to give them a respectable existence. Now to prove the correctness of the figures I have given on the allowance of food for the family of a workman, I will quote, by way of example, the ration allowed to each soldier in the army. It is as follows:

Bread, 1½ lbs. per day, 547 lbs. per year at 5c.	$27.35
Sugar, 2 oz. per day, 45 lbs. per year at 7c.	3.15
Chocolate, 1 oz. per day, 22 lbs. per year at 25c..	5.50
Tea, ½ oz. per day, 5 lbs per year at 25c.	1.25
Fresh meat, 1 lb. per day, 365 lbs. per year at 14c.	51.10
Fresh vegetables, ½ lb. per day, 182 lbs. per year at 1c.	1.82
Flour, 9 oz. per day, 205 per year, at 5c.	10.25
Currants and raisins, 1½ oz. per day, 34 per year at 10c.	3.40
Total per man per year ..	103.82

These figures, as we can see, do not cover all the items of everyday life, far from it; so they can reasonably be multiplied by four for a family of five. This would give us $415.28. This shows plainly that my calculations were not exaggerated.

Labour demands justice and equality, though not in the sense in which those words are often used. Labour men do not wish to go beyond reason. But they recognize that the law of itself is not powerful enough to prevent vast combinations representing millions of dollars of capital from organizing to oppress labour, to control and monoplize production and prices, and to carry into effect the purpose of such combinations.

Statesmen of to-day should read the prophetic words written by the great American statesman, Abraham Lincoln, in 1865:

> I see in the near future a crisis approaching that enerves me and causes me to tremble for the safety of my country.
>
> As a result of the war corporations have been enthroned and an era of corruption in high places will follow and the money power of the country will endeavour to prolong its reign upon the prejudices of the people until all the wealth is aggregated into a few hands and the republic is destroyed. I feel at this moment more anxiety for the safety of the country than ever before even in the midst of war.

The crisis feared by Mr. Lincoln is upon us, and it is the duty of every member of this House, regardless of political allegiance to prevent it.

Mr. ANDREW BRODER (Dundas). Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the hon. member for Maisonneuve who has just addressed the House, but I could not but think that if he had had the moral courage to have made that speech on the budget a year ago, it would have come with better grace from him. He has been denouncing a legacy that we have received from that outgoing government, and his speech is a terrible arraignment of his friends whom he has supported for the last eight years. I cannot understand a gentleman having such knowledge of the evils that existed in this country sitting quietly behind his friends all these years and saying nothing about it, consistently supporting them and saying that everything was right. He gives us to understand that this condition of things has been brought about since September 21 last. I suppose the tariff has not been changed since September 21. I suppose that these Trusts have not all grown up since September 21. Have they? He says there are 39 combinations and Trusts in this country. They must all have grown up, of course, since last December, because the hon. gentleman did not say a word against them during the last eight years.

Mr. VERVILLE. I know my hon. friend does not desire to misquote me. I did not say that they were formed since September 21.

Mr. BRODER. But you did not find fault with them in all that time. As shrewd and observing a gentleman as he is would surely have said something about these Trusts before that time if they existed, but he did not want to worry his friends. The hon. gentleman has been talking about the tariff. The Cobdenites have been in power for 15 years and we have a tariff with an average of 27 per cent, or nearly so, on dutiable goods and on dutiable and free goods of 16 per cent—after 15 years of free trade rule. I do not think much of the men who stand on the doorstep of Cobden and shout free trade principles to the present generation. I think a tariff of 26 per cent on an average is a protective tariff, that it has the principle of protection as much imbedded in it as any tariff we have ever had in this country. And now our friends waken up the moment they are out of power to the realization that there is something wrong in this country. If there is something wrong in this country it is a legacy left by hon. gentlemen opposite, and we are going to probate the will, and we will probate it in the interests of the people, not in the interest of a party. Combinations have grown up, yes, and what do you think of hon. gentlemen who were willing to carry this country over into the arms of the greatest Trust company in the world, the United States? That was their effort, to put us at the mercy of the greatest combinations in the world, where we could not deal with them, and they had not the courage to deal with the Trusts at home.

Insincerity can be charged against hon. gentlemen opposite. There are 39 combinations found in this country after 15 years of their being in power, and these combinations have a combined capital of $575,000,000. Now, these gentlemen wake up to the fact that there is something wrong. They did not kick from under the blanket while their friends were in power, they were as quiet as mice in their nest in the winter. Now they are up in arms, there is something wrong in this country. Yes, there is something wrong in this country, it is well it is not worse after hon. gentlemen have ruled it for so long. It will have to be dealt with. I have no quarrel with capital. What we want in this country is capital properly invested. The hon. gentleman speaks of meeting these difficulties with a combination, but the combination that he suggests may be as arbitrary as the combinations we are attempting to meet. What we must realize in this country is that we want a reasonable tariff, and a stable tariff, that capital will know that it is safe to invest in Canada and that it will be secure, and not at the caprice of any sect of men. Hon. gentlemen may shout now from the house tops about their free trade principles, but the country has had an experience of these gentlemen and will question their sincerity in the future. There is only one Cobden medal in this country and that is enough because it is not worn as it ought to be worn, because the man does not deserve it who has it; he has never been a free trader since he came into power. We may talk as we like about free trade, but why are hon. gentlemen opposite anxious to go to a country where the tariff is higher than it is here for the blessings they are seeking?

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). Does the hon. gentleman desire me to reply; he is looking directly at me? When I came to Canada—this question applies personally to me—I came to seek free land not restricted trade. I believe in freedom all the time.

Mr. BRODER. We will let you be free if you behave yourself. There is nothing wrong, we are glad to see you on the land, but I want to say that we do not want to see the labour conditions of Europe transferred into this country, and I question whether the hon. gentleman does. A gentleman met me in the west and said they had a poor man's tariff in England. I said: They must have because they have a million paupers there whom the people have to take care of; it must be a poor man's tariff. My hon. friend who just sat down said that the labouring man got more wages in the United States and a less cost of living. How does he find that in a country where they have about 40 per cent of a protective tariff when he cannot find it in this country where we have a 26 per cent tariff. Why does he go to a high protective country to find his blessing? Why does he not go to a free trade country?

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). The tariff does not make the land.

Mr. BRODER. I am not speaking of land. If 40 per cent protection makes prices cheap in the United States, I do not see how 26 per cent can make them dear here. There is a lack of consistency in the argument.

My hon. friend referred to some mergers and indicated some of the men in them. He might have referred to a cement merger in which he would have found a prominent gentleman pretty closely allied to hon. gentlemen opposite, but he did not see fit to refer to it.

Mr. CARVELL. Yes, he did.

Mr. BRODER. He did not refer to any names. It is a very significant fact that during all these years these combinations have been doing their mischievous work in this country, very few of them were prosecuted. Why were they not prosecuted by hon. gentlemen opposite? We had the Paper Trust. Who prosecuted the paper combination?

The press of this country agitated against it, and the Canadian Press Association prosecuted it, and at very large expense to themselves, and proved their case. But the government refused to pay the expense; so that the newspaper men had to pay it out of their own pockets. Then, when the grocery combination was prosecuted publicly, the case was not proven; and it cost them $10,000 to defend themselves. A prosecution is going on now against the United Shoe Machinery Company. Why were not these combinations prosecuted by hon. gentlemen opposite? Why, they did not wish to touch a hair of their heads. But now they are beginning to shout about it all over the country—somebody else is in power. But what about the sincerity of hon. gentlemen opposite? These mischievous organizations can grow up and do their evil work, but those interested must prosecute them or there will be no prosecution, and they have to pay the expense themselves even if they prove their case. So, it ill becomes any one on that side of the House to criticise the present condition of things, for the present condition of things is the outgrowth of their rule in this country for fifteen years.

The hon. gentleman went on to tell about the duty on clothing, on the towel, on the dishes, on the nightshirt, on the blanket,

and on shoes. But all these duties were put there with his friend's consent, and his own. So, it ill becomes him to raise his voice so hurriedly about the evils that exist. If there is an evil existing in reference to any of these combinations it should be dealt with. But hon. gentlemen opposite did not deal with any of them. These combinations grew up under their rule, and attained their great proportions. A combination need not be an evil; it may be used to get rid of overhead charges and so to cheapen production. If it does this, and gives the public a better deal, the combination is not an evil. Combination may be a blessing, as capital is a blessing. These things have to be taken cognizance of, and dealt with in the interest of the public generally.

I do not pretend to say that it is a wise thing for any public man to arouse a suspicion against any class of people; on the contrary it is a misfortune. The callings of people in this country are largely a matter of their own selection. A man chooses to be an agriculturist, or a merchant, or a mechanic, or a professional man, and the door is open to him, he can reach the position he desires, no matter what his birth may be. It is largely a matter of choice. But when he makes his choice, it is not right for him to question the sincerity of another man who makes a different choice; they follow different lines to success. Now I do not follow with prejudice or hatred the man who leaves the log-house and makes his way up through the battle of life to a palace. I follow that man with pride in his success.

There are problems before this country; hon. gentleman opposite have left many problems unsolved that they have at least attempted to solve in the interest of the people. These problems to-day are at the threshold of the Conservative party; and I hope that party will have the genius, the sincerity and the ability to deal with these problems and solve them in the interest of the people of Canada. Why should this country, a great agricultural country, after fifteen years of Liberal rule, and with a practical farmer as Minister of Agriculture, be importing four or five of the most important agricultural products for table use? Why should we be importing butter from New Zealand, and potatoes, meat and eggs from other countries? And this after fifteen years of Liberal rule. Have these hon. gentlemen done their duty to the agriculturists? They tell us that this importation is due to increased consumption. Well, should not an agricultural country keep pace with the consumption of its own people? Have these hon. gentlemen solved the problem of the agriculturist or assisted him to cope with the difficulties that confront him? I say, no. There is one way to feed the people more cheaply and at the same time to assist the agriculturist; and that way is to get down to the man in the furrow, if you will, make him understand the possibilities of his soil; show him that to double the product of each acre will mean more money from his farm. While the artisans and people generally will be more cheaply fed, the farmer will be better off. That is the solution of this problem, but it is a solution that hon. gentlemen opposite never attempted to make. And this is within our reach. Why should we be decreasing in the output of our butter and of other products? It is because of the serious shrinkage in farm labour. Has there been a serious attempt on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to bring to the oldest province of this country from the old country the necessary help that would go on the farm and become a fixture in the social life of this country? No successful attempt, no serious attempt in this direction was made by hon. gentlemen opposite. I say to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Burrell), who sits here as Minister of Agriculture, that one of the serious problems before him is in this question. Let the farmer build a house for his hired man, if you will, let the man marry and raise his family, and you have gone a long way towards solving the problem of domestic help. These are questions that the government ought to take cognizance of, and deal with, and solve. But hon. gentlemen opposite did not deal with them. I have in mind an instance in an adjoining county of what one man could do towards solving this question. He told me only the other day that he, through his personal efforts in bringing immigrants from the ships at Montreal, had brought five hundred men into the county of Russell. The government did not do that. That man had several cheese factories. He found that the farmers were keeping fewer milch cows, and on inquiring the reason he found that it was because of lack of help. So he commenced to solve that problem by bringing suitable agricultural immigrants into that county. And what is the outcome? The outcome is that only five out of that five hundred have proven unsatisfactory. That is what is possible and if the government of this country take that matter up and deal with it along those lines, it will go far to do away with the complaint of the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville)—increase the produce of the country, increase the fertility of the acre, improve the conditions of the agriculturist and keep him on the soil, that is what is necessary for the future welfare of this great country.

Now, here is an instance of a man who came up through the influence of this gen-

tleman into that county. He came here with six or eight children, he had about $1,200 to the good after paying expenses. There was a farm offered for sale for $8,500, along with the stock and implements. This individual encouraged that stranger to buy that farm. He bought it, and he has paid interest and $1,000 a year since; he has also bought the hundred acres next to him for $6,000, and he will pay for that. That is what is possible, that is part of the solution of our difficulties in this country. Now, this is a matter of history that might well be repeated in every county in the province of Ontario, and in a good many counties in the province of Quebec.

Mr. NESBITT. How long was that gentleman in bringing in the 500 people?

Mr. BRODER. Only about four years since he commenced.

Mr. NESBITT. Did this man buy this second farm within the four years?

Mr. BRODER. Yes, of course he has the debt, but he has 40 milch cows on his farm to-day. That is the kind of men we want brought into this country. An agriculturist with $3,000 to $5,000, with his economy, and with his industry, will make a success in any part of Ontario or Quebec. Surely it is in the interest of this whole country that that should be done. Many of our people are going west. You cannot proscribe any one of our people from going west. Now, we must, in order to maintain our social conditions, our schools, our churches, and all those things that pertain to a good neighbourhood, we must do something to maintain them in their strength, and in their usefulness, and to my mind that is a solution of many of the difficulties that we have just heard mentioned.

But what has been done by hon. gentlemen opposite to bring to the notice of that class of people in Europe the older provinces of this Dominion, within the last ten years? Do they know much about Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Quebec, Ontario? I fancy that our hon. friends opposite have not done their duty in that respect. The opportunities in the older provinces are equal, are as good, are as permanent, as they are in any other part of Canada. For my part, I hope the present government will take up those matters and solve them along these practical lines, upon which they can be solved. We must keep the people on the land, and in order to keep them there we must improve conditions, and that is possible. Take up a list of the people that are going out of the older provinces into our western country—and it is a good thing to have them go there, I am not finding fault with that, it is a good thing to have our eastern people go into that western country. But we must do something to fill up the gap that is created by their departure, we have got to make an effort to do it. I fancy hon. gentlemen opposite did not make an effective effort, if they made any at all, to solve that problem, and that is one of the difficulties that lie at our door pressing for solution. I believe it is now possible to solve them. I think it is one of the first duties of the government to attempt to solve them. Why, Sir, what do we find? We find this agricultural country, with all its splendid possibilities, buying its butter, its meat, its eggs, and some other produce from other countries. I can't understand it. That is where we find ourselves, after fifteen years of this progressive government that has gone out of power. But some hon. gentlemen say that condition of things is caused because we cannot get reciprocity. Well, I am not going to talk much about reciprocity. The jury has pronounced upon that, and they say they don't want it, and I give them credit for being an honest jury and for having good common sense. We have heard a good deal about the possibilities of marketing our 200 million bushels of grain. But hon. gentlemen, with amazing inconsistency, say: We will drop our present market and go where they are exporting grain now. I cannot understand it. For every bushel you send into the American west, you have to send a bushel out of Boston or New York. I say, find your market, suit your market, keep your market. That is what you have got to do, and that can be done. But the difficulty is that some hon. gentlemen seem more anxious to keep up the discontent in the west than to allay it. I believe that is not fair-play. The people of that country have got to help solve their own problems. The conditions are abnormal, and these conditions will be best solved, not by fanning the discontent, but by showing that you are making an honest effort to remove the difficulties. That is the position I think we ought to take as public men, interested not only in the west, but in the east.

My hon. friend (Mr. Verville) thinks that this surplus should be expended in lessening taxation. Well, there is another legacy that has been left us by hon. gentlemen opposite, the enormous expenditure on the Transcontinental railway, an expenditure double or treble their own estimate. That is a legacy we have received, and that we must carry. We have got to meet that responsibility. We are proposing to meet these responsibilities that are thrown upon us, I say largely by mismanagement, if not by mismanagement, then by miscalculation. Take their revised estimates, and where are we to-day? I say that no set of

men governing this country should have launched out into an undertaking of that magnitude without knowing more about it. They should have known approximately, at least, what it was going to cost before they undertook it. They said they had mountains of information Yes, and they have had mountains of difficulties, but they did not have the information. No man can justify the action of hon. gentlemen opposite in that respect. Now that responsibility is thrown upon this country, that responsibility must be met. It is an obligation, and the honour of the country is bound to carry out its obligations. For that reason it is necessary that the revenues of this country should be large, so far as is consistent with the welfare of the people. All these obligations must be met, but they cannot be met without a revenue, and you cannot have a revenue without a tariff.

I do not say that we should have a high tariff in this country, but I venture to say that, while it may not be much higher than hon. gentlemen left it, it will be more consistently adjusted and will not be hugger-mugger until you do not know where the tariff is. There is nothing in heaven above or in earth beneath like it. There is nothing in any country in the world like the tariff which these hon. gentlemen left on the statute-books. They have a preference, a maximum, a minimum, and dear knows what. They go to the farmer and they say: We have lowered the duty on carriages; under the British preference the duty is lowered on carriages from England. But, it was raised on carriages coming from the United States and that is where people buy their carriages. They fixed the tariff so that they could go to this man and say: We have lowered the tariff, and so that they could go to the other man and say: We have raised the tariff. They could go to the carriage maker in Ontario and say: We have raised the tariff, and they could go to the man using a carriage and say: We have lowered the tariff. That would be the truth, but it would be only part of the truth and that is equivalent to something I am not going to say anything about. That is the condition of the present tariff. How many mowing machines or carriages do we buy in England? The articles on which the duty has been lowered under the British preference to the farmer are the articles that he does not get from Great Britain at all. He gets them from the United States against which you have raised the tariff barrier. You claim that you have lowered the tariff under the British preference. That is scarcely fair-play to the innocent man, yet, that is the fact. I say that the tariff in this country should be a tariff that would be understood. It requires an expert every day in the year, except Sunday, and he has to think of it then if he is honest in his endeavour to act in the public interest, to tell what the tariff means as applied to different goods that are coming into this country. He has got to sit up nights in order to apply it, and then he makes mistakes. That is the tariff that has been left on the statute-book by the free traders who have gone out of power. They are getting back to the old platform. The right hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said away back in 1893 when they were making their platform, that he did not intend to skin the bear till he killed it. Oh, no, he killed the bear but he never skinned it. It is there with its skin on as much as it ever was.

Mr. BURNHAM. That is a skin game.

Mr. BRODER. Yes, he said that in that 1893 convention right here in this town. Yet, these hon. gentlemen opposite did not do what they promised. It was free trade that they promised then.

Mr. LALOR. Blue ruin is their platform now.

Mr. BRODER. We are in power to-day and they are driven back in desperation to the idols of old. I do not blame them for that. This recalls to my mind a story, and it is a lawyer's story, that I am going to tell to these free traders across the way. There was a man in Ireland who wandered into a grave-yard to amuse himself. You can amuse yourself in a grave-yard in Ireland. He came to a grave-stone on which was the inscription: Sacred to the memory of Mr. So-and-So, an eminent lawyer and a Christian. He said: This is a strange country; I see they bury two men in one grave. That is the kind of graves we will have all over this country when these men die. They will be putting two men in one grave. I do not see how you could bury them in any other way, because you will have to bury the free trader and protectionist in one grave. They were all buried on the 21st of September, and all we have to do now is to put the inscription on the tombstone. I am suggesting that we will have to bury two men in one grave. That is the kind of country we are living in.

Mr. McKENZIE. Leave well enough alone.

Mr. BRODER. Yes, we are going to continue as we are. Do you want things left as they are? Do you want the principle of protection to be continued in the tariff?

Mr. McKENZIE. I said: Leave well enough alone.

Mr. BRODER. I want to know if you want the tariff left as it is to-day. If the hon. gentleman said that he did, for the next ten years he could not say a word.

They do not want to leave things as they are. They expect them to be improved and they will not be disappointed. The people of this country expect practical, common sense in the government. They do not want a lot of rhetoric; they want something that is tangible, and they want an improvement in the present conditions. I believe that they can be improved and that the government who are in power to-day have opportunities that perhaps no government that ever came into power, in this great country, with its possibilities, have had. The public men of the country must use the common sense they have, get down close to the people and help them solve those serious problems which must be solved not only in the interest of the country at the present time, but with a view to its future welfare.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, the address we have just heard is the most ample justification for the choice of the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) in filling the position of Minister of Agriculture in his Cabinet. However good the stories of my hon. friend (Mr. Broder) are, I think all will agree that his political arguments are hardly worthy of this place and the subject matter that is under discussion.

Mr. BRODER. I was dealing with the arguments from your side of the House.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not remember any argument on this side of the House with regard to that man who made $6,000 farming in three years after starting with $1,000.

Mr. BRODER. I do not wonder the hon. gentleman does not like that argument.

Mr. OLIVER. If a man got along as fast as that in the cattle country in the west the police would be after him, because they would expect that he had lived on his neighbours. I would like, however, to point out to my hon. friend the case of this particular gentleman who made so great a success——

Mr. BRODER. I want to ask——

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, may I please point out——

Mr. BRODER. Do you dispute my statement?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not disputing my hon. friend's statement for a moment. I hope he does not dispute mine. What I wanted to point out to my hon. friend was that this remarkable success of this gentleman was achieved under the administration of the Liberal government.

Mr. BRODER. Will my hon. friend allow me to say that it was not under his department; it was the case of a private individual relying on himself.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend should keep his seat when he has nothing to say. I repeat that if this statement is correct—and we are bound to accept his statement—that certainly the conditions in this country making for agricultural success, under the policy and administration of the late government, were all that any reasonable man could desire. That my hon. friend (Mr. Broder) was not suited with these conditions is the evidence I have to offer to the House as to his not being a reasonable man.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Broder) criticised the condition of this country under the tariff policy of the late government. My hon. friend's friends have been in power for five months and they have come down to this House with a budget which absolutely confirms the tariff of the late government; not changed in one line, in one word; not changed by the dotting of an 'i' or the crossing of a 't.' It was good enough apparently for the last fifteen years, and it is going to be good enough at any rate for another year under the administration of these gentlemen. May I say just this word with reference to the tariff policy under which this country achieved the magnificent success it did achieve commercially, industrially, financially, as a people, and as a country, during those fifteen years; that any government would be wise in exercising due caution in making changes in that tariff that my hon. friend said was not like anything in the heavens above, or the earth beneath, or the waters under the earth. The slogan of the party he supported in the late election was: leave well enough alone, and I say that certainly in my judgment the Conservative party is well advised that yesterday, after five months in power, when it was for them to do as they saw fit in the interests of the country, when it was in their hands to change that tariff, they did not change it by one jot or by one tittle.

Mr. BRODER. How long were your friends in power before you made any changes in the tariff; it was nearly a year, my dear man.

Mr. OLIVER. Possibly it was. Again let me draw attention to the argument as to the condition of this country in regard to mergers. My hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) read to the House a state of facts that certainly cannot be considered by any man responsible in any degree for the welfare of this country, and having knowledge of it, without recognizing its gravity, without recognizing that a condition exists that calls for the most

careful attention of any government that may be in power. The only criticism my hon. friend (Mr. Broder) had to offer was that this condition had grown up under the administration of the late government. That is true. It is a condition that grew naturally out of the prosperity of the country, but it is a condition with which the late government was dealing in the arrangement they placed before the electors last September, and upon which issue they were defeated. The late government went to the country on an anti-combine policy, and they were met by a party absolutely in alliance with—and may I suggest the possibility of it being subject to—the combines, and, the combines won. My hon. friend said the reciprocity policy of the late government was going to throw this country into the hands of the United States, a country of greater combines. Well, my hon. friend (Mr. Broder), is excellent at telling stories, but he is not so good at making political arguments. By the reduction of the tariff as between this country and the United States, there was to that extent competition promoted between the combines on that side of the line and the combines on this side of the line, and the proposal was fought by the combines on each side of the line. There is no use of my hon. friend (Mr. Broder), trying to becloud the issue. The issue was decided between the combines and the people, and the combines won. And my hon. friend (Mr. Broder), sits in this House supporting a government which holds its place, because of the support received from the combine interests of this country. Now, it may be that the government will not realize for their friends the expectations that have been entertained; I do not know as to that. Certain members of the government have certainly failed to realize the expectations of those who elected them, within the last few days. I do not know, but the rest of the government may also fail to realize the expectations of those who elected them.

Mr. BRODER. That is on that side of the House.

Mr. OLIVER. Not at all my hon. friend; the condition I speak of exists on your side of the House, and on that side alone and I say that when the government of the day at a future session of parliament frames a tariff for this country, it may be that it will not realize the expectations of those who were chiefly instrumental in putting it in power. But, if it does not realize these expectations, there certainly will be very much the same sort of denunciation—it may not be as public—proceeding from the merger interests, as is to-day proceeding from the interests which elected my hon. friends the Postmaster General, the Minister of Public Works, and the Minister of Inland Revenue. I do not suggest, and I shall not suggest, that the present leader of the government or his colleagues are going to be false to their friends. I do not think for a moment that they will be. The evidence we have had so far as this session has proceeded is that they will stand by their friends, and that the tariff legislation of this country, when the government comes to the point of framing it, will be framed in the interests of the combines, will be framed for the purpose, and with the intention of creating values for those enormous numbers of millions of fictitious capital that have become associated with our industrial enterprises in this country.

Our hon. friends have made many campaigns upon their assertions of insincerity on the part of the party on this side of the House in regard to tariff matters. They have been able from time to time to becloud the issue, and they have won their seats as a result; but from this time forward, as the result of the elections of the 21st of September, there will be no beclouding of the issue. It is straight and square: it is for the combines or for the people. Now, I do not want to be understood as declaring that the membership of a combine is not just as legitimate a business proposition as the ownership of a farm. I do not wish to be misunderstood on this point. I want it to be understood that capital has a perfect right to be invested in any enterprise and under any reasonable circumstances; but when combinations of capital are made with a view of securing an undue profit from the people at large, it is the business of the people at large to protect themselves as well as they may against the consequences of that act. It is not that the man who is concerned in a merger is not as good a citizen as my hon. friend who has just spoken or as myself. No question needs to be raised on that point. But the point is that he is able,—or if he gets the legislation that he hopes to get from this government he will be able,—to make my friend and myself contribute an undue share of his wealth and success. That is what we object to; that is the point on which the camps are divided.

Mr. LALOR. Hadn't you better wait till it happens?

Mr. OLIVER. I think it is evident, from what has been read by my hon. friend from Maisonneuve, that it has been happening.

Mr. LALOR. For fifteen years.

Mr. OLIVER. Precisely, for fifteen years, in a greater or less degree. As the pros-

perity of the country increased, as capital was more and more available, as the financial magnates got the habit, the number of these mergers and combines increased, so that the condition in the latter years of the period referred to has been immensely accentuated as compared with the condition in the beginning of that period. Who would have thought of forming an industrial merger or combine in 1896? The suggestion is absurd on the face of it; and should there arise in this country another condition of depression such as that which existed in 1896, there would be no more forming of mergers and combines. If our hon. friends are as successful as my hon. friend from Dundas (Mr. Broder) hopes they will be, in preventing the formation of combines, I can only say that if they achieve that result by bringing about a condition of depression such as existed in this country in 1896, then I think we had better have the combines than have that condition. but it is not to that condition that we look for relief. All that we ask is that there shall be a fair consideration of the needs of the revenue in the framing of the tariff, and any industrial enterprise that is able to flourish under that condition is welcome to flourish; everybody will wish to see it flourish. But the industrial enterprise that must secure an unjust toll from the consumers, that must be protected in order to flourish, occupies a position that cannot receive the support of the majority of the people—cannot at any rate receive the support of those who are on this side of the House. Let there be no misunderstanding of the question. As my hon. friend has said, there is nothing wrong about the formation of a combine. A combine that decreases the cost of production and tends to improve the methods of distribution is not injurious. It only becomes injurious when means are taken to secure an unfair return on the capital invested, and the government has partly to do with that matter in the framing of the tariff. If the tariff is framed with a view to securing to this enterprise a return upon the capital invested and the stock issued, instead of being based upon the needs of the revenue, then we say that such a tariff is unjust to the people.

I was struck by some of the remarks made by the Minister of Finance yesterday, and they were in line with utterances of the Premier and the Minister of Trade and Commerce, made in the early part of the session. He spoke of the bounties of Providence, the success and development of this country due to its natural advantages and to the energy of its people. The inference which I think he desired to convey, and which the Premier and the Minister of Trade and Commerce certainly desired to convey, was that the administration and policy of the late government had practically nothing to do with the desirable financial conditions that prevail in the country at the present time, when its revenues are higher than ever before, when it has a greater surplus than has ever before existed, when immigrants are coming in greater volume than ever before, when its prosperity is increasing at a greater ratio than ever before. I have heard the Minister of Trade and Commerce in previous sessions make the same suggestion from this side of the House. Now, there cannot be success without the foundations of success. A country cannot succeed and be prosperous unless it has the material means whereby success may be achieved. But if a country, no matter how advantageously situated, can succeed without capable and competent direction, then a country is the only institution or organization in the known world that can succeed on these terms.

Inasmuch as the government of a country is the most complex piece of machinery that exists in connection with any human enterprise, I submit that in the very nature of things the policy of the government must to a stupendous degree be given credit or blame for the result that is achieved in the well-being of that country. I say this not because I wish to claim any credit on behalf of the late government, but to point out to the friends of the present government and to the people of Canada that if our friends undertake to conduct the government of this country on the principle that it does not make very much difference to the welfare or prosperity of the country whether the government has a forward or a backward policy, whether it has a developing or a restrictive policy, they will find, and the country will find, that they have made a great mistake. The policy of a government, in the nature of things, must have a great effect upon the well-being of the country, and if our friends have not yet realized that fact then I hope they soon will realize it, because we are all anxious to see development and progress in Canada.

If it is thought that the progress and prosperity that has been achieved has come simply because the sun has shone and the soil is fertile, and our people are energetic and industrious, I would ask, was it the fertile soil or the industry of the people, or the act of Providence, or the shining of the sun that entered upon the undertaking of the National Transcontinental Railway? Was it Providence that deepened the canals? Is it Providence that is building the port of Montreal? Is it not the aggressive and intelligent action of a progressive government having a progressive policy that has absolutely and directly brought into being this condition of affairs?

A word with regard to this eastern section of the National Tarnscontinental railway. My hon. friend from Dundas (Mr. Broder), as his friends have always done, decried the building of that section of the railway, and yet the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Trade and Commerce on former occasions in this House tried to discredit the late government because that railway was not completed before to-day. Did you ever hear of men taking such an attitude? These gentlemen exhausted every effort that could be put forth to prevent the construction of that great public enterprise, and when they could not prevent its construction, no later than some two or three weeks ago in this House, on their responsibility as ministers of the Crown, they attempted to discredit it as a profitable enterprise, after attacking the government because it was not completed more quickly.

I said that the government was not changing the tariff. They are entitled to credit for that, and I am sure that this country breathed a sigh of relief when the announcement was made yesterday that there would be neither changes in the tariff nor the establishment of bounties. We really got off better than we expected, but we were not less gratified to hear that the policy of constructive development which had been entered upon by the late government, and which had been carried so far towards completion, is to be still continued by our friends on the other side of the House. The two Transcontinental railways and the Hudson Bay railway are all to be completed, and the ports are to be equipped. All that the late government undertook to do or had in progress of doing is to be carried on without change by our friends the new government. For this again, the country is thankful.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. OLIVER. Shortly before the House rose at six o'clock, I had alluded to the fact that the budget recently presented to the House offered no variation from the tariff prevailing when the late government went out of power. That, however, is hardly a complete statement of the situation. The position of the late government in regard to tariffs is set out, not in the schedules on the statute-book, but in the proposition placed before the country, generally known as the reciprocity arrangement. This arrangement was the policy of the late government in regard to tariff readjustment, and was their policy also in dealing with the questions that were then up for immediate consideration in the interest of the people. The tariff as represented in the reciprocity arrangement involved a policy of reduction of taxation and expansion of trade. The reduction of taxation was the means taken by the late government to deal with the question of combines, the question of the high cost of living and also the question of the readjustment of the burden of taxation. It is futile to say that the late government did not move as it should have moved in the direction of lower tariffs. The tariff as it was proposed under the reciprocity arrangement was especially a reduction in regard to food products; it was essentially aimed at the high cost of living. It was believed that by taking the duty entirely off the more important food stuffs and reducing the duty in regard to practically all others, the cost of living to the people of Canada would be reduced. This could not be done without, in some degree and to some extent, affecting the profits of the combines and mergers which had been formed during the preceding years. And, as soon as it was announced that the policy of the government was to reduce the cost of the food of the people, at once these combines, trusts and mergers, whose organization was entered upon for the express purpose of levying an unjust toll upon the food of the people, rallied in antagonism to the late government and its policy. And the result of that rally is the success of our hon. friends on the other side. It has been said frequently that the late government was not true to low tariff principles because for so many years of its term in office no serious reductions had been made in the tariff. Let me point out that, situated as we are alongside of the United States, the half of our total trade being done with the United States and that country being a food-producing country like our own, if at any time during their fifteen years of power the late government had removed the duty on food stuffs, those who to-day criticise, and on all previous occasions have criticised, the late government because it did not move more rapidly towards reductions of the tariff, would have been the loudest in their declarations against its attitude and action. It was not practicable, in the ordinary sense of the word, for Canada to abolish the duty on foodstuffs unless our neighbours on the other side of the line did the same. But, when the government of the United States saw fit to reverse the policy it had followed for forty years of maintaining a high tariff on foodstuffs, the Liberal government, the government of low tariffs and fair-play to the individual citizen, did not lose one moment in closing with the proposition and staking its existence as a government upon the acceptance of the proposition by the

people. Whatever allegations may be made against the late government, the allegation of bad faith toward the principle of low tariff can never, in fairness, be made in view of their record on that occasion. It is a surprising fact that, in face of the high cost of living prevailing in Canada and of the complaints that have continually been made in regard to that condition, such a proposition did not receive the approval of the majority of the electors. That it did not receive their approval is only another tribute to the strength, and vigour the energy, and, may I venture to say, the unscrupulousness, of those interests that, on the sound of alarm on the declaration that the government was for lowering the tariff, rallied their forces in opposition, stopping at no consideration of honesty or fair-play, or loyalty to either Canada or the empire, in order to secure the defeat of the government.

Mr. BURNHAM. May I ask the hon. gentleman if he will be good enough to say how he thinks this lowering of the tariff on foodstuffs would affect the prices paid to the farmer?

Mr. OLIVER. I should be very glad to be permitted to proceed with my argument without interruption——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. OLIVER. But, inasmuch as my hon. friend (Mr. Burnham) has asked a question —certainly a fair question—I hope the House will bear with me if I digress for some little time from the line of my argument in order to deal with the point he has raised. My hon. friend asked how I expected to secure a higher price to the farmer for his products and a lower price to the consumer.

Mr. BURNHAM. No, what I asked was: How does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) think the reduction of the tariff on the foodstuffs would affect the prices paid to the farmer?

Mr. OLIVER. On such foodstuffs as are produced in Canada, not for export, I should take for granted that the abolition of the duty upon these food products, eliminating the question of the cost of distribution, would tend distinctly to the benefit of the consumer, and to that extent would be to the prejudice of the farmer. I think there is no question about that.

But let me point out that the cost of transportation comes into this question of the price of the food product to the farmer and to the consumer respectively; and not only the cost of transportation, but the exactions of the middleman.

An hon. MEMBER. He is always there.

Mr. OLIVER. He is always there, and when he has a hard and fast combine such as the Canners' Combine, he is able, Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER. We in the west feel the Canner's Combine very severely, and the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) knows as well as I do, that when a combine has control of a certain food product the price which the farmer receives bears no necessary relation to the price the consumer has to pay; that is a well known fact. Take the article of canned goods; it is a matter of absolute record that the producer on the south side of the line gets a better price for his product, and the consumer on the south side pays a lower price for that manufactured product.

Mr. MARSHALL. I would ask the hon. member why canned goods are higher on the other side of the line than they are here? I can quote the prices. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, it is not necessary for my hon. friend and myself to enter into an argument on this subject.

Mr. CURRIE. Of course, because you would get the worst of it. He knows his business and you do not.

Mr. OLIVER. That is where the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Marshall) has the advantage entirely over the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie). I say there is no need of the hon. member for Elgin and myself getting into an argument on this question. The matter has been before the public continuously, and whatever my hon. friend may say—I do not question his word at all, I do not question his knowledge of the subject, but I repeat that my information is, and I have the fullest confidence in it, that the price in the United States to the producer is higher and the price to the consumer is lower on the very goods that his combine puts on the Canadian market.

Mr. LALOR. Does the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) state that the producer is paid less in Canada?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. LALOR. That is absolutely incorrect.

Mr. OLIVER. Very well, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend, of course, has full knowledge of the facts so far as the Canadian end of it is concerned. But my hon. friend does not know any more about the conditions on the other side of the line than I do, or any one else, and I am responsible for the statement I make to the House, there is no question about it. So far as my information goes, the facts are

as I have stated. There is no question that since the formation of the Canners' Combine the price of canned goods in Canada has been increased very considerably, I suppose my hon. friends will not deny that. Now, let them tell this House, and they know this of their own knowledge, will they say that the price to the farmer for his product has been increased in the same proportion?

Mr. MARSHALL. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it has increased.

Mr. OLIVER. Has it been increased in the same proportion?

Mr. MARSHALL. Yes, and I will tell you why. Eight years ago we paid the farmer $20 a ton for peas, to-day we are offering him $34 a ton for peas. Eight years ago we paid him 18 cents for tomatoes, to-day we are paying him 30 cents. Eight years ago we paid him $5 a ton for corn, to-day we are paying him $8.

Mr. OLIVER. How many cans of tomatoes will a bushel make?

Mr. MARSHALL. I suppose I am interrupting the hon. gentleman, and I do not want to do it.

Mr. OLIVER. All right, this is important.

Mr. MARSHALL. We are paying for our labour twenty to thirty per cent higher than we did eight years ago. Our teams cost us more. Everything we use in our business costs from twenty-five to thirty-five per cent more than it did eight years ago. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have here both the American prices and the Canadian prices, and I want to tell the hon. gentleman, or any other gentleman in this House, that when he makes these quotations he is altogether wrong. I have the prices and I can give them to the House any time.

Mr. CARVELL. Let the hon. member make his speech later on.

Mr. MARSHALL. I say I do not want to interrupt the hon. gentleman. I am sure that he is not familiar with the facts, or he would not make that statement. I have that confidence in the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BROWN. Does the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Marshall) mean to say——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) has the floor.

Mr. OLIVER. I will be glad to have this matter cleared up.

Mr. BROWN. Does the hon. member for Elgin state that tomatoes were higher in the United States during the month of July last than they were in the city of Montreal, that is, a three-pound tin?

Mr. MARSHALL. I could answer that in this way. The canner's price was less than $1 per case. After the case leaves our hands we have nothing whatever to do with the price. There is no doubt the wholesaler has raised the price, I am speaking particularly of our own business. Every case of tomatoes which the Dominion Canners Company put up was sold at less than a dollar.

Mr. LALOR. 95 cents.

Mr. BROWN. Is the hon. member for Elgin aware that the combine went to the wholesale trade in the city of Montreal and other cities, and contracted with them for a certain quantity of cases, and after that they would shrink down the quantity they were to deliver so as to enhance the price?

Mr. LALOR. It is easy to answer that question. We did not deliver the quantity because we did not pack them. We only packed according to order.

Mr. MARSHALL. I may just add that it cost our company $40,000 last year to buy up our shortage. We guarantee a percentage. The shortage on our pack was so great that it cost the company some $40,000 to buy up their orders.

Mr. OLIVER. I asked the hon. member for Elgin a question which he has not answered. I asked him how many cans of tomatoes a bushel would make?

Mr. MARSHALL. That is a fair question, and I am ready to answer it. That depends on the quality of the tomatoes. We get from 10 to 12 cans from the bushel.

Mr. OLIVER. What is the size of the cans?

Mr. MARSHALL. Three pounds.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend gets from 10 to 12 cans from a bushel and he raised the price to the farmer a matter of 12 cents? Is that right? That is a cent a can. Now how much does the consumer pay to-day as compared with what he did before the Canners' Combine was formed?

Mr. MARSHALL. Now the hon. gentleman knows that is not a fair question.

Mr. OLIVER. I consider that is a fair question.

Mr. MARSHALL. It does not stop at that. We are paying men to-day $2 where we used to pay them $1 a day. We are paying more for the cans.

Mr. OLIVER. Just stick to the point. I want to know from the hon. gentleman

what his tomatoes cost the consumer before the combine was formed, and what they cost the consumer now.

Mr. MARSHALL. It shows that the hon. gentleman is not posted in the line. Before the amalgamation we sold tomatoes at $1.40 a dozen, and peas at $1.60 a dozen. We sold the same goods last year at 85 cents.

Mr. LALOR. And we sold them three years ago at 70 cents.

Mr. OLIVER. That does not make any difference. I did not say that the canners have raised the prices; I said that the prices had been raised to the consumer. As a matter of fact, beyond any question, the consumer pays that price and all that the farmer gets more is 12 cents a bushel on the statement of my hon. friend. Every man who buys tomatoes knows that he pays more than a cent a can more for them to-day than he did five years ago.

Mr. BRADBURY. Would the hon. gentleman tell me how he proposes to remedy the evil of the middleman?

Mr. OLIVER. What I propose to do is to reduce the duty on canned goods and allow the combine on the south side of the line to compete with the combine on the north side of the line. That was our proposal.

Mr. LALOR. Why did you not do that during the last fifteen years?

Mr. OLIVER. We did it just as soon as the United States could give us fair terms for doing it.

Mr. LALOR. I want to correct the hon. gentleman. You did not do anything of the kind; reciprocity did not affect canned goods at all.

Mr. OLIVER. I have a statement here of the tariff relations between the United States and the Dominion of Canada, the correspondence and statements, a government paper, a blue-book purporting to set forth the reciprocal tariff agreement between the United States and Canada. Let us come down to the question of fact, in regard to a matter that my hon. friend claims to have absolute information on. He has evoked a great deal of applause from his friends by his statement that the reciprocal agreement did not affect canned goods——

Mr. SHARPE (North Ontario). They were on the free list.

Mr. OLIVER—did not affect canned goods. My hon. friend is in error. Has he anything more to that effect to say?

Mr. LALOR. Tell us how much it affected them.

Mr. OLIVER. It did not affect them much.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. OLIVER. I am dealing with a question asked by the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Burnham). The hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Lalor), interrupted and as a canner and a member of this House he should have known whether the statement he made was correct or not. He was given the applause of his friends on the other side of the House as having made a sucessful contradiction of a statement which I had made.

Mr. LALOR. You did not know it yourself until your friend behind you told you.

Mr. OLIVER. It does not make any difference what I knew. The question is what my hon. friend knew. I did not make the statement; he made it. Let us have a thorough understanding, and let us have fair-play.

Mr. MACDONALD. It is quite evident that the hon. member for Haldimand did not know.

Mr. OLIVER. I am afraid that the hon. member for Haldimand must have known, and that he presumed upon this House when he said there was no——

Mr. LALOR. Tell us what it is.

Mr. OLIVER. I will tell the hon. gentleman what it is. I am at some disadvantage in discussing questions of fact in regard to trade matters when hon. members of this house will make statements upon which they must have knowledge, on which the House knows that they must have knowledge and when they make misstatements in regard to these matters. I hope that when I am contradicted again the House will be good enough to take account of the possibilities of the facts in regard to the matter.

Tomatoes and other vegetables, including corn and baked beans in cans or other air tight packages, including the weight of the package per lb., ¼ cent.

Mr. LALOR. If the hon. gentleman will look he will find that that is the treaty with France he is speaking about.

Mr. SPEAKER. It seems to me that the hon. member who has the floor ought to be allowed courteously to continue his speech and that such unseemly interruptions are not becoming to the dignity of the House of Commons or in keeping with fair debate.

Mr. OLIVER. The United States tariff is 2 1-2 cents to 40 per cent. and the rate

now proposed for both the United States and Canada is a cent and a quarter. The reduction by the United States is 1¼ to 2 cents per pound and the reduction by Canada a quarter of a cent. I think I have established the point that the reciprocity arrangement, the proposal to reduce the duties on food products in Canada and thereby reduce the cost of living, did not necessarily affect to the extent of that reduction the price received by the farmer when there was a combine standing between the producer and the consumer and that in so far as the reciprocity arrangement brought competition into the distribution of such food products, to that extent, the consumer gained and the producer did not lose. I have been delayed somewhat in the course of my argument by the question—the very proper question — of the hon. member for Peterborough and I hope that I will be excused for now continuing.

I say that it was absolutely established as the policy of the late government to reduce the cost of living by reducing the taxation on food products and that that policy was entered upon at the very first moment when it could reasonably be entered upon and expect the endorsation of the people, all things being considered. Just as soon as it became possible for Canada to secure entry to the United States market for food products on fair terms, just at that moment, the government of Canada was prepared to make corresponding reductions in the tariff on such products coming into Canada and thereby benefit the consumers and reduce the cost of living to the people of Canada. The late government undertook to answer the question as to what should be done in regard to the high cost of living and in regard to the exactions of combines. The country is interested in knowing what they may expect at the hands of the present government in regard to the same matters. It is to be regretted that since the present government came into power the cost of living has not decreased. It has increased. The formation of combines has not ceased. There have been more rather than less.

The country is interested in knowing what attitude this government will take now that it is in power, in regard to these pressing and important matters. Whatever the late government may have been or done is not the question to-day, although the late government is quite prepared to stand on its record. But the question is: What is this government going to do; and we can judge of what it is going to do by what it has done. I took the liberty of suggesting earlier in the discussion that the present government, when it comes to frame a tariff, will frame that tariff in the interests of the combines, not in the interest of reducing the cost of living, not in the interest of reducing taxation. I say that if the government is true to the policy and the principles upon which it attained office, it will be a government of increased taxation and restricted trade. And, Mr. Speaker, in my humble judgment, such a policy cannot tend to the well-being, or the progress, or the prosperity of this country. We have had some experience of the actions of this government, although they have not introduced changes in the tariff. They have been in power for five months, and in a country like this a great deal happens in five months. I submit that it is no answer for their failure to deal in the public interest with great questions as they arise, to say that they have not been long in office. It is not necessary to tell us that. They have been so busy removing officials appointed by the late government, so busy appointing commissions to find places for their friends, in parliament and out of parliament, that they have not had time to pay attention to those matters of first importance in which all the people of the whole country are interested. There have been matters brought to the attention of this government, not only by those on this side of the House, but by their own friends as well. The member for Calgary (Mr. Bennett) has taken the country into his confidence—I do not know whether he has taken the government into his confidence or not—he has told the country that there is a condition of affairs west of Lake Superior that demands the instant and urgent attention of the government. I think my hon. friend the member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) is imbued with the same idea, so that if our friends opposite are not aware of the existing conditions, and if they have not taken any action in regard to these conditions, it is not for lack of knowledge. I submit it is not for lack of time, because, if they were spending their time in that which was of greater importance to the country and not in that which was of greater importance to their party and their friends, they would have had plenty of time. It has been said in the House, it has been repeated in the press, and it is well known throughout all Canada to-day, that to that part of Canada which chiefly produces food products for export, access to the markets of the United States was an important feature of the then government's proposal last spring. In some parts of the country access to the producing areas of the United States so as to reduce the cost of living was desirable; in other parts of the country access to the consuming markets of the United States was desirable in order to secure greater benefit to our people. Our friends in the government are proposing to extend Can-

ada's trade by a treaty with the West Indies, and I think I have read in some place that the Minister of Trade and Commerce is going to visit Australia with a view to our increasing our trade with that country. But, there are the trade possibilities which were open to Canada by the lowering of the duty on food products going into the United States, an opportunity which would add to the value of every bushel of the farmers' products in all the three prairie provinces. That proposal was as available to this government as it was to the late government, and if to-day the farmers of the western prairies are selling their wheat at an average of ten cents a bushel less than they could have obtained for it, the fault lies not with the late government but with this government, and to this government the loss must be charged. It is true that this is not in line with the policy of trade restriction upon which the government were elected, and I think it cannot be emphasized too strongly in the minds of the people, just exactly what loss is being suffered by reason of that restrictive policy.

Mr. BURNHAM. If we had, say for purposes of illustration, a dozen transcontinental lines, so that there would be no congestion of traffic, would the hon. gentleman not then say that that was quite equal to what he proposes in the way of a reciprocal market?

Mr. OLIVER. Not at all The suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. Burnham) does not touch the point. I will deal with the point he has raised later on. But for the moment I am dealing simply with the question of the advantage to the western producer of access to the markets of the United States for his products, and I say that the market reports show that the advantage in the United States markets on the 2nd of March averages about ten cents a bushel on wheat, fourteen cents a bushel on white oats, and from twenty-four to sixty-four cents a bushel on barley.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). Is it not a fact that the price of wheat was higher in Manitoba on the 20th of September last, the day before the election, than it was in North Dakota?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know, and I do not know what difference that makes. The question is, what is the price of wheat now and what has it been ever since? If my hon. friend is going to put before this country the idea that because his friends have been returned to power the price of wheat in Canada has gone down, he is welcome to that contention; but I would think he would be the last man to make such a proposition, and I want him to be my witness that I have not made that suggestion.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). The hon. gentleman knows as well as any man in this House that a premium is paid for hard wheat in North Dakota at the present time. He knows that the millers at Minneapolis thought that reciprocity was going to carry in Canada, and for that reason the price of hard wheat went down in North Dakota, and the price in Manitoba on the 20th of September last was higher than in North Dakota, showing conclusively that reciprocity would have been no good for western Canada.

Mr. OLIVER. The only flaw in my hon. friend's argument is that the difference in price is greater on damaged wheat than it is on sound wheat, greater on soft wheat than on hard wheat, greater on barley than on wheat, greater on flax than on wheat and greater on oats than on wheat. So that my hon. friend has no ground whatever for his suggestion unless he contends that because of the return of this government to power the price of wheat in Canada has gone down.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). I never said that. I said that the price in North Dakota went down. I did not say the price in Canada went down.

Mr. OLIVER. The price in North Dakota to-day is an average of ten cents a bushel higher than in Manitoba. Therefore the price in North Dakota must have gone up, or the price in Manitoba must have gone down.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). Does the hon. gentleman as a western representative think that we would get the prices quoted in the United States to-day if we had reciprocity with the United States?

Mr. OLIVER. There comes to my mind the case of a rich man who was dying and whose pastor suggested that he might leave his money to the church. The dying man wanted to know what effect that would be likely to have upon his future condition. The minister said that he could not tell, but suggested that there would be no harm in trying. There would be no harm in our trying the effect of access to a market where the price has been persistently for four months ten cents a bushel higher than it has been on our market, and has been persistently year after year in that condition. Not every day, I will admit; but as a rule the Dakota price has been better than the Manitoba price, and my hon. friend is my authority for this statement, in a speech which he delivered in this House in 1909.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). Would that condition continue under reciprocity?

Mr. OLIVER. My opinion is: yes, undoubtedly. But it is not a question of opinion; it is a question of fact. I say that, with a population of ninety millions of people consuming wheat, and wanting the best, there is a sufficient demand in the United States for our special quality of wheat to keep the price at a premium for home consumption in the United States. That is my belief, and I think nobody will contradict it.

Mr. LALOR. They wanted it for export.

Mr. OLIVER. They are not exporting a bushel of that kind of wheat, and if my hon. friend does not know it, my hon. friend behind him (Mr. Sharpe, Lisgar) will tell him. I think I have established thoroughly that the policy of this government has cost the prairie country, on a fair estimate, not less than $12,000,000 during the current year. Is that a loss only to the prairie country? Is not that a loss that will affect every interest in Canada, and particularly the manufacturing interests of eastern Canada?

Mr. BURNHAM. Do I understand you to say that they offered reciprocal trade without a quid pro quo?

Mr. OLIVER. They offered it for a consideration.

Mr. BURNHAM. How do you claim, then, that it would be a benefit to the whole of Canada?

Mr. OLIVER. I am saying that the loss of $12,000,000 of newly-created wealth to the western farmer is a loss to the whole Dominion of Canada. I hope my hon. friend understands that.

Mr. BURNHAM. I do not.

Mr. OLIVER. Then I am sorry. There has been a great deal of talk about a division between the east and the west. Let me say that the eastern manufacturer is directly interested in the loss of that amount of money to the western farmer —that the eastern commercial house, the eastern financial interest, every interest, even the canners' combine, is interested.

Mr. LALOR. What about the eastern farmer, who turned your party out of office?

Mr. OLIVER. That is his privilege. I am not arguing with my hon. friend on that point at all. May I be allowed to continue my address, unless my hon. friend has some light to throw on the subject? I want to emphasize the point that every interest in eastern Canada is interested in the western farmer and in his getting every cent of value that can be got for his crop; and when the eastern manufacturer lined up his men before the 21st of September and told them that if reciprocity carried, the factory would have to be shut up and they would be out of employment, he told them what was not the fact. He urged them to vote against what was in their best interest and in his best interest, as well as in the best interest of this country as a whole.

Mr. LALOR. How about the member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie)?

Mr. OLIVER. The member for South Wellington can answer for himself, and I think he is quite competent to answer any of my friends on the other side of the House who may wish to ask him any questions. I have estimated the loss to the western farmer and to all Canada by reason of failure to secure access to the United States markets for the western products at $12,000,000 in this current year. But our hon. friends will say that it is contrary to their policy to allow the western farmer to sell his products on the other side of the line. I think my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. White) suggested that we ought to build up a milling industry in Canada and build up our railway system by defeating reciprocity. That is to say while we have a tariff that compels the producer to buy in a protected market we are also going to reject an arrangement that would enable him to sell otherwise than in a restricted market.

But there is another condition in the country in regard to which relief might be given in a manner less directly contrary to the policy of our government, I speak of the condition of traffic congestion or grain blockade. That matter has been brought to the attention of the House and the government have given their answer in regard to it, they have told us we must not complain of the dispensations of Providence, that they have not been in office very long and have been very busy, they have had something else to do than to take care of the conditions as they exist. Let me emphasize those conditions. It has been stated here and elsewhere that by reason of the lower prices resulting from the grain blockade the western farmer loses on this year's operations not less than $10,000,000, and he stands to lose $6,000,000 more by reason of the total destruction of damaged grain. That is to say he stands to lose $16,000,000 as a result of the inadequacy of the transportation facilities in that country in regard to this year's crop. But our friends say that this is a condition that cannot be avoided. They say that in one breath and in the next breath they say: We have taken measures to avoid it. They have succeeded in making arrangements with the railway companies so that this grain can be delivered by a short haul to St. Paul and Duluth instead of being taken

to St. John—and if they had made those arrangements so that they would have come into effect on November 10 instead of on March 7, there would not have been any grain blockage, there would not have been any loss to the farmer either in depressed prices or in loss of damaged grain. This government has been convicted by its own action of having stood silent and quiet and careless while this country has lost $10,000,000 and stands to lose $6,000,000 more when it need not have lost one cent had an aggressive and energetic government, one that was paying attention to the needs of the country, been in office. If they take refuge in the statement that their policy is averse to sending Canada's trade across the line, then I ask, why did they make arrangements to have it go south of the line? If they say it is not contrary to their policy then they stand convicted of having lost to the western farmer and to this country the stupendous sum of from $10,000,000 to $16,000,000 without the slightest justification on earth. There are times when a policy may very well be abandoned.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER. There are times when a policy may very well be abandoned, and this was certainly one of those times. Yet when I had the honour to place before the House a resolution approving of the action of the government, desiring to confirm them in the policy which they ultimately adopted, they rejected the resolution, and their followers voted against it to a man, declared absolutely against a policy that would have relieved the situation of this year; and in all human probability such action will be just or almost as necessary next year. We have on record the votes of the members of the government and their followers in the House declaring absolutely against the very policy that they themselves were compelled to undertake, only at too late a date in this year. I do not know just how far the excuse of lack of time should prevail. When a government is charged with the responsibility of office, when they have assumed with all readiness that responsibility, I am not sure just how far lack of time is an excuse for lack of action.

Another matter that has been discussed in the west for some time and brought to the attention of this House by formal resolution, is the question of the equalization of local railway rates. Surely there could be nothing more fair, more reasonable, more right than that the railway companies should not be allowed to charge more on the western prairies for like services under like conditions, than they are allowed to charge in eastern Canada. That principle has been applied to the carrying of passengers, but it has not been applied to the carrying of freight. The proposal that it should apply to the carrying of freight was rejected by the government; it was declared that the Railway Commission must deal with this matter, that the responsibility was with the Railway Commission and not with the government or with parliament. Now, on behalf of the western country, I want to say that what is important to them is that they shall have a square and even deal; they ask for no advantage, but they do ask that in a question of railway transportation, which is more important to them even than the question of tariff, they shall not be discriminated against by the railway companies. And they look to parliament, which charters the railways and grants them bonuses and assistance of various kinds, and they look to the government, to see that justice is done in that particular. But the government does not want to take the responsibility. It has a Railway Commission that takes that responsibility off its shoulders. This is a form of government by commission, of which, it seems to me, it is quite possible to have a little too much. When a great injustice exists—or I will not say injustice, but when a great and manifest inequality exists—as between the east and the west, and the government refuses to take cognizance of that condition, it is no wonder that my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. Bennett), my hon. friend from St. Antoine, Montreal (Mr. Ames), my hon friend from Brandon (Mr. Aikins), and some other members of the House supporting the government go out through the country and make what I must characterize as very wild statements in regard to the condition of public feeling in that country. But the government surely will recognize that when their supporters are so fully impressed with the conditions as to cause them to make these statements, it is surely time for the government to take a day off from slaughtering Grit officials and pay a little atention to the necessities of the country, even though it be the western country.

While the government did not have time to deal with the grain blockade, and did not have the inclination to exercise its responsibility in dealing with the freight rates, there was one matter that they did not lose any time in dealing with. I refer to the duties on lumber. I have not the calendar at hand, but I do not think the government had been in office more than a few days when their friends of the lumber combine in British Columbia came down and, at their demand, the lumber duties were practically readjusted so as to lay a heavier burden upon the western settler than he had borne up to that time. It was not enough that he had a bad season; it was not enough that he was

compelled to accept panic prices for his grain owing to the grain blockade; it was not enough that he should have to pay excessive local rates in securing a local market for his damaged grain, but our friends opposite had plenty of time to make a little adjustment of the lumber duties so as to take I should fancy not less than a quarter of a million dollars out of his pocket in this particular season, at the command of the British Columbia lumber combine.

Did I say the government did not have time? Well, in some things they had time. The government brought in, early in the session, a Bill to deal with the grain trade. This Bill represented the mind of the people of the west, of the producers of the west, in regard to the handling of their product. It was the result of years and years of consideration, possibly of agitation and demonstration. They came to parliament last year—came, may I say, to a friendly government—and asked that the conditions surrounding the grain trade be further improved in their interest. The Bill was prepared and was brought before parliament, but it failed to become law owing to the dissolution. It was brought forward again at this session, practically identically the same Bill. But our friends opposite had time to amend it in such shape that even my hon. friends from Lisgar (Mr. Sharpe) and Souris (Mr. Schaffner) could not, or dared not vote for its provisions. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is probably the most serious matter that has touched the west at the hands of this government since they took office. In one particular, in the matter of car distribution—and I do not intend to trouble the House with details—the Bill as it had been presented meant an average of from 2 cents to 6 cents a bushel to the western farmer selling his grain at country points. By reason of that car distribution clause, he was able to sell his grain at the terminal, and so he could benefit by the buying competition in Winnipeg while otherwise he would have had to take the competition at the local point. And any man who knows anything of the grain trade will realize that the difference between the competition in price at country points and at the central or terminal point would mean anywhere from 2 cents to 6 cents per bushel. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) has seen fit to amend that Act. That Act, affecting a right established by the efforts of so many years and which was of such benefit to the producer, has been framed in such a way, that, as I have said, two of the hon. gentleman's own supporters would not or could not vote for it. And there is another amendment dealing with the mixing of grain. If there is one thing more than another that the farmer has insisted upon it is that the grain shall go forward to its ultimate destination under the government certificate that is given at the inspection. Again it is not necessary to deal in detail with this matter; but it is a fact that the prevention of the mixing of grain offers a premium to the good farmer and that to permit the mixing of grain destroys the good farmer's premium on the market.

My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) did not hesitate at short notice to push his amendment through which legalizes the mixing of western grades on their way to market, provides means and machinery and legalizes the degrading of the quality of western wheat as it goes to the ultimate market.

Sir, is it any wonder that our friends behind the ministry have taken alarm? Is it any wonder that they have become afraid of the consequences, first of ignoring, and then of attacking the interests of the producers of the west? I am at a loss to know on what principle this government proposes to govern this country, if it is to ignore the welfare and progress of that vast western country, if it is to ignore the importance to the whole Dominion of providing that the western farmer shall get the last cent of value of his bushel of wheat. Unless the government acts on the principle that it is necessary to recognize that right of the farmer, I am doubtful of the progress of this country in the future. It is not a question as between the east and the west, it is a question as to the whole country. If this country has progressed, if manufactures have increased in Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton and Brantford, if the price of real estate in Montreal and Toronto is high, and soaring, everybody knows that it is not because of the increase of production on the farms of Ontario and Quebec, but it is because of the increase of production in the prairie west, and that increase of production depends upon the price the farmer can get for his product. But instead of recognizing that fact, instead of bending their energies to some policy or principle that would improve the conditions of the farmer there, they come here and preach us sermons on the necessity and desirability of the farmer being on good terms with the elevator men, and not finding fault with the railroad company. They tell us that the farmer must go into mixed farming, that they are going to build the Hudson Bay railway, and that the farmer ought to be optimistic. They tell him anything and everything except what will be to the point and will do him some good. Now let me say that it is no business of

the government whether the farmer raises ducks or raises wheat. It is his business what he raises, and they can depend upon it that he is going to raise that which is within his means and to the best advantage. It is the business of the government to see that the best possible opportunity is given to the farmer to get the best price for what he raises. It is not a question of the railroad companies, nobody is attacking the railroad companies because they did not haul more grain than they did. The railroad companies no doubt hauled all the grain they were able to haul, along the routes that this government have allowed them to haul it. The railroad companies apparently were deprived of the advantage of taking the shorter haul, and to-day are doing the best they can to catch up with the conditions which, I am sorry to say, have been allowed to remain so long that there is no possibility now of relieving them to the full extent.

Now Sir, we are dealing with the presentation by the government of its financial propositions for the year. We are glad that they have decided to continue the tariff that has been in force for some years past. We are glad that they have declared they are going to continue the policy of constructive development that has been the policy of the late government during past years. But if they are going to take the position that because the country is prosperous that all they have to do is to shake the plum tree vigorously, then I want to assure them that they are under a wrong impression. This condition of prosperity that we enjoy to-day did not come about only as an act of Providence. It was necessary to give direction and inspiration to the energy and industry of our people, and because that direction was given in due course and at proper times by the late government, under its well defined policy of lower taxes and freer trade, it has been possible for this country to achieve in the current year its greatest revenue, its greatest surplus, and the greatest measure of prosperity that it has ever enjoyed. If our hon. friends are able to keep that record, if they are able to increase still further the prosperity of the country and its development, it matters not, I am free to admit, whether it is their policy or ours, whether it is high taxation or low taxation, whether it is restrictive trade or expanded trade. If they can secure that continued increase of prosperity with a policy of high taxation and restricted trade, we will be glad to enjoy the prosperity and to share it with them, and we will give them the credit of their policy being better than we expected. But our belief is that this country needs a policy of lower taxes and expansion of trade, in order to secure its continued development and prosperity.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford). Coming as I do from an industrial city in the province of Ontario, I think it is proper that I should say a few words on the issues raised by the budget speech presented yesterday by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. White). At the outset I desire to compliment that hon. gentleman on the exceedingly straightforward manner in which he presented the condition of the finances of this country, indicating a grasp of the financial arrangements, a grasp of expenditures and receipts, and the management of sinking funds, loan accounts, and all other subjects dealt with in the budget, which showed him to possess a master hand.

I desire, therefore, to compliment him in that way. Having said that much I must add that I have one or two regrets in regard to the budget speech; not for any thing that it did contain, but for one or two items of considerable importance that it did not contain. I may probably be standing in a somewhat isolated position with regard to what I have in my mind, but, being a man of business and always having been accustomed to say exactly what I mean on any given question, I propose to name the subject on which I regret that the Minister of Finance, and those who are associated with him, did not see fit to speak. The omission I desire to mention is the non-introduction of the iron and steel bounties. I think that the 'Citizen' this morning indicates very largely what the country thinks, that is, that the chief point that was expected was missed, because the first head line contained these words: 'No iron or steel bounties.'

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Hon. gentlemen seem to say 'all right,' but we are in this anomalous position, Mr. Speaker, that the iron and steel trade for the past 15 years have received more from a so-called free trade government than they are going to receive this year, and next from a so-called protectionist government. That is an anomaly that is worthy of being pointed out, and I regret that in this respect I do not agree with the budget speech that has been delivered. When a man is drowning is not the time to investigate; it is the time to save, and after that, if you wish to find out how he got there, make inquiry. Do not wait while he drowns, but lend him a helping hand. If the iron and steel trade require reasonable bounties, as I believe they do, in my judgment they should be granted now, and after the Tariff Commis-

sion have made their inquiry, if it is found that they do not need this assistance, they can be taken away. How much would it have taken? According to the 'Monetary Times,' it would have taken about $2,000,000 a year. That is a very small matter, and it may be said that it means very little to the industries of the country. But I would point out that it is an indication, to a certain extent, of the forces that are in control at the present time of the trade of Canada, and I quite agree that the present government were elected very largely because they were supposed to be a protectionist government.

That is my view, that is the doctrine that I preached on the hustings, and that is what I say here. I am not ashamed to own that I am a protectionist, and that I have been consistently a protectionist for thirty years past. I was brought up as a business man, I have made a special study of tariffs and business matters, and when I speak to you, Mr. Speaker, and the members of this House, I speak as a business man not desiring particularly to make any political capital at the expense of any one else, but with a true desire to look at what I believe to be the best interests of Canada in all respects, and to all classes. Remember, I am not a protectionist for the manufacturer any more than I am for the agriculturist. I know that an hon. gentleman across the way will say that you cannot protect the agriculturist, but if he comes down to our town, or to our part of the province of Ontario, I can show him that the farmer is protected there. I can show him that the farmer of Ontario is protected to-day. He knows it and, further, he appreciates it. The farmers of Ontario at the last general election voted in very large measure for the return of this government to power, because they realised that the home market was their best market, and that it was for their welfare that it should be retained.

I also desire to call the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance to the very large excess of imports over exports at the present time. I look upon that as a danger point. No less a financial authority than Sir B. E. Walker of Toronto, drew attention to it in his recent report to the shareholders of the Bank of Commerce. He says that is a danger point, and I think that in a country such as Canada, with natural resources such as she has, it requires no explanation to show that when you import, as you did last year, $472,000,000, and only export $297,000,000, there is something wrong. That is a difference of $175,000,000 between imports and exports, and that balance, for the most part, has to be settled by cash. Last year, in the trade between Canada and the United States, it took $165,000,000 in cash to settle the balance of trade. The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), who has just spoken, told us that it is broader markets that we are perishing for, that it is wider markets that we are suffering for, and he goes on to figure out that the western country has lost $10,000,000 by reason of reciprocity not being put into force as it would have been, according to the hon. gentleman, by the late government. I want him to make all fair deductions from that, and if he does he will find that he has a large balance on the other side, and I can show it. That reciprocity agreement did not cover grain only; it covered animals and their products, vegetables and fruits and almost every conceivable product of the farm. The hon. member for Edmonton figures out that we lost about $10,000,000 this year because we did not adopt reciprocity in so far as western grain is concerned. Let me tell him what would have happened in Ontario, Quebec and the maritime provinces. You have in these provinces one and a half million cattle, and the figures produced during the discussion of the subject proved that on cattle alone you would have had a loss of $10 a head, as compared with the value in the United States. It was figured that there would be a loss of $10 per head on milch cows, $5 to $10 per head on young cattle, and $2 to $3 per head on sheep. On cattle and sheep, Ontario, Quebec and the maritime provinces would have lost double the $10,000,000 if reciprocity had been adopted, that the hon. gentleman estimates was lost by the people of the western country on account of the refusal to adopt reciprocity. Has he no sympathy with the farmers of the east? Ontario is doing a little farming still, Ontario contains as many farmers yet as the whole of the three new provinces of the west, and Ontario for the past three years has grown more products upon its farms than have been grown in the three great western provinces. I am saying that with no disrespect to the west, but I want the hon. member for Edmonton to have a little more desire to equalize things than he appears to have, and not be ready to sacrifice the farmers of the east for the sake of the farmers of the west.

There must be give and take in this matter, and I say to the hon. member that we saved the farmers of Canada when we turned down reciprocity. If there ever was a gold brick that came down the pike, it was that reciprocity gold brick that my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) has advocated. Reciprocity was discussed in this House of Commons for six months, and I read the speeches, and high prices for the farmer was the cry that rang from one end of the Liberal benches to the other. But, when

these gentlemen got out on the hustings of Ontario, their crop was: Cheap food for the workingman. Oh, what a fall was there, from high prices for the farmer to cheap food for the working man, and so to-day we have in this House the hon. member from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), and the labour member from Montreal (Mr. Verville) both on the same side of the House and each advocating, an entirely different policy. But, from this side of the House, comes a policy which benefits all classes in this country; protection for both these great interests, protection for the agricultural industry and protection for manufacturing enterprises. That is the policy that has built up Canada in the past, and that is the policy that will make Canada great in the future. Reciprocity with the United States was turned down because it was a gold brick and everybody in our district knew it, and we discussed it fairly and squarely. We showed the people exactly where they would be at if they voted for reciprocity, and the farmers from one end of Ontario to the other said: We don't want any of your reciprocity; we appreciate our home markets. We were told to-night by one hon. gentleman of the opposition that it is the middleman that is causing all the trouble and that he steps in between the farmer and the consumer of the farm produce, and keeps the farmer from getting the high prices he otherwise would. Well, let me tell that hon. member what happens in my own town. I live in the city of Brantford, which has a population of about twenty-five thousand, and which, I think, is about equal to the population of the city of Edmonton. We don't make quite as much blow, and you don't hear as much about us, but we are there all the same, and I think we are producing more than does the city whence the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) comes. I may claim at all events that the city of Brantford is at least the equal of the city of Edmonton, although it is true we are content with a hundred dollars a foot for our real estate, while the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) would ask a thousand dollars a foot for real estate in his city. At all events, we have built up in the city of Brantford with great trouble and care a body of skilled labour, represented by six thousand five hundred workingmen who have been trained in their business. And with great capital and with skilled labour a great manufacturing industry has been established in the heart of an agricultural district such as Brant county is. Let me tell the hon. member how we do business in Brantford, and then he will see that the farmer gets full price for his products and that no middleman intervenes. We have a market square occupying about two acres in the centre of the city, and on Saturday morning there are from three hundred to five hundred farmers with their wagons around that square, and these wagons are filled with the products of the farm. The workingman from the factory marches up to the farmer's wagon, laden with eggs, butter, meats of all kinds, poultry, vegetables and fruit, and he buys direct from the farmer who produces, and the money that is paid goes directly into the farmer's pocket. Is not that the right system; is not that co-operation between the country and the city? And let me tell the hon. member further, some of the prices that have obtained right in the city of Brantford under these conditions this winter: eggs have brought for the last two months from forty cents to fifty cents a dozen direct from the farmer; butter has brought from thirty cents to forty cents a pound; potatoes have brought from one dollar and fifty to two dollars a bag and so on with the other products of the farm sold direct from the farmer to the workingman, and no middleman about it. And, Mr. Speaker, what is the result: The farmer is prosperous and the workingman is happy and living well and enjoying himself and getting good wages in an occupation that suits him well. The workingman is saving money and the farmer is saving money, and these conditions prevailed last summer during the election campaign and, therefore, the farmers of Brant county and the workingmen in Brantford decided to let well enough alone, and they did let it alone with a vengeance; and a city that has been usually Liberal gave me almost one thousand majority, a thing I never dreamed of and never expected to see. These were the conditions that prevailed not only in Brant county but throughout the province of Ontario, and instead of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) wondering how it was all done, if he had kept up another month or two with the style of argument he has put up to-night and which was put up during the campaign, there would not have been even thirteen members from the province of Ontario. What a tumble it was from high prices for the farmer to cheap food for the workingman. The first man to make the leap from the high prices for the farmer to cheap food for the workingman was the late member the hon. Mackenzie King, who prepared the figures for the government to prove that the American market was going to be a bonanza, but as soon as he saw the figures he flopped over and he took every one with him who could be stampeded, and the 'Expositor,' the Liberal newspaper, and the 'Expositor' man who was the candidate against me went with him in the jump. Then, instead of talking high

prices for the farmer as they had done for six months previously, they began to talk cheap food for the workingman to catch his vote. We asked one of the prominent Liberal workers how he took such a jump, and he answered: I have talked high prices for the farmer for six months; we have got the farmer loaded up with high prices, and having got the farmer we are going after the workingman with a cry of cheap food. Well, that is exactly what was done by the Liberal party and between the two stools they fell to the ground, and, as I said, the Hon. Mackenzie King was the first man to take the jump, because he saw that the plea of the government was completely frustrated by the figures which he himself had prepared with great care to prove that prices in the United States were better than in Canada. And, Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that these prices in the United States throughout that campaign, and for the most part up to the present time, on all agricultural products, barring perhaps No. 1 wheat and one or two things of that kind, are higher in Canada than they are in the United States to-day, and they have been right along. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) tell me if he can—and I will give him a chance to answer—will he tell me of one single product of the farm that the United States does not produce in greater quantities than it requires for its own people? Can he name one? As far as I know there is not a single agricultural product raised in the United States that there is not an excess of. On nearly all classes of food products which they raise, their yearly exports run up to the hundreds of millions of dollars.

An hon. MEMBER. What about barley?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. They export barley. They may not export No. 1 malting barley, but they export barley. They export potatoes, they export wheat, they export oats, they export cattle, sheep, horses, butter, cheese and all the products of the dairy. Probably, I might include flax as an export from the United States, but that may be questionable as it depends on their requirements at home, and some years they export it and some years they do not. But, take almost every product of the farm and you will find that the American is an exporter.

An hon. MEMBER. Including hay.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Yes, including hay. The Americans export every class of vegetables, and in the city of Brantford, which is in the heart of an agricultural district, we are eating products of the American farms that have paid 30 per cent duty. Irish potatoes, I understand, have reached Ottawa, paying 30 per cent. Butter has reached here from the Antipodes; mutton has come from the Antipodes; eggs have come from Russia, China and Japan. And yet these gentlemen are telling us that we are pining and dying for broader markets, when they cannot look after the markets right here at our own doors.

Mr. OLIVER. Will the hon. gentleman tell the House, if the agreement had been passed and the duties on the articles he has mentioned had been taken off, would that have increased or decreased the cost of living in Canada?

Mr. THOBURN. Would it have increased the price to the farmer?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I think that in some lines it would have decreased the cost of living at certain times of the year; but I want to say further that we in the city, realizing the climatic conditions in this country, knowing the difficulties that our farmers have in producing their stuff in the cold weather, are ready to pay a fair price so as to give them a profit in order to remain on the land. My hon. friend will see eggs coming from the United States, where the chickens run free all winter, and compete with eggs laid by hens in a pen artificially heated and where every bit of food has to be provided. Is that a fair proposition? My hon. friend would admit the vegetables grown by negro labour in the southern states at this time of the year when our vegetables have to be grown under glass. He would have our vegetable producer, who has to heat his hothouse with coal at $7 or $8 a ton, compete with southern labour, which can grow vegetables in the open air. I would be prepared to meet my hon. friend before any audience of farmers, and I would make him take back many of the arguments he has put forward to-night.

Mr. OLIVER. If my hon. friend will permit me, I want to say most distinctly that my policy is free food, so long as we can get free markets for the food we export.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. My policy in opposition to that is to give every man a chance to live, and live well. I know that in Canada industry cannot thrive without protection, that the Ontario farmer cannot thrive as he is thriving without protection; and if my hon. friend does not know that, he ought to know it before he undertakes to speak for the farmers of Canada. What does the proposition of my hon. friend mean? It means that not only the products of the United States, of which there are hundreds of millions in excess every year, but the products of Russia, of China, of Japan, of Norway, of Sweden, of Denmark, of Australia, of New Zealand, Argentina, and other parts of the world, would be dumped in Canada to compete against those of our farmers, and without a single conces-

sion from those countries. If there ever was a jug-handled proposition if there ever was a policy propounded by men whom Providence led on to destruction, it was the policy propounded by the Laurier government. We are sorry for the two old gentlemen who went to Washington and came back with that gold brick, and we are sorry for the men who sent them; but if they were foolish enough to take so foolish a course, we say now gentlemen take your medicine, and the longer you hammer away at reciprocity, the longer you will stay on that side of the House. We are glad to have you talk reciprocity, and we will meet you all along the line on every argument you can make. There is not a single argument in the whole list with regard to which we cannot justify a protective policy for Canada. The hon. gentleman's party were in the government for 15 years, during which they came very near to practising the National Policy, and wherever they deflected from that policy they made a mistake. Now, I am not speaking at random. Let me give two instances. When the hon. gentleman's party came into power there were flourishing in Canada twelve barbed-wire factories. They had not been in office two years before they removed the duty on barbed-wire, and since then for years there has not been one pound of barbed-wire manufactured in Canada. Take binder twine, of which there are two industries struggling in Brantford at present. The hon. gentleman's party took the duty off binder twine. I am not discussing whether or not that was an act of wisdom; but I am showing how reciprocity of that kind works. The price of binder twine went up, and all the twelve factories but three are now gone. Of these three factories, one that had $3,000,000 capital has cut it down to $1,000,000, and the other two are struggling for life, and may not last until the Tariff Commission comes to their relief.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Hon. gentlemen laugh. They have laughed before it was time to laugh. They are a good deal in the position of the Irishman who was handed a shillelah. He asked, 'What shall I do with this? This man who gave it to him said, 'Wherever you see a head, hit it.' That is what hon. gentlemen opposite would like to do: wherever they see a struggling industry, they want to hit it on the head—why should it flourish? If it loses money, they do not say anything, but let it go; but if it is making money, it is a mark for the shillelah of our hon. friends. The hon. member for Edmonton since last September has repeated at least a thousand times some of the expressions he has given utterance to to-night. I am within the mark when I say that he has repeated the words 'mergers. combines and trusts,' at least a thousand times. Has he destroyed one of them? No, but he is doing his best to destroy his party. He is doing his utmost to raise the west against the east. He is telling us in the east that we have no problems that should have attention. The hon. gentleman forgets that Canada is more than a mere province or a city like Edmonton. We wish Edmonton every success; we are proud of it. I visit it with great satisfaction. I do not know whether or not my hon. friend has spent in the west more than I have if he has, I would be surprised to hear it. My interests are bound up in the west as much as those of my hon. friend, and I would not lift my finger to injure any western interest. I trust that I am too broad a man to endeavour to have a policy which would be good only for my town or my riding, and would let the rest of the country go to the dogs. I hope, as the years go by, that my hon. friend will take a broader view of this country, that he will consider what it is from the Atlantic to the Pacific, that he will not forget our brethren down by the sea, who are men of the right stock, and who, if they have done nothing else, have given to the west some of the very best blood that it has to-day. A country that can raise such men is worth keeping. We have not been inimical to the interests of the maritime provinces. We have scarcely had an opportunity to get a man to settle in the eastern provinces.

Mr. OLIVER. To what industry was the hon. gentleman referring in the maritime provinces?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Agriculture particularly. I think my hon. friend is rejoicing in the disappearance of the iron and steel bounties. He certainly approved of that course, and this emphasizes my fear with regard to it, because I always shun anything that my hon. friend endorses. I am sure I am on the right track if I am opposed to the hon. gentleman. That is the reason I feel so sure. The iron and steel bounties are of great importance to Nova Scotia, I think even some of his own political friends will endorse that. For 15 years the hon. gentlemen himself endorsed these bounties when his government gave them. Now he congratulates the country because these bounties have disappeared as soon as the late government are out of power, and he is willing to sacrifice Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Quebec, because he thinks this little $2,000,000 that is going to be saved to the pockets of Canada is far more important than that these industries should go on and flourish. He is not so slow to commit us to large ex-

penditures when he thinks they will be of any advantage to himself or his part of the country. I understand he has both hands up for the Hudson Bay railway. We certainly have an overflowing treasury, and I think that this is a time for expansion, but there are many of us in the east who have our misgivings as to the propriety of rushing ahead with that road.

Mr. OLIVER. The west is going to pay for that road, and is not asking the east for any money for it.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I had not heard of that. How is the west proposing to pay for it?

Mr. OLIVER. By the sale of land.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The hon. gentleman says the people of the west are proposing to take all the risk with regard to it. Of course if they are building the road with their own money all well and good. I thought it was to be for the general advantage of Canada, and that the expense would come out of the general funds of the country. The hon. gentleman admits that he asks the government to assume the control and operation of terminal elevators, which would involve an enormous expenditure. I hold up both hands for all matters of that kind that will help the west, but if $2,000,000 is going to save industries in the east, and my hon. friend wants $20,000,000 or $30,000,000 or $50,000,000 for the west, does he not think it would be rather kind of him to allow us to spend a million or two in the east if we spend $10,000,000 or $20,000,000 at his behest for the benefit of the west? I do not know if the hon. gentleman would go that far with me or not, but I trust he will, and I trust he will admit that these things which affect the east should be encouraged as well as those things which affect the west. But I shall not pursue the hon. gentleman in that course any further.

I have talked on reciprocity. I have shown you the reasons we turned it down, and turned it down hard, and we showed the people of the province of Ontario a more excellent way. My hon. friend may say what do you mean, you denied us access to the markets of the United States which were already overflowing with all the products of all kinds that Canada could possibly send to them. We have had something else in mind besides that when we turned down reciprocity. We said to our friends in Ontario that we believed reciprocity was dangerous from a material, a National and an Imperial standpoint. In a material sense we proved our case up to the hilt to the satisfaction of the farmer and the working man. Then we took the national view, and we said that reciprocity would strike a staggering blow at confederation, because when the Dominion was formed one of the conditions of the union was the construction of railways to run east and west in order to bring the provinces into touch, and to secure the flowing of trade east and west between them. My hon. friend wants to stop all that, to take the wheels off those railways running east and west, and to run his into the United States which is already flooded with these products. What would that have meant? The diversion of the carrying trade of the great west into New York, Boston and Portland. These ports would handle the traffic that should have gone from our own Atlantic and Pacific ports.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). Would my hon. friend tell me how he can possibly make out that the railways running north and south would have taken our products to a place which is already flooded with them?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I think the proposition is dead easy and I am sorry my hon. friend has not been able to see it. He comes from a country where they do not see things quite as quickly as we do in Canada. The products of the northwest would flow in at say North Portal into Illinois, Dakota and Minnesota, and the same products would flow out over the American roads through Boston, Portland, and New York. The hon. gentleman may ask how I know that. The American statistics show that they are exporting from all these ports every item that we could send into the United States. They might eat a little Canadian grain but then they would have all the more American grain to export. Every bushel of wheat that entered the United States from the Northwest territories, would displace a bushel of American wheat to go to the markets of Europe to compete with us in the great British market which we at present enjoy. These hon. gentlemen have built up a beautiful theory. They say: Broader markets, what we want is beautiful broad markets.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend says that because the United States exports wheat there is therefore no market in the United States for Canadian wheat. Does the hon. gentleman say the same thing in regard to ploughs?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. In regard to a certain kind of plough yes, if you make the best plough in the world you will get a few into the United States. Let me tell my hon. friend that this is a free country and if he thinks there is money in making ploughs I invite him to go into the business. I think he will soon conclude that

No. 1 Hard wheat is a better proposition than plough making. He will be quite welcome. We have no monopoly, it is an open free market for everyone who wants to come in, and if my hon. friend says he wants to enter the competition, all right. I say that if the United States has a surplus of produce, then for every bushel of Canadian wheat that is sent in there and consumed by the American people there is a bushel more of American grain to export. A blind man can see that proposition. A market which is full cannot be more than full, and the United States is replete with every class of foodstuffs produced at first hand, in many cases cheaper than we can produce them. Why? Climatic conditions are at the root of the situation and I say that the farmer who with great difficulty raises early lambs in this country in artificially heated barns is entitled to receive for those lambs a higher price than the man who raises lambs in Alabama or Texas where they can run out in grass all the year round and require no hand feeding.

And you ask the farmers of Canada to compete with such a country as that. We are willing that the farmer shall get high prices. How high? As high as will pay him to stay upon the farm. And the workingmen of Canada are willing to pay it. Why? Because the manufacturers have been prosperous and have paid their workingmen accordingly. When the National Policy was introduced in 1878 men were getting from 85 cents to $1 a day. They are now getting $1.75 to $2 for even the cheapest labour in Canada, while artisans are making from $3 to $4 and even $5 a day throughout this country. And the workingman knows, if my hon. friend does not, that protection has a lot to do with it.

Now the hon. gentleman disturbed me in my argument and I wish to go on as rapidly as possible, because I have a big subject to deal with and do not wish to weary the House. I say that we turned down reciprocity, and in doing so we showed to Canada a yet more excellent way. And what is that way? Trade with the mother country on preferential rates and advantageous terms. That is what we said, and that is the secret that more than anything else destroyed the late government. We got the people of Canada to see it; even though my hon. friend does not see it yet. The former Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) came down to Simcoe, the county town adjoining my native county of Norfolk—and that was the only win he made in Ontario and he did it this way. He said to the people: They say that this reciprocity arrangement will injure the preference; don't you believe it; we are the men who gave the preference and we stand by it, and the preference cannot be hurt by this arrangement. Never was a more fallacious statement set before any audience than that if made to men who know what trade preference means. The policy of a British preference was not inaugurated by hon. gentlemen opposite as they have always claimed. I make that statement advisedly. The first preference proposed ever laid before the empire in a public way was made by the great statesman who has been lying almost at death's door this winter, Sir Charles Tupper, whose name has been a household word for so long in Canada. He was the first man to introduce the doctrine of preference and not the jughandled variety of preference adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite. The preference that Sir Charles Tupper and those who followed him advocated was a give and take policy, and to this I invite especially the attention of my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark). I say that the preference we advocate and we ask the people of Canada to turn to was not the jug-handled preference now in force, but a preference in which we would receive something for something given. What would this reciprocity have done had it been endorsed? It would have destroyed the possibility forever of having a preference arranged with the mother country such as is proposed. Everybody can see that; it is plain on the face of it—there could have been no mutual preferential arrangement with the old country if reciprocity had come into force. Why, reciprocity was aimed at that. J. J. Hill made no secret of it. He said: Gentlemen, there is a move on foot in Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa, along with Great Britain, to make a great trade compact whereby the mother country will receive from the colonies a preferential rate on the foodstuffs they have to send. Reciprocity, on the other hand, would have permitted the American wheat to come into the Canadian market free of duty. Now, can my hon. friends opposite tell me how Canadian wheat could get preferential treatment in the British market where the American wheat was coming in free, without giving the same treatment to the United States? And to give it to the United States would be to destroy the inter-Imperial preference. They are looking to the idea that Canadian wheat will receive preference in the British market. And I take issue with the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) in what he said on the subject in this debate. I tell that hon. gentleman, and I tell any other hon. member on that side that the tariff reform movement, the empire preferential movement, is yet going to be the winning card—and under a Canadian Pre-

mier, too, Mr. Bonar Law. I believe that will be the fixed policy. I believe it to be a 'comer' and that it will afford to Britain and the empire a bond such as we have never seen in the history of the world. That is the more excellent way pointed out to our northwest friends—not to trade less with the United States, but to trade more with the mother country. The mother country requires over 180,000,000 bushels of imported wheat—more than the northwest is yet able to supply. And the United States is getting more of that market to-day than we are. These gentlemen in England tell us that they are prepared, as soon as they get into power, to arrange a preferential agreement with Canada, New Zealand and South Africa by which the products of the farms of this country will be received into Great Britain at preferential rates. That is not an impossibility; that was practised sixty years ago. And it was a success then and will be a success in the future. I see that my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) does not appreciate that statement. But I think he will realise, if he consults the history of that period that it is quite true that there was prosperity of the empire before the Cobden days—which were intended to smash the empire; Richard Cobden made no bones about it, he said, free trade will ultimately cause a disunion of the empire; that is the doctrine he preached when he introduced free trade and broke the preference to do it. Canada had a preference in Great Britain in timber, raw products and foodstuffs. That is a well known fact of history; and before Richard Cobden appeared on the scene the empire was thriving better than it has ever done since. Let us look at the picture there to-day, and I say this with the deepest sympathy. Every man in this House regrets from the bottom of his heart the affliction that has fallen upon the mother country during the last two weeks, where upwards of a million miners are on strike and most of the industrial concerns of the country are closing down. I say our hearts go out in sympathy to them in their affliction; we realize that Great Britain is in the throes of great trouble. But we are ready to stand by the same policy that we have proposed for twenty-five years past if I understand aright. I understand that this government is recognized as a government that has an Imperial policy, and I say that now is the time to bring that policy to the front. And that is the reason, more particularly, why I speak to-night. I say, I pin my faith to the union of the British Empire—union in trade and union in defence. And we cannot bring that about too soon. That is the reason why the United States was so anxious to detach Canada from the Imperial orbit. For, detach Canada and you break the chain. That was the idea, and J. J. Hill knew it and preached it. He said: Now is the accepted time, now is the time to break the chain—now, or never. But we got the people of Canada to see it; and the people of Canada did see it and said: Whether the bargain with the United States is good or not, our duty is to the mother country first and to the dominions overseas. They said that and they voted that, and the result is that hon. gentlemen then in power are on the opposition side of the House to-night. The policy announced by the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain about ten years ago is the endorsed policy of the business men of the empire. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean) says there is nothing to it. I am sorry he is not in the House to hear me read a resolution I have here, but he can see it in 'Hansard.' This is the businessmen's views as expressed on three different occasions in the greatest trade gatherings that have ever taken place in the British Empire. This gathering took place in Montreal, the convention of the Chambers of the Empire in 1903. And I now read the resolution that was passed at that time:

> It is resolved that in the opinion of this Congress the bonds of the British Empire would be materially strengthened, and the union of the various parts of His Majesty's Dominions greatly consolidated by the adoption of a commercial policy based upon the principles of mutual benefits, whereby each component part of the empire, would receive a substantial advantage in trade as a result of its national relationship, due consideration being given to the fiscal needs of the component parts of the Empire.
>
> That this Congress urges upon His Majesty's government the appointment by them of a special commission composed of representatives of Great Britain and her colonies and India to consider the possibilities of thus increasing and strengthening the trade relations between the different parts of the Empire and the trading facilities within the Empire, and with foreign countries.

Now, that resolution was passed by a very large vote of picked business men of the whole empire that went to London in 1906, where, convened with the majority of the British Chamber of Commerce, they passed a similar resolution in the heart of the empire. Three years ago they went to Australia, my hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Ames) and myself being Canadian delegates, and in Sydney they again passed a similar resolution. So three times over a congress of the Chambers of Commerce of the empire has decided that an empire combination in behalf of trade is what is wanted. That is my policy. I have advocated that policy for 25 years, and I am advocating it here to-night. I say that is what will give a better price

to our farmers and our workingmen. The United States wishes also to become a partaker in the benefits of that policy which will give the Northwest a great deal more money for its wheat. The British market is the market that pays the best, because Great Britain requires an immense amount of that kind of stuff from this side of the world. She is naturally inclined to trade with Canada to the best advantage, and it is natural that she would be more generous toward her own children than to strangers. That is a policy of empire preference. I believe that ere long we will see Great Britain and her colonies united in one confederation for the benefit of the whole empire, co-operating entirely in trade and defence. When that happy day comes I believe we will have accomplished the greatest work the world has ever known in empire building. We will never be united as we should be until that combination is complete. We wish to see the British workingman for his own sake receive the same benefit that the workingman in Canada receives. We are sorry to-day for these coal miners. I think if there is one class in the community with whom we should sympathize more than another, it is the coal miner who has to leave the world of light and go down in the bowels of the earth, and at the risk of his life delve and dig there in order that we might be kept warm through the winter. I say our hearts go out in sympathy to him, we think it is a pity he is not better paid in the mother country; we realize that they want something in the shape of protection, so that the employing classes may be able to pay better wages. In the words of a miner's song:

> Mammon is the master and man is the slave,
> Toiling for wealth on the brink of the grave
> Leaving the world of sunlight and sound
> For the darknes of night and a silence profound.

For the man that delves in the coal mines our hearts go out in sympathy. And if we could send a sympathetic message to Great Britain that we are prepared to stand by her, to make a bargain with her to lock our trade with her own, and our business interests with hers, we would be doing something great and grand that would redound to the credit of Canada, and I trust the time is not far distant when we shall take that step. I sympathised thoroughly last night with the member for South York (Mr. Maclean), who spoke on the naval question, I sympathise with him in that respect as well as on the trade question. I know that this is not the occasion to dwell on that subject, but I may say that if we are true Britishers we shall see to it that in trade and defence we will give the best we have, the best help, and the best consideration to the mother country, and to the sister colonies of Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa in every respect that we can.

Now, Sir, I have spoken longer than I intended. So far as I am concerned, I stand for a policy that will build up every interest and every part of Canada. I do not want to see the east built up at the expense of the west, nor the west built up at the expense of the east. I want to see the west and the east stand by one another like brothers, that is the way I feel, and if at any time anybody has ever drawn any other construction from my remarks he has done me an injustice. I stand as firmly in my desire for the welfare of the west as for the welfare of the east. I have a son of my own in the west, I have interests in the west, and I am just as heartily desirous of the success of the west as I am of the east. But I say we must have a give and take policy in this matter, we must stand together to develop the country. One part cannot grow without assisting the other. We must be united in a policy of development, in a policy that will be not a hindrance to any part, but a policy of co-operation, giving earnest heed for the welfare of every part of this vast country.

Mr. NESBITT. First of all I wish to congratulate the Minister of Finance on the very systematic and capable way in which he presented his budget speech. I would like to say first of all that I quite agree with him that railway subsidies should not be charged to capital account, but to consolidated fund account; I think the former Minister of Finance also expressed the same view. I remember that I had the privilege of saying so once before. I certainly congratulate the country that in 1910-11 we had a surplus of $30,000,000 in round figures, and an increase in the debt, after paying a large amount towards the Transcontinental, of only $3,773,000. I congratulate the country at large, and more especially I think the late government, on the surplus that is shown for the financial year of 1911-12, being sufficient not only to pay all the expenses under consolidated fund account, but also the large amount that had to be paid towards the Transcontinental railway, and in implementing the bonds of that railway in the west, leaving an amount to apply on public debt of $1,150,000. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance said that he thought, and I agree with him, that to the energy and perseverance of the Canadian people is due the splendid showing he was able to make. I quite agree with

that. I do not agree that whatever credit may be due to the government in power should be equally divided with the late government, because my hon. friends who are now in power have done nothing whatever to increase that surplus. They have made no change so far as the tariff is concerned. In the supplementaries that were brought down last night they have done something to decrease the surplus by some expenses that I think were unnecessary since the 10th of October, 1910.

Anybody who will look at the supplementary estimates will see a charge upon the revenue in the form of increases of salaries to departmental men that were unnecessary. They were paid sufficiently before. In addition there were changes for the secretaries and one thing and another of that kind that, I suppose, are only natural with a new government coming into office. At the same time these are increases that have to come out of last year's income and they are, in my judgment, quite unnecessary. I would like to congratulate the country on being able to pay $120,000,000, estimated by the Minister of Finance on the National Transcontinental railway, and upon the fact that, with an expenditure on capital account since 1904 of $252,000,000, the net increase in the debt is only $77,000,000.

I desire to say just a word in reference to the cost of the National Transcontinental railway. I quite agree with my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) that a cost, even if we allow the statement brought down by the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) the other day to be legitimate, of $130,000 per mile is not over and above what the cost of any first class railway in the United States, or even in Canada, has been. I understand this railway to be equal physically to the Grand Trunk between Toronto and Montreal and if that is the case I do not believe that there is a railway in America which has been finished up to that standard that has cost less than $130,000 per mile. In any event, if the railway has been so finished and if it has been left in first class physical condition, I am not the least bit disturbed by the cost. If, however, the railway is not finished in that condition perhaps the cost has been excessive. You must understand that the cost was natural on account of the almost impossibility of getting in supplies. The supplies to build the railway are naturally heavy and hard to transport and therefore it was absolutely necessary that the cost should be very high. We all know that a commission has been appointed by this government to investigate the cost and we will see what its report is. As far as I am personally concerned I am not a bit afraid of an investigation, nor am I disturbed by the cost of the railway. In the first place, it opens up a country, the development of which is necessary to the continued progress of this Canada of ours and a country which will contribute largely to our prosperity. At the same time it will enable transportation from the west to be carried on, I hope, at a cheaper rate than at the present day and if it does that it is all that we desire. But the main question is, no matter if the cost has been great, would anybody in this country vote to do away with the railway on that account? If the bulk of the people would then it has been an unnecessary cost.

Now then, I come to another question dealt with in the speech of the hon. Minister of Finance, and that is the question of the 3¾ per cent loan of £5,000,000 sterling due in November, 1909, and which, owing to the high price of money at the time, was renewed by the former Minister of Finance, Mr. Fielding, by a short date loan which falls due some time this spring. We were told by the Minister of Finance that he was able to renew that loan, I think, for forty years at 98. I asked him if that 98 was net, and he immediately defended underwriting. I raise no question with regard to the system or principle of underwriting, because we know that is a principle which is applied to all these large loans, but, I am sorry to say he did not tell us what the cost of the underwriting was. While I have no fault to find with the principle of underwriting, I do want to know what the cost is. Our hon. friends on the other side of the House, I remember, attacked Mr. Fielding on the occasion of his last budget speech, or the budget speech before that, very severely because he had paid some expenses of underwriting in the same manner. I remember their criticisms very clearly, and they were certainly anything but kind or necessary. I am not going to find fault with the Minister of Finance because they did that with our Minister of Finance. At the same time it is only fair that we should ascertain what the Minister of Finance realized for these securities. He told us that he realized 98. That was 98 gross. I think the Minister of Finance told us that he paid a commission of about 2½ per cent, so that the sale would realize to us 95½. Our 3½ per cents which are due in 1939—that is to say that we can pay them during that term—were sold in February last at from 99½ to 100½. Our 3 per cents were selling at from 91 to 92 at the same time. Canadian Pacific railway 3½ per cent bonds, with our own guarantee, due in 1938, were selling at 99 to 101. That was a guaranteed bond. It seems strange that the Grand Trunk Pacific fell so low as a guaranteed bond, when Canadian Pacific railway guaranteed bonds were selling

practically at the same price as our own bonds. The question I would like to ask the Minister of Finance is not whether it was wise to sell these securities through the Bank of Montreal as our fiscal agents at 98, but whether he got what he should have got for these 40-year securities when he sold them at 98 gross, when the same security, or a worse security, because we had the option of paying it off at any time by giving a certain notice, was selling on the English money market, according to a statement of the 'Financial Review of Reviews' at from 99½ to 100½. It may be that there is some explanation for it, but without an explanation it would look to me at least as if the Finance Minister had not realized for these securities as much as he should have realized. I quite understand that we must have fiscal agents in England while we are borrowing large sums of money, but if the Bank of Montreal are charging too much, there is no reason why we should not get some English fiscal agent. There is no reason why the Minister of Finance should not change his fiscal agents if the Bank of Montreal are charging him the difference between 95½ net and the market price, 99½ to 100½, or say, par.

The Minister of Finance issued the warning that nothing should be done in this country that would tend to stop the flow of British capital for investment, and in that I agree. But, I think something might be done by the government to help us in obtaining even more English capital than we have been receiving in the past. We all know that capital is shy and that no capital is more shy than English capital if it is once deceived, and in view of many of the wildcat investment schemes that are sent over from Canada to the English market there is great danger that British capitalists may be turned against us. In order to guard against such an occurrence, I would advocate that the government might establish some branch under the State Department or some other, which would carefully scrutinize every charter issued by the Dominion government. I have no fault to find with a merger or combine if that merger or combine is incorporated for the purpose of reducing the cost of production so as to supply goods to the consumer more cheaply, but over-capitalization of companies, whether they be combines or mergers or not, is a great danger to this country. There are very many enterprises being incorporated in these days with no other object in view that that of making money on their flotation, and to do that they have to be over-capitalized. There surely could be some organization under the government to scrutinize carefully what was intended to be done with the capital and to see that there was no over-capitalization beyond the necessary money required for the enterprise itself. A combine or a merger, even though it can be described as such, may be for the benefit of the consumer, and I know of combines and mergers that have resulted in that way, but, at the same time, they may be organized only for the purpose of benefiting the get-rich-quick promoters, and then these gentry come to us and ask for protection to enable them to make money on the extra capitalization. I care not whether it is a combination of companies already incorporated, or whether it is a new company, there should be government supervision of it to stop over-capitalization. I know that the provinces can charter companies without reference to us, but if we had such a Dominion institution as I advocate, which would, to a certain extent, guarantee to English investors the validity of the security, it would not be long before it became known in the financial world that Dominion chartered companies were most worthy of confidence.

There is another thing which I regret to find there was no reference to in the budget speech, and that is the fact that the time has come when Canada should take her part in the protection of the empire, and cease to longer sponge on the mother country for her defence. I regret to find the absence of any indication on the part of the present government that they will do what they should towards the protection of the empire, and which, in my opinion, England will insist on, if she is going to invest her money with us in such large measure as in the past. It is only because the people of the motherland had faith in Canada, that they have hitherto advanced their money so generously for our development; and, in order to retain that good feeling towards us in England, it becomes necessary for us to do our part in the defence of our common empire. Then again, on the question of immigration, I would suggest that track be kept of the emigration which leaves our shores as well as the immigration which comes to us. The result of the last census would seem to prove that if the immigration reported and the natural increase had remained in the country for the last 10 years, Canada to-day would have a larger population. My hon. friend the minister for Dundas (Mr. Broder)

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. NESBITT. Pardon me, the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder) told the member for Edmonton to-night that our late Minister of Agriculture had not done his duty towards agriculture in the older provinces, in that he neglected to see that the

farmers raised large families and kept them on the land. He told us also that houses should be built for the hired men on the farms, and he promised that the present Minister of Agriculture was going to see to it that the farmers of Ontario especially would raise large families, keep them on the land, and build houses for their working men.

Mr. BRODER. The hon. member (Mr. Nesbitt), has misstated my remarks.

Mr. NESBITT. I regret if that is so, but that is the way I understood my hon. friend (Mr. Broder).

Mr. BRODER. You are quite wrong.

Mr. NESBITT. Anyway, the suggestion is an excellent one.

Mr. BRODER. I simply referred to the fact that it would be wise to build houses for the hired men and let them raise their families, so as to solve the domestic help question.

Mr. NESBITT. I do not know that it would be wise for the government to undertake to build houses for the farm labourers of Ontario.

Mr. BRODER. You are misquoting me again; I said the farmers themselves should do that.

Mr. NESBITT. Well, I think that is a very good idea. For the last ten years I have been urging on our farmers at home that the best way to solve the hired man problem was to build houses for them, hire them by the whole year, and keep good men when they got them.

In my experience the farm hand that we get from the old country is not at all equal to our own native product. The native-born is the man for me every time, while I find no fault with the immigrants from the old land some of whom make excellent hands. The farmers themselves can remedy the trouble very materially by building houses on their farms and hiring their hands for the year instead of for eight months, and letting them for the rest of the time go idle or go to the towns to swell the ranks of the unemployed there. Agriculture, we are told, is flourishing. I am glad to say that it flourished throughout Ontario last year, though as a matter of fact the crop was not much more than half the usual crop.

I note from the minister's speech that there are to be no changes in the tariff. As my hon. friend from Edmonton points out, while our hon. friends have been finding fault with the late government for the last fifteen years, they have not seen fit this year to change the tariff in any way. They are going to wait for the report of that wonderful Tariff Commission that is going to do so much for the people of this country. I was surprised, however, that there were not some changes made. For instance, take the cement tariff. Cement is used by nearly every farmer and workingman in this country. An enormous quantity of cement is used by the farmers of Ontario. I understand that there is a Cement Combine. I am not complaining of that. I am complaining, however, that the duty on cement should be retained to the detriment of the farmer and the workingman. The workingman, if he has a home of his own, wants cement to build sidewalks to it. To the farmer cement is almost as much a necessity as food and clothing. I was surprised, therefore, that there was no intimation of an intention on the part of this government to reduce the duty on cement. Some people say that cement is no dearer in Canada than it is in the United States. As a matter of fact, it is selling at $1.20 in Buffalo and at $1.75 in Woodstock, Hamilton and Brantford. The cement business in this country is thoroughly established, it does not need protection as an infant industry, and therefore, there is no reason why the farmers of Canada should not have been given a reduction of the duty on cement. Then, take the item of potatoes. With the price at which potatoes have been for the last four months there is no reason why hon. gentlemen opposite should not have passed an order in council remitting the duty on potatoes for a period, as they did on coal going into the west last year. I think it has been a crime to charge the poor man, or even the rich or reasonably well-off man, the duty on potatoes during the last four months. There has been no object in doing so, because we have not had potatoes for sale; we have been importing them from Ireland, from the United States and from other countries.

Now, my hon. friend from Brantford was very enthusiastic over the bounties on steel and iron. He said the late government had continued those bounties for the last 15 years. As a matter of fact, I think they were originated by the friends of the present government before the late government came into power; but we continued them and perhaps increased them. As far as I am personally concerned, I do not think the late government should have given those bounties; but in their wisdom they gave them to the iron and steel industry while it was in its infancy, and as soon as they thought that industry had grown up and was able to support itself, they did away with the bounties. It was not the present government that did so. Everybody thought they were going to put on the bounties again, but apparently they dare not do so, and personally I am very pleased that this is the case. We heard a great deal from the hon. member for

Brantford about the balance of trade, about our importing more than we export. I am not worrying about that; it shows the prosperous condition of the country. It is like a man starting in business. Before he can start he must necessarily put in a plant and equipment. The balance of trade is all against him at the start. We are only organizing this country. We have grown enormously in the last 15 years. The consequence is that we have been bringing from the United States and also from England, hundreds of millions of dollars worth of machinery to equip our factories; and we are bringing enormous quantities of supplies from the old country. This only shows that the country is prospering, and is preparing for still greater growth in the future, as we have to provide our equipment before we can be what we shall eventually become. The balance of trade is nearly all represented by the vast quantities of machinery that we are bringing in that we cannot make ourselves, to equip our factories. My hon. friend from Brantford told us in a very enthusiastic manner that his people went to the market to buy their vegetables, fruits, meats, &c. We all know that that is done all over Ontario; every town has its market. He asks, would you allow the cheap eggs and vegetables from the Southern States to come in and compete with our eggs and vegetables? I say yes, by all means. Would you deprive the ordinary man living in the city or the town from buying vegetables simply because he cannot pay the price for those grown under glass?

That is so far as vegetables are concerned, and as for eggs, what benefit do our farmers get from eggs being 40 cents a dozen. When eggs are at that price there is not one in a hundred who has any eggs for sale; but when eggs come down to 20 cents and 25 cents a dozen, as they are now and have been for the last two weeks, the farmers get some benefit because they have some for sale. If vegetables go up to a high price because they are grown under glass and the ordinary residents of our towns cannot afford to buy them, does that benefit the farmers? Is that not a great disadvantage to the workingman? Because a darkey grows them down in Georgia, should we deprive the workingman of the benefit of being able to get potatoes and fresh vegetables in our towns and cities? What harm would that do to the potatoes or the vegetables? Yet you deprive the workingman of them. My hon. friend says that we told the people that under reciprocity the farmer was going to be benefited and the workingman would get his goods cheaper. We heard that illustrated to-night. My hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) showed you by figures that were undeniable that while the raw production was dearer, the food for the family was cheaper in the United States, the farmer there got more for it. Take the figures for any part of the United States, and you will find that the farmer does get more for his raw material and that the workingman gets his meat and his vegetables cheaper because the price to somebody is less. I have no fault to find with the middleman. We have got to have middlemen, but there is reason in all things, and there is no reason why eggs should be purchased for 30 cents from the farmer and sold at 50 cents to the consumer. At the same time, while there may have been a few eggs sold at Brantford for 40 and 50 cents a dozen, Brantford is too near Woodstock to have such a difference, as the farmers from near Woodstock would go to Brantford to get such prices, and there were no eggs sold in Woodstock this winter at over 35 cents a dozen. Even then, who got the benefit, how many were sold? One woman could carry them all on her arm, because how many people are there in Woodstock who could afford to pay 35 cents or 40 cents a dozen for eggs? My hon. friend may say that there were more people in his town than in some other town able to afford such prices, but I doubt it.

As my hon. friend from Edmonton says, we would have benefited the great west in allowing them to ship their grain. What nonsense to say that because the United States is an exporting country it could not absorb this western grain. He has told you that we built railways connecting the provinces, and that if we allowed that grain to go to the south it would have stopped shipments over these railways. As a matter of fact, when we have the three Transcontinental railways in operation we will be just as badly off or nearly so, so far as the west is concerned, as we are to-day with reference to shipping facilities. What assistance has the Intercolonial railway been to the people in the west? Is it any benefit to the people in the west to see their grain rotting in the fields or in the railway yards because we want to secure the shipment of that grain over the Intercolonial railway to the east? What harm would it have done us to have a free market? The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), is absolutely right when he tells you that the farmers of the west during the last 15 years have been of the greatest possible benefit to the manufacturers of the east, and I heard last week of one court in one city in the west that during one week recently had issued 600 writs on farmers because they could not pay for implements, etc., shipped out there. That is a serious

state of affairs and that could have been helped last year as the hon. member for Edmonton claims it should have been helped. Would it not have been a grand thing for the people of the eastern country to have assisted them in this? It is quite true that the farmers of Ontario were not grumbling about the prices. It is not exactly correct to say that it was loyalty to Great Britain that defeated reciprocity among the farmers of Ontario. What tended to defeat reciprocity more than anything else in the world was the fear that as we were getting good prices a change might not be beneficial, the eternal call of the British-born in our towns and cities and the appeal against the American who was too smart for us. I told the electors on the platform and I repeat to-night, that any Canadian who has so little pride as to think that the American is more clever than the Canadian in a business transaction I do not want to have as a fellow-Canadian. I have never yet seen any reason why we as a people, individually or collectively, should be afraid to put our brains up against our friends on the other side of the line. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Cockshutt) says that so far as the farmers in his section of the country are concerned, they were united against reciprocity. So far as the farmers in my section are concerned, and I think they are as good as there are in the world, they were very strongly in favour of reciprocity and they did not care a snap of the fingers about protection. They do not ask for protection; they can farm, and sell goods against the world and they are not afriad to produce goods and sell them against the world. I, as a farmer standing here to-night, just as much interested in farming as any man in this country, according to my means, tell you that I do not want your protection. I can farm and raise produce, whether it is sheep, pigs, cattle or grain, and sell it against the world. Do not deceive yourselves into believing that the farmers of Ontario voted against reciprocity because they wanted protection. They voted against reciprocity becaues they were deceived by factional cries.

An hon. MEMBER. Not so.

Mr. NESBITT. I tell you it is so. I know what I am talking about when I talk of the farmers of Ontario. For there is nobody here who mixes with them more than I do, and nobody here who consults with them more than I do. And that is the way to find out. My hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) told us that when we came into power we ruined I do not know how many factories that were in the business of making barbed wire. These factories got their wire from the United States—that country that we are told is so corrupt and bad—and they twisted the barbs into it in this country. No wire was made in this country; the barbed-wire was finished here, that is all. But who got the benefit of the change? The farmers got the benefit. Hon. gentlemen opposite know that. And I dare them to-night to put a duty on barbed wire. Let them do that, and they will see how long the farmers of Ontario favour such a policy. I do not wish to see any factory ruined. Everybody knows that I am in favour of reasonable protection. But there is reason in everything; and there are times when protected industries, even in their own interest, should consider the interest of the public at large. As I have said, I dare these hon. gentlemen to put a duty on barbed-wire, whether their Tariff Commission reports in favour of it or not. And the same with binder twine. We are told that the price went up after the duty was taken off. Everybody knows that the reason for that was not the taking off of the duty, but the higher price of the raw material. The binder twine factory in Brantford to which the hon. member (Mr. Cockshutt) referred, was started by the suscriptions of the farmers. It paid the farmers 80 per cent dividend the first year; the second year 40 per cent, nothing the next year, and nothing ever since. And why? Because they made money out of the rise of price of raw material and sold the raw material rather than make it into binder twine.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I believe the hon. gentleman (Mr. Nesbitt) has the Bain wagon factory in his constituency. Is he in favour of protection to that industry?

Mr. NESBITT. Certainly.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Then, why not to others?

Mr. NESBITT. I have just said I am in favour of that. I am in favour of reasonable protection on the Bain wagon product the same as on others. And if they cannot exist with a reasonable protection, I don't want them to exist at all. And I do not believe the Bain wagon people do either.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Is the hon. gentleman in favour of the present protection on wagons?

Mr. NESBITT. I voted for it. And the Bains voted for me and did everything in their power to elect me. And there was a reduction of the duty on wagons by the reciprocity agreement.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Is the hon. gentleman still in favour of reciprocity?

Mr. NESBITT. Certainly I am. There is no man in this House more willing than I am to let every class of people in this country have a living; nobody more willing that there should be reasonable protection to manufacturers so long as they require it, while industries are in their infancy. But let me tell hon. gentlemen opposite that the day is coming when this proposition will carry in this country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. NESBITT. You may laugh; but it is coming. There has got to be a reduction of duties as was proposed under reciprocity. There are industries in this country that need protection, but there are other industries, and hon. gentlemen opposite know it, and none better than the Minister of Finance (Mr. White), that do not need the protection they now have. And the people pay for that protection. As I said a few minutes ago, why keep the duty on potatoes when the farmers of this country have none to sell? Why have a duty on any foodstuff? We the farmers of Ontario don't want it. We can compete; and you do not make the farmers more able to compete by a duty of 3 cents on eggs. How much barley do we in Ontario ship out except for malting purposes? We grow it only to ship out for malting purposes, because barley is not as good feed for our cattle and hogs as our other cereals that we can grow. And how much wheat do we want to sell? It has got to be in the neighbourhood of a dollar a bushel or the farmers of Ontario don't sell it; they feed it. Farming factories—that is what they are coming to be in this country. And I believe we shall see the day, when, as my hon. friend from Dundas (Mr. Broder) said, more intensive farming will be carried on in Ontario. But we do not want your protection; that is the excuse you have for the whole system of protection; though it is not the one I make. I am perfectly frank in declaring my belief that the infant industries of this country require a certain protection. But it should be reasonable; it should be only sufficient to allow them the difference between the cost of manufacturing in other countries and the cost of manufacturing here. And the rest should go to the consumer.

Now, I am sorry to have taken up so much time; but at least I can say that I do not often claim the attention of the House. Now, let me tell hon. gentlemen opposite once more that so far as the question that was defeated on the 21st of September is concerned, they need not hug themselves over that defeat—not a bit. That question will come again, perhaps in a new form, but it will come. There have got to be reductions of the duties on a great many things in this country, and that within a short time, or there will be trouble.

Mr. A. BELLEMARE (Maskinonge). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, knowing the excellent disposition of the government towards the agricultural community of this country, and as a representative of a rural district, I might be allowed to make a few suggestions concerning the expansion of the agricultural industry with the hope that the representatives in this House of agricultural districts will avail themselves of the few remarks I intend to make.

I think it is high time that more effective means than those resorted to in the past should be adopted in order to improve the yield of the land under cultivation.

We are living at a time when it is on the shoulders of the farmer that fall ultimately the most onerous burdens. The task of the farmer is an arduous and difficult one. He discharges it manfully, but does he get from it the reward he is entitled to? Does he reap from his work as much as he could reasonably expect?

In almost every case, Mr. Speaker, the crop of the farmer is out of proportion with the work it has entailed. That is, Sir, the true reason, why so many Canadian families have deserted the native land and settled in a foreign clime. In a country boundless and rich as ours is, a country inhabited by a population which is sober, vigorous and hardworking, really it is a national crime to let the farmer desert the native land because he lacks the knowledge which he should have to make his farm more productive.

I shall add, Sir, that if the ignorance of certain farmers with respect to agriculture is guilty, the indifference of the rulers who, being aware of the fact, would let such an evil hold good, should be criminal. Would it be possible without incurring extraordinary expenses, to improve our agriculture and to make the position of our farmers more supportable? Why yes, by means of school farmers, and though somewhat costly, those schools would mean invaluable advantage to the farmer.

I have received, a few days ago, a booklet on agriculture; this work was written by one of our compatriots who has studied different systems of school farmers abroad, and especially in France and in Belgium. Here is what I find in it, among other things:

There is in operation, in the country districts of France and Belgium, an admirable 'instrument' of agricultural education and instruction. It is not too complicate and it is rather easy to copy. The representatives of the Department of Agriculture are directed to buy or to merely rent, in a commune, a farm intended to vulgarize such methods of farming as are most profitable to the district. That farm is known as the school farm or

'monitor.' The intendant or keeper is bound by his contract to have at the disposal of people such and such seed-grains, saplings, fertilizers, samples, tools, etc., etc.; to keep such and such breeding animals, to rear poultry, bees, &c., &c. He is bound to receive, every year, during a week or more, the farming engineer or government's lecturer who comes and gives the farmers, on the spot, a course of practical teaching. As a rule part of the course pertaining to theory is given in the forenoon. The balance of the day is spent outside, in lessons of things, in applying the notions taught during the morning. In a place well adapted for the growing of apples, for instance, the professor will teach all the operations connected with apple-growing from the burying of the pip in the soil to the packing of the ripe fruit ready to ship to the market, &c., &c.

All this is not only possible but even very easy as you see. The farm should not necessarily be an immense farm; a very small one would be very suitable. Supposing a farm like this is found in every farming county, do you not see what advantage the young men in the country districts would derive therefrom? They would study without much cost, what farming system should be the best for their district, owing to the climate and the soil. When those young men would be farmers in their turn, they would be in a position to do practical, rational and profitable farming. Of course, an account could be kept here of what proceeds those farms bring, and such earnings would reduce to a great extent the amount it might cost to keep them up.

I conclude by humbly making those suggestions to the House, and I hope that they shall be taken into serious consideration before long.

Mr. ROCH LANCTOT (Laprairie-Napierville). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to take part in the debate at this late hour of the night, but the hon. member for Maskinongé (Mr. Bellemare) has just given me the opportunity of making a few remarks. He stated, first, that the present government is well disposed towards the farming community. I am glad of it, and I would like the government to show what they can do.

The hon. members who have preceded me addressing the House in English, have dealt practically but with our financial situation. I would like to say a few words about reciprocity. It has been said that reciprocity was now a dead issue. I assert the contrary. I maintain that reciprocity is a live question at least in the county of Laprairie-Napierville which I represent here.

In the last electoral contest the electors did not vote on reciprocity, but on the navy question which our opponents took advantage of everywhere. The electors would say: Well, we are in favour of reciprocity, but we must first decide this famous navy question.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, our opponents said that should the Laurier government be defeated the navy would be no more a question. But I see that it is a question to-day just as it was before, and I am very much afraid that it shall grow too big and that the electors of the province of Quebec shall find it more dreadful in the future than they did previous to the 21st of September.

It was evident that reciprocity would have been profitable to the farming community, and I say so without fear of being contradicted. In all the public meetings which were held during the last general elections our opponents said—in order to scare the people—that the farming community would have to compete on the local market against the natural products of twelve nations which were favoured by the treaties. And they added: you have the English market, then you have no need of the United States market, send the surplus of your products to England. We are perfectly aware of the fact that the natural products of all the countries in the world are admitted in England duty free. For my part, I fail to see why we should have dreaded the competition of those twelve favoured countries on our own market, since we would have had to compete with them on the English market.

As the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt), has said, we are not afraid to compete with any other country or on any market in the world, with respect to our agricultural products. To my mind, all the difficulty arises from the fact that the foreign markets are difficult for us to reach owing to customs duties which, in many a case, are practically prohibitive. It is admitted that the farmer nearest to a market is the one who derives the most benefit from it, provided there is no such obstacle as customs duty. For instance, the United States government, by imposing $4 duty per ton on Canadian hay, keeps it away from the market of that country; and those $4 duty must be added to what it costs for carrying that hay to destination. All this contributes to keeping us away from that market.

During the last electoral campaign I happened to make a comparison which seemed very clear to me. I took, as an illustration, a Manitoba, a Saskatchewan or an Alberta farmer who shipped a car load of oats to the Montreal market, and I compared his case with the case of a farmer in any country who also shipped a carload of oats to Montreal. In the first instance the cost of transportation should be $150, whereas in the second instance it would amount to $12 only. Then I asked

my auditors; is it not true that western farmers could not compete with the farmer in Laprarie? Therefore, the quality of the product being the same, the only question is the cost of transportation; the producer who is nearest to the market is the one who derives the most benefit from it.

The United States government, by imposing $4 duty on hay, keeps us away from the Boston and the New York markets and from the New England markets so as to favour the farmers of the Western States. That duty then, keeps us away from those markets, although we have the advantage of distance. I say, therefore, that this or any other government must, one day or other, make that reciprocity treaty which the farmers of my county, and I might say, of the whole country, are loudly asking for.

When the hon. member for North Toronto, now the Minister of Commerce (Mr. Foster), criticised the budget speech last year I listened to him with close attention. He said that it was almost a crime for the government of Canada to levy $72,000,000 as customs duties, which represented he said, $10 to $11 per head of the population. In fact, that was a good deal of money. And great was my surprise when I heard that same member declare later on, when he spoke against the reciprocity treaty in this House, that everything was satisfactory and that we should let well enough alone. If it was a crime to collect $72,000,000 as duties last year I say that the late government intended to remedy that evil by reducing the duties on our imports from other countries. In fact, is it not true that by a reciprocity treaty with the United States, the farmers of our country would have made a gain of about $5,000,000 which they pay over to the United States to-day as duties? The duties paid on goods imported into Canada or on those of our products which exported to the United States mean no profit for anybody except for the public chest of each of the two countries.

It is stated that the duties are paid by the consumer. Such is not always the case. In many instances, the vendor has to suffer because the price of the products that he ships is affected not only by the cost of transportation, but also in proportion of the duties imposed. Having done business with people in New York for the last twenty years as a dealer in hay, I have some notions on this subject. When I ship a carload of hay to New York I must calculate, first, the cost of transportation, then the customs duties and, finally, my agent's commission. I would be in a position to pay a higher price to the farmer had I no duty to pay, and that duty would exist no more if we had had reciprocity with the United States. Such is the case with all the ordinary business of this life. To reach Montreal the inhabitants of my county pass on the Victoria bridge. Formerly, they used to pay 80 cents for every carriage, to-day they only pay 25 cents for a two-horse carriage and 15 cents for a one-horse carriage. Shall a farmer who goes from my county to Montreal with a load of potatoes, of tomatoes or other vegetables, dispose of his products at a higher price because he paid to cross the river on the bridge or on a boat, while the farmer who lives on the Montreal Island—in Laval or in Jacques-Cartier, for instance—has paid nothing and will come and take a place right at his side at the market, with the same kind of products for sale? Certainly not. When he is back at home in the evening he calculates the result of his journey, deducting, of course, from the amount received, all he had to pay on the bridge or on the boat, and for his dinner, whereas the farmer from Laval will have to deduct nothing but what his dinner may have cost him.

In the last campaign, especially in Laprairie, the reciprocity question was not decided on its own merits. My opponent who called himself a Liberal, talked of the navy, but very little did he say about reciprocity. Since the elections people ask me every day: shall we have reciprocity? No, I reply, the party that was in power and that wanted reciprocity has been defeated.

Who Mr. Speaker, has fought reciprocity most vigorously? The great financiers, millionaries and important manufacturers, some of which opponents, I regret to say, are to be found in the ranks of the Liberal party. Why were manufacturers opposed to reciprocity, when we asked for a reduction of duties on natural products without touching manufactured articles? It was feared that the agricultural population, having tasted the sweets of reciprocity, would want unlimited reciprocity as devised by the Liberal party twenty-five years ago. The manufacturers decided that the idea must be nipped in the bud and in such a manner that it might never come up again. In my opinion the manufacturers were mistaken. The agricultural class representative of the population who have paid duty since 1878 on all they buy, is it not time that the burden of taxation should be reduced for them, especially as they are the majority. Is it necessary that the government should favour the manufacturers to the detriment of the masses and make them millionaires of whom it may be said after their death: so and so was worth so many millions? When men lived eight or nine hundred years as in the time of Methusalem, such fortunes might be useful, but to-day life is too short, and if a man accumulates millions in the short span alloted to him the people must suffer for it.

The day will come when the mistake committed on the 21st September last will be recognized, people's eyes will be opened and we will obtain the reciprocity we desire.

It is objected that reciprocity with the United States is a step towards annexation. For my part, I traded in hay with the United States since twenty years and that has not made an American of me. However a dollar is just as useful to me if it comes from New York as if it came from London or Liverpool. I may add that if we had access to the American market, we would have three markets instead of two and reap greater commercial benefit in consequence.

It is all very well to speak of the local market, but a large population is needed to consume all we produce and much time is required to increase that population. There is no race suicide amongst us, it is true, but the best each family can produce is one child a year and it required twenty years to make a man of him. I am of opinion that we should consider ourselves to some extent and not think exclusively of our children yet unborn.

I say that reciprocity must come, that the day of its coming is not far off and that when it does come it will benefit the agricultural population and the consumer.

Mr. PAQUET (L'Islet), Mr. Speaker, the hon. Finance Minister laid down very clearly yesterday the true principles of good financial administration.

The budget of 1913 comes to us as one of reform and progress, marking a new stage on the road to financial restoration.

Laisné once gave to Mr. Villèle some advice under a rough form:

A financial minister, he said should be a watch dog, lying on the national strong box.

The finance minister is following this advice and he will show us results worthy of the admirable vitality of the Canadian people.

On the evening of the 21st September some of our opponents felt anxious on account of Mr. Fielding's absence, but we know now that not only has the present finance minister (Mr. White), succeeded Mr. Fielding; he has replaced him.

Montesquieu once said: 'Certain things are accepted by the people only when unseen; as soon as they appear the people re ject them.'

During the last two sessions, on the questions of the navy and of reciprocity, the Liberal majority demonstrated the truth of the French philosopher's words. That majority, forgetful of the rights of the people, acted as if they had a general mandate and relied upon the acceptance by the public of the accomplished fact. Under Liberal rule, national representation had given way to uncontrolled dictatorship. The sovereignty of the people had become a farce. Our opponents thought that they had obscured the national conscience. But on the 21st September, militarism, imperialism and reciprocity went down before the rights of the people and the national policy. It was the awakening of the spirit of the nation to the necessity of protecting our national resources, our industries and our agriculture.

The lightening of the naval tax is deeply significant; the government was thus enabled to adopt manly resolutions, and to turn earnestly towards the improvement of agriculture and of our national highways.

The hon. member for Napierville (Mr. Lanctot) was bemoaning a moment ago the fate of the farmer. In reply to his observations I will remind him that the first words of the present right hon. Prime Minister were: 'Now it is the farmer's turn' whereas the former premier required fifteen years to say such great words.

The people require commercial and financial reforms adequate to the wants and aspirations of the different classes of society. Among the nations we perceive a progressive wealth of brilliant commercial institutions. In all those countries to which extend our industrial and commercial activities we require commercial agents properly trained and informed as to our resources and our economic situation. We have such agents in several countries, but progressive Canada should insist upon more complete commercial representation in this respect. Our universities and our great commercial schools, so interested in our material and intellectual development, might furnish proper agents for this commercial and consular service. They are in a position to accomplish this national work. The Department of Trade and Commerce, now administered by a distinguished man, should be in a position to collect all useful information for the development of our trade and manufactures.

This missi dominici would transmit to the central administration a mine of accurate information. In trade with the east, with France and South America, we have not obtained our full share. I cannot sufficiently impress upon our new government the importance of opening new markets to Canadian products, while preserving to the full our administrative autonomy.

Speaking of the commercial progress of Canada, I can never sufficiently insist upon the importance of the report of the United States immigration commission. During the fiscal year 1908-1909, 17,121 French Canadians emigrated to the United States. One cannot see without concern thousands of Canadian workers in the shops and factories of the United States. Their labour and their talents add to the wealth of our neighbours instead of enriching Canada.

In order to accomplish our mission in

this Canadian land, to foster the strength, prestige and power of the ancient races who civilized Canada, we need to preserve all the members of our great family.

In the interest of Canada we should keep our people here and encourage the return of the French Canadian population so important on account of their traditions and its attachment to the faith of their ancestors.

Our new government will meet our wishes by the development of our industries fostered by a tariff policy framed to meet our needs, while favouring at the same time our agricultural progress. As a Canadian author has said: 'It is impossible to imagine a more favourable situation for the organization of a great industrial movement according to enlightened and scientific methods.'

I am gratified to find that the government has given its first thoughts to the farmers and the tillers of the soil, to those patriots who increase the national domain. Proper protection of the agricultural interest will diminish the exodus of farmers towards the United States and the cities.

As I said a moment ago, it was only after fifteen years of power that the liberal government adopted the slogan: It is now the farmers' turn.

The Conservative government seeing the depopulation of the rural districts and the deserted condition of many constituencies, desires to remedy the evil and render farming attractive. The joint action of federal, provincial and municipal authorities will secure, I hope, efficient agricultural reforms. By co-operating with the provinces in the promotion of agricultural progress, the government will accomplish a work of national importance.

The administration resulting from the vote of the 21st September 1911 will be doing national work by contributing to the building of roads, to the development of agriculture and also by extending to the older provinces the benefits of immigration.

Allow me to make a few observations concoming the requirements of the south-eastern region of the province of Quebec. During the two last years, work on the Transcontinental in our region has not been carried on with sufficient celerity. I call upon the government in the interests of colonization, of agriculture and of forest industries to hasten the termination of the construction work between Levis and Moncton.

Quebec is an agricultural market. On the prosperity of the city of Quebec depends in a great measure the prosperity of the Eastern portion of our provinces.

Under the active, skillful and prudent direction of the hon. Postmaster General, the interests of Quebec and of our District will be safe.

The government, I am sure, will hasten to provide some efficient mode of communication between Quebec and Levis in order not to parlayze the efficiency of the Transcontinental.

I thank the government for wishing to make of Quebec a really national port. In doing this the Conservative government responds to the wishes and requirements of the population of our district.

I have no intention to claim for Quebec anything detrimental to the other large cities of this country, but I want to see the city of Champlain compete with other Canadian cities in the commercial and industrial fields.

Mr. N. MARTIN (St. Mary's, Montreal). (Translation). Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to take part in the debate, especially at this late hour, but I think I would be failing in my duty as one of the representatives of Montreal—the commercial metropolis of Canada—if I did not say a few words on the subject.

This evening when I was in the cars coming from Montreal, I learned by the papers that the hon. Minister of Finance had stated to the House that he has a surplus of 39 millions. He has had better luck than his predecessor, who, when taking office in 1896, found only an empty coffer and even a deficit of $330,000.

In my division, I carried the last campaign almost exclusively on the question of reciprocity with occasionally some remarks on the naval policy.

In what condition was this country in 1896 and in what condition is it to-day? The country, and Montreal in particular, was in a lamentable state. The manufactories were closed, and the men were leaving for the United States. What was the cause of all those disasters? For my part, I say that the real cause was the policy of protection inaugurated by the Conservative party in 1878 and that policy was that the farmers of this country should not produce any more than was required for home consumption. A time came when the farmer having no market to which he could export his products, found himself with an over production that he was obliged to sell at any price. I remember the time when the farmer in the province of Quebec was obliged to exchange his products against the country merchant's goods and at the end of the year when the time came to settle accounts there was almost nothing coming to him, that is why the sons of our farmers were leaving for the United States, their fathers being unable to give them a start at home, as they are doing to-day. A great number of our farmers were compelled to leave their farm to find work in the American manufactories during the

winter season to pay the mortgages on their property.

To prevent such a deplorable state of affairs the only remedy in my judgment was a policy of protection for the manufacturers and a policy of exportation for our natural products. Before 1896, the manufacturers had to curtail their output six months in the year, and to leave without employment a large number of men who had to leave the country.

That is why we had in the city of Montreal 27,000 untenanted dwellings. The building industry was paralyzed and all classes of the population suffered by it, from the lumberman in the woods to the banker in his office. Since the return of prosperity, that is to say since about fifteen years, the population of Montreal has increased by about three hundred thousand inhabitants.

What do we see to-day? The number of the manufactories are continually on the increase, the building industry is in full swing and we can see properous banks at the corner of nearly every street. Everybody seems to be in comfortable circumstances, the day labourer who earned from 80 to 90 cents a day receives to-day two dollars and $2.25 a day. The man with a good trade easy earns four and five dollars a day. I maintain that if the government persists in a policy of protection on natural products, before ten years we will return to the conditions we were in in 1896, and that will endure so long as the country produces enough to maintain a population of two or three hundred millions that we have not.

As I have said, we must have a policy tending to promote exportation of our over production in natural products, because we have not enough population to consume all that the farmers have to sell.

I do not intend to make a speech, but I can say with my hon. friend from Laprairie, that reciprocity is not buried, it is not even dead.

If the question had been judged on its merits by the electors, if men like Messrs. Bourassa and Lavergne and their Nationalist friends had not misled the people on the naval policy, the Liberal party would again be in power to-day, and reciprocity would have carried the day.

As to the naval question, I didn't speak much about it to the electors of St. Mary's division. I merely went to the trouble of explaining that all those clauses that Mr. Bourassa was giving as binding clauses, were only optional. I told the electors that if the Conservative party had been in earnest on the naval policy, they would have resorted to the same tactics as they resorted to on the reciprocity treaty, that is to say, they would have blocked the estimates and forced the government to go before the people on the naval policy.

To-day the electors of the province of Quebec must perceive that they have been duped. We had the proof of it when the Minister of Public Works himself told us that they had 'played the game.' I expect that before long, at the next election no doubt, the Liberal party will be returned to power. The stand taken by the government on the question of reciprocity, on the Manitoba school question, on the 'Ne Temere' decree, has been nothing but a sham, and the electors will soon discover that the Conservatives carried many counties by false representations.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee on Ways and Means.

Progress reported.

Mr. BORDEN moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. GRAHAM. What business will be taken up tomorrow?

Mr. BORDEN. Bills and resolutions on the order paper, afterwards Supply for the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Possibly before that, we may take the Northwest Mounted Police estimates.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.05 a.m., Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 15, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No 141) to incorporate The International Fire Insurance Company—Mr. Lesperance.

Bill (No. 142) for the relief of Alvena Bell Leaitch.—Mr. Macdonald.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. J. D. HAZEN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). moved that the House go into committee to consider the following resolution;

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Canada Shipping Act by providing (a) that certificates shall not be required for masters and mates upon sailing ships of not more than one hundred tons, registered tonnage, propelled by auxiliary power other than steam, employed partly in fishing and partly in the carriage of freight; and (b) that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries may fix the fee for replacing lost certificates.

He said; The principal necessity for this change in the shipping act arises out of the very great change which has taken place of late years with regard to the way in which the fishing industry is conducted. To-day nearly all the fishing vessels on the Atlantic coast and, to some extent, on the lakes and the Pacific coast as well, are propelled, not alone by sail, as was the case in days gone by, but by auxiliary power furnished by gasolene engines and nearly all of these vessels are being operated in violation of the present law because the law requires that vessels of over ten tons shall have properly certificated engineers. As the law stands it would be a very great hardship upon the fishermen, who find that the auxiliary power afforded to them by the gasolene engine, is of very great assistance enabling them to make their runs to and from the fishing grounds with a great deal more certainty and with a great deal less labour than was the case when they depended upon sails and upon the wind alone. In addition to that there is no such number of certificated engineers, even if the fishermen were able to pay them for their services, to be obtained as would be necessary for the purpose of serving as engineers on board these boats. The proposed amendment to sec. 100 of the Canada Shipping Act consists of the addition of the following words to the law as it exists to-day:

Or to sailing ships of not more than one hundred tons, registered tonnage, propelled by auxiliary power, other than steam, employed partly in fishing and partly in the carriage of freight.

The reason for the amendment is that many of these auxiliary propelled ships are not employed solely in fishing. If they were, they would be exempt under the present law from having to have a certificated master in charge. They engage in fishing for three, six, or nine months only, and after that they carry cargo between the small ports in the maritime provinces.

Without the installation of the gasolene engine, sailing boats are also exempt from the provisions requiring a certificated master to be in charge, if they are under 150 tons registered tonnage. (See section 5 of Chap. 65, Statutes 1903, raising such tonnage limit from 100 to 150 tons). But the usual custom to-day is to install a small gasolene engine in boats which are to all intents and purposes sailing boats so as to aid their movements in calm weather. As soon as a gasolene engine is put in they become steamships under the provisions of section 743 of the Imperial Merchant Shipping Act, which reads as follows:

743. Any provisions of this Act applying to steamers or steamships shall apply to ships propelled by electricity or other mechanical power with such modifications as the Board of Trade may prescribe for the purpose of adaptation.

The board of trade have advised the Department of Marine and Fisheries that it is their practice to classify gasolene propelled vessels as steamers. The reason why reference is made in this matter to the Imperial Merchant Shipping Act instead of to the Canada Shipping Act, is that the Canadian Act is silent in part 1, which relates to registration of shipping, as regards such ships. The department is advised that, in these circumstances, the provisions of the Imperial Act would govern. Unless, therefore, some provision is made to exempt these sailing vessels with their small gasolene engines on board from the operation of Part II of the Canada Shipping Act, every one of them will require, under section 96 of the Canada Shipping Act to have a certified master in charge. There were 4,588 boats with gasolene engines engaged in the fisheries of Canada in 1910-11, (See answer in 'Hansard,' February 8, 1912, page 2722).

Unless some relief such as is proposed is given, these boats must either lay up when not employed in fishing, or if they engage in the cargo carrying business they must obtain a certified master. It is unnecessary to say that there is no such number of certified masters in the maritime provinces waiting employment. It is bad in principle to keep a provision in the law which it is out of the power of the people to comply with. The owners of these auxiliary sailing vessels could, of course, take out the gasolene engines and so bring themselves under the provisions of section 96 of the Canada Shipping Act which entitles sailing ships up to 150 tons registered tonnage to ply in Canadian waters or to 80 tons on a coasting voyage, (which voyage is defined in section 72 of the Act—and extends south as far as five degrees north latitude), without a certified master. But to remove these gasolene engines would be a retrograde movement, and the shipowners would naturally be opposed to any such step.

The department has been asked to amend the law so as to meet the present day conditions. There is on file in the department a petition for such legislation. It is very numerously signed. It reads as follows:

To the Honourable the Minister of Marine and Fisheries:

The petition of the undersigned owners of sailing vessels equipped with gasolene auxiliary power respectfully represents—

(1) The tonnage of the vessels in which we are interested, and the horse-power of the engines and speed developed by same is set opposite our respective names signed hereto.

(2) Said vessels are equipped with auxiliary power for the following reasons: (a) To enable

those operating them to have them under better control when entering harbours during light airs; (b) To expedite movements from dock to dock when in harbour, and save cost of towing; (c) To keep vessels in motion, and under steerage way in calm weather when on voyage from port to port, and thereby shorten the duration of voyage when fares carried consist of perishable commodities such as fresh fish; and (d) to supply in some measure a port to port service to aid in marketing commodities largely owned by the operators of said vessels, rendered necessary owing to lack of other available means of transportation, thus enabling those engaged in the fresh fishing or carrying trade to market their fares in as prime condition as possible.

The regulations of the Department of Marine and Fisheries requiring the employment upon said auxiliary crafts of passed masters and engineers are burdensome and oppressive for the following reasons:—

(1) It would add seriously to the expense of operating, as they would have to be paid much higher wages than the ordinary men employed. (2) There are no such men available at present; and if there were any we would be unable to hire them, as we can make our vessels pay only by running them with ordinary men. (3) Men who have passed for steam engineers are not thereby qualified to run gasolene engines as they are so different. (4) Seventy-five per cent of the goods carried is owned by the parties operating said vessels, on which no insurance is carried, on either vessel or cargo. (5) The agents of insurance companies inform us that they will insure gasolene vessels for seven per cent, where without gasolene they charge thirteen per cent.

Therefore, your petitioners humbly pray that the Honourable Minister of Marine and Fsheries will favourably consider our request. And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

Those members of the House who last year were members of the Committee on Marine and Fisheries will recollect that when the Bill to amend the Canada Shipping Act was before that committee that this question of gasolene propelled sailing vessels came up for discussion. The members from the maritime provinces took very strong ground that something should be done at once to meet the requirements of the case. So firmly convinced was the committee of the justice of this claim that section 100 of the Act was recommended for amendment as follows:

100. The foregoing provisions as to masters and mates shall not apply to sailing ships of not more than one hundred tons gross tonnage having motive power of not more than eight nominal horse-power and employed solely in the carriage of freight; or to any ship of less than fifty tons gross tonnage propelled by motive power and employed as a tug-boat or in the carriage of freight; or to pleasure yachts not carrying passengers or goods for hire; or to steamships carrying passengers not having a whole or fixed deck and of not more than twenty-nine feet in length at the light water line; or to ships employed solely in fishing; or to barges or other vessels having neither masts, sails or rigging and not being steamships.

Explanatory Note.—Sailing vessels with auxiliary engines and certain ships under 50 tons gross tonnage, are added to the list of exempted vessels.

Owing to the dissolution of parliament the Bill was never reported back to the House. It may be asked why not adhere to the amendment of last session? The reason is that many changes were to be made in the Act last session and this section was amended in line with others in other parts of the Act. As it is not now proposed to deal with the Act generally, it is thought better to amend this section with the main view of affording relief during the present season to the class of shipowners referred to. Any elaborate amendment of the Act would make its consideration and enactment this session practically impossible. The proposed exemption appears to cover the case fully, and if after it has been in operation for a season or two it is found to be faulty in any respect the matter can be gone into again.

Clause 2 of the Bill is designed to remove what is felt to be a just grievance of the holders of certificates issued by the department. If a man loses his certificate he is called upon to pay one-half the fee that the original certificate cost. No matter how meritorious his claim to exemption from the payment of such fee may be, there is no power to grant it. Besides, the payment of six or seven dollars is often a serious tax on a master or mate who have, as a class, no reserve fund out of which to pay these extra expenses. The government does not want the money, and the certain knowledge that if a certificate is lost the owner of it will have to pay for a duplicate will not prevent its loss nor tend to make the holder more careful. Section 93 of the Act lays down the scale of fees as follows:—Master, competency, $15; mate, competency, seagoing, $8; mate, competency, inland, etc., $6; master, service, $8; mate, service, seagoing, $5; mate, service, inland, etc., $4.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Will the first part of this Bill apply merely to the coasting trade or to foreign trade as well?

Mr. HAZEN. It will apply to all vessels of less than 100 tons engaged partly in fishing and partly in other business. If the vessels are engaged partly in fishing and partly in the carriage of freight, it is immaterial whether they carry the freight in the coastwise trade or otherwise.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I think the Minister will have to designate in the Bill whether the sections apply to the coasting trade or the foreign trade.

Mr. HAZEN. I shall consider that point when the Bill is under consideration.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee on the resolution.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). Where has the petition which the Minister has read come from?

Mr. HAZEN. I have not the signatures here, but they come from different points in the maritime provinces. I shall be glad to let my hon. friend see them.

Mr. MACDONALD. Are there any provisions of the law which require certificated engineers for these motor boats, or is any amendment necessary to remove the difficulty?

Mr. HAZEN. They do not require certificated engineers when engaged in fishing. But the fishing does not last during the whole year. At other times these boats are engaged in carrying products from one port to another; and at such times, if they were required to have certificated engineers they would be laid up, and would be of no use to their owners as earners of money.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will the Bill in any way affect fishermen using gasoline boats on the inland lakes?

Mr. HAZEN. The Bill, of course, is not restricted to any particular part of Canada. It will not in any way restrict the fishermen, but rather extend their rights to use these boats.

Resolution reported, read the first and the second time, and agreed to.

Mr. HAZEN moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 143) to amend the Canada Shipping Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. KAY. I beg leave to draw the attention of the hon. Postmaster General to the fact that a return ordered by this House on the 26th of February, relating to the dismissal of the postmaster of Bedford, in the county of Missisquoi, has not yet been brought down.

Mr. PELLETIER. I intent to spend most of my spare time on Saturday and up to the hours of Sunday in trying to put in shape the various papers asked for. I have really been too much overworked to get them attended to. But I hope to be able to bring most of them down on Monday.

VACANCIES IN THE SENATE.

Mr. MACDONALD. I would like to call the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that there are at present three senatorships from the province of Nova Scotia vacant. One of them has been vacant since before the opening of this parliament, and one for some months and the third for some weeks. All indications point to parliament rising within a short time. Does the right hon. gentleman intend to fill these vacancies before parliament rises?

Mr. BORDEN. There are not only the three to which my hon. friend has directed attention, but there is one from the province of New Brunswick. We will give the best consideration possible to these matters at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. EMMERSON. It has been announced apparently with authority that the vacancy in the Senate caused by the resignation of the present lieutenant governor of New Brunswick has been filled by the appointment of Mr. Daniel of St. John. Am I to understand that that was not a correct statement?

Mr. BORDEN. I have not observed any report such as my hon. friend has indicated. As a matter of fact, no appointment has yet been made.

THE OFFICE OF SOLICITOR GENERAL.

Mr. MACDONALD. I would also call the attention of my right hon. friend to the fact that one of the important public offices connected with the government of the country, that of Solicitor General, has been vacant since the resignation of the late government. Does my right hon. friend intend to appoint any one to that office, or how long does he intend to keep it vacant?

Mr. BORDEN. I will give careful consideration to any claims which my hon. friend desires to put forward to fill that position. I really do not know that I have any announcement to make with regard to it beyond that which I think has already been made on more than one occasion in this House.

CANADIAN NORTHERN ALBERTA RAILWAY.

House went into committee on the following resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide that the aid and assistance which, under the Canadian Alberta Act, 1910, the Governor in Council was authorized to give to the Canadian Northern Alberta Railway Company in respect of the construction of the one hundred and fifty miles of railway therein described may, notwithstanding anything in the said Act, be applied to the first one hundred and fifty miles of the said company's railway at present constructed or located from St. Albert, in the province of Alberta, in a generally westerly direction toward the Yellowhead Pass.—Mr. White (Leeds).

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). In the session of 1910 an Act was passed incorporating the Canadian Northern Alberta Railway Company, and providing for aid by the government in the construction of its line from a point at or near Edmonton, or Strathcona, in the province of Alberta, in a generally westerly direction to the coal areas situate at or near the Brazeau river and the head waters of the McLeod river, for a distance not exceeding 150 miles, by guaranteeing the principal and interest of the bonds, debentures, debenture stock, or other securities of the company, to the extent of $13,000 per mile for the first 50 miles of the line so treated, and for the remainder of the line to the amount of $25,000 per mile, not exceeding in all 150 miles. In March, 1911, those securities of the Canadian Northern Alberta Railway Company guaranteed by the Dominion, were sold on the London market, the issue amounting to £647,260 sterling. It was the intention of the Canadian Northern Alberta Railway Company to route its line to Wolfe creek, that is a point 116 miles west of Edmonton, and then to divert the line in a south-westerly direction 34 miles, making up the total of 150 miles mentioned in the Act towards the Brazeau coal areas. The company afterwards changed its plan, and instead of carrying the last 34 miles towards the Brazeau coal areas, it decided to carry that part of its line from Wolfe creek in a generally westerly direction towards the Yellow Head Pass. In other words the 150 miles has become part of the main line of the Canadian Northern Alberta railway from Edmonton through to Vancouver. Afterwards a trust mortgage pursuant to the Act was executed giving a first charge upon the 150 miles of line which I have mentioned, and providing, as is usual in such trust mortgages, that the proceeds of the bonds should be paid out from time to time as the construction of the line proceeded. Application has been made to the department for some time past for payments out of the proceeds of these securities, amounting as I have said to £647,260 sterling; but by reason of the fact that the trust mortgage purported to cover 150 miles of line running to the Brazean coal areas, and by reason of the fact that the company subsequently changed its plan as to the last 34 miles of the 150 miles, the department took the position that further legislation would be necessary, and that the consent of the debenture holders should be obtained to the change. So far as the debenture holders are concerned the change is not an important one for two reasons: In the first place the 150 miles of the company's main line is, I think, quite as valuable as the 150 miles which it was proposed to construct towards the Brazeau coal areas. In the second place the securities are guaranteed as to principal and interest by the Dominion, so that the debenture holders, if these resolutions are adopted and the Bill founded upon them becomes law, will have in lieu of the security which they now have under the present Trust mortgage, 150 miles on the main line of the Canadian Northern Alberta railway, of which 116 miles are common to both, that is to the security which they now hold, and to the security which they will hold under the new Trust mortgage which it is proposed to execute. In addition to that, they will have the guarantee of the Dominion of Canada as to both principal and interest upon these securities. Now so far as security is concerned there was no reason, therefore, why the debenture holders should have been consulted, but, as it is, I think it desirable that we should be exceedingly careful with regard to legislation which might seem to infringe, even in the slightest degree, the rights of the debenture holders, I conceive it to be my duty—and I believe the same course would have been adopted by my predecessor from what I can learn in the department—to have the debenture holders notified, that is those who now hold the debentures of the Canadian Northern Alberta Railway Company, to the amount of £647,260 sterling. Notices were sent out by one of the trustees under the mortgage, the British Empire Trust Company, of London, to all the debenture holders. Consents have been received from about 92 per cent of those debenture holders to the proposed change in the security, and we have received no notification of any dissent on the part of any debenture holder. Under these circumstances there would appear, therefore, no reason why this Bill should not be adopted by the House. The Trust mortgage which will be executed in substitution of the existing mortgage, will, of course, contain the usual provisions under the authority of the Act for the payment out of the moneys upon proper certificates from time to time. The Bill which I shall ask leave to introduce, if these resolutions are adopted, will provide that the consent of the two Trust companies representing the bondholders, will be obtained to the change in security, and that they will execute the new Trust mortgage. I may say that my predecessor, the Hon. Mr. Fielding, in July last, on the last day of the session, I believe, placed upon the order paper, resolutions similar to those which are now under consideration by the committee. I think, Mr. Chairman, that that is a sufficiently full explanation for the present.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is a matter which was before the late government on several occasions, and the explanation given by the Minister of Finance is practically the explanation given to us. As I understand it the guarantee as proposed originally could not be accepted by the Edmonton and Yukon Pacific on account of the conditions existing. Consequently, in 1910, the company applied to the Railway Department asking to have a Bill passed not only to incorporate the Canadian Northern Alberta, but with that incorporation to transfer from the Edmonton and Yukon Pacific the guarantee that had been given to that company. That guarantee must be all right, as I signed the document myself and no person in this House took objection to it. I think the reason for the change was in connection with the amount of underlying security on one or other of the roads which was not compatible with the security going to the Edmonton and Yukon Pacific. That road was to start at or near Edmonton, and was to go to a point at Wolf Creek, and then down to the Brazeau coal mines, thirty-four miles. This Bill proposes that the road shall start from St. Albert, north of Edmonton, which is on the line of the Canadian Northern railway, and it runs through the same territory to Wolf Creek, but it will not interfere with the thirty-four miles branch line to the coal fields owing to the physical difficulties, but will continue along the main line towards the Yellowhead Pass. The meat of the objection, if objection there should be, in changing this, is that the line will parallel the Grand Trunk Pacific very closely for that distance. I studied that question somewhat, and I know it is a difficult matter in the case of through lines to avoid paralleling, particularly when you are approaching the crossing of a river or a mountain pass where there is only one practical place to go through. In order to get the best results for a through line the companies have to be allowed to build as nearly to an air line as possible. If it were a local road for local purposes only, there would be strong objection to allowing the road to be removed from one point to another, thus getting away from serving one class of people perhaps to go to another point that would help the railway, but injure the people. In the present instance this is to become part of their through transcontinental line. For my part, I see no way to avoid what might be considered the difficulty of allowing the Canadian Northern to parallel approximately closely the Grand Trunk Pacific. The Canadian Northern people in discussing this matter with me on several occasions, rather chided the government in this respect—and I give it to the House for what it is worth—that they always maintained that they were first on the ground from Edmonton to the Yellowhead Pass, and instead of them encroaching on the Grand Trunk Pacific, that it was the Grand Trunk Pacific that was encroaching on what they thought were their prior rights. Be that as it may, I cannot see any objection to the transfer of this guarantee, because if this government or the late government had been asked to guarantee the bonds of the Canadian Northern in the first place along this direct line, I think there would have been no objection. As I understand the situation they require legislation passed because under the guarantee of 1910, in which a special Act was passed also incorporating the Canadian Northern Alberta, bonds were practically sold or subscriptions received, and in order to protect those bondholders a trust deed had to be executed. Now, the route is to be changed, and although it might possibly have been all right if the transaction had been between private individuals to not introduce special legislation for the transferring of this road from one place to another, yet I think under the circumstances, not only to protect the bondholder—perhaps that is the smallest part of it because they would have been protected anyway—but in order that there may be no clashing of legislation, and that in the future there may be no opportunity at all for any person to raise the question that the Dominion of Canada was lax in protecting the capital that was sent into this country for the benefit of our railways. I am delighted to hear the Minister of Finance take the ground that the present government, and parliament, I believe as well, will not be a party to any legislation, no matter what others may do, which will seem in any way to mar in any degree the securities held by capitalists on Dominion projects. We cannot afford to do that under any circumstances. I acquiesce cheerfully in this Bill, and I believe it is the only thing that can wisely and properly be done under the circumstances.

Resolution reported, read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 144) respecting aid towards the construction of the Canadian Northern Alberta railway.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY—POLLUTION OF THE RED RIVER.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. G. H. BRADBURY. (Selkirk). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I must crave the indulgence of the House for a few moments while I call the attention of

the government to a condition of things existing on the Red river north of the city of Winnipeg, that is fast becoming intolerable. Previous to some four years ago the river was open. At that time the government constructed what is known as the St. Andrew's dam across the St. Andrew's rapids, and by so doing all current in that river was practically stopped and there has been created what might be called a large basin of dead water. That basin extends from the dam south to the city of Winnipeg some twelve miles. When the dam was built it raised the water some seventeen feet at the dam and about two feet at the city of Winnipeg. Previous to the construction of this dam the sewage from the great city of Winnipeg and the other cities south of the dam had been deposited in the river, but there was current enough to carry this sewage past the town of Selkirk towards the lake, and it was deposited in Lake Winnipeg. Although at that time we complained bitterly on account of the pollution of the Red river which made it impossible for the water to be used at Selkirk, or by any of the settlers along the river, we failed to obtain any redress from the city of Winnipeg, and up to the present time there has been no legislation placed on the statute-book to make it impossible for this great city to pollute the river. And owing to the construction of this dam the conditions have become intolerable, and as I said a moment ago, property all along that river has been depreciated, and the health and the lives of tens of thousands of citizens of Manitoba are menaced by the conditions that exist in this basin of water. The construction of this dam stopped the current, as I stated a moment ago, and the city of Brandon, the city of Portage la Prairie, and all the municipalities down the Assiniboine river, and the great city of Winnipeg, with its 150,000 or nearly 200,000 people, with all its great stockyards, abattoirs and manufactories, have been pouring their sewage into this basin during the last four years, with the result that the lives and health of the people are seriously menaced. I hold in my hand a letter from the secretary of the Board of Trade of the town of Selkirk, enclosing a small clipping which I desire to place on record. It is dated Selkirk, March 3:

Selkirk, Man., March 3.—Three cases of typhoid fever are reported at Lockport among the crew from the Dominion government public works department engaged in blasting out a new ship channel at St. Andrew's locks. The men are working in bulkheads driven through the ice and their illness is said to be due to the bad condition of the river water under the ice. All winter difficulty has been experienced on account of the odours arising from the sewage-laden water.

The letter written to me indicates that the conditions are very bad at this place, and asks me to call the attention of parliament to it. I have a Bill on the order paper which I moved with the object of trying to get the sanction of this House, but I only succeeded in securing its first reading. The purpose of the Bill was to make it an offence to deposit sewage or poisonous waste in the river. There was another Bill which passed the Senate and came to this House, very similar to my own, and owing to the emergency of the case I would have been very glad indeed to assist in passing that Bill into law. The town of Selkirk has from time to time petitioned the government asking that some legislation be passed. I hold in my hand several petitions that have been filed, asking that some action be taken to prevent the city of Winnipeg from using the Red river as an outlet for its sewage. I wish to place on record one of these resolutions. The memorandum reads:

The placing of the dam in the Red River at St. Andrew's causing the waters for a long distance above the dam to be raised has necessarily robbed the river of its current to such an extent that it does not carry away the dirt and waste being thrown into it. This waste falls to the bottom and remains.

The system of running the sewage into the river was objectionable before the construction of the locks, but under the present conditions it is a serious menace to the public health, and it becomes a vital necessity that a more sanitary method be found for the disposal of the Winnipeg sewage without any delay.

Then the Board of Trade passed the following resolution which was filed with the government:

Partial copy of resolution of the Board of Trade passed at Selkirk, November 8, 1911:

Be it resolved that this board do emphatically and most strenuously protest against the disposal of the sewage of the great and growing city of Winnipeg without the interposal of a proper septic system for the purification of all sewage before it be discharged into the river.

That this board express it as their opinion that such procedure will cause the accumulation of practically all of the impurities of sewage for a greater portion of the year between the point of discharge and the St. Andrew's lock dam; and that the discharge of all this sediment 'en masse' at certain seasons of the year will have the effect of largely increasing the menace to health that is presented by the sewage itself. That such action will be inimical to the lives of sixty million white fish which are annually descharged from the fish hatchery at Selkirk, and upon which the fishing industry of Lake Winnipeg and the perpetuity of the species in Lake Winnipeg is largely dependent.

That this board is deeply interested in the development, as an agricultural and residential

district, of the lower Red River valley, and depreciates any action which will have the effect of arresting that development. . . That where the sewage of the city of Winnipeg, with the enormous increase to be expected from it, must depend upon so slow and shallow a discharging stream as is afforded by the Red River, the adoption of any permanent sewage disposal without purification would be suicidal in its tendencies, and work instant and incalculable harm upon this section of the province of Manitoba.

Now, there are several resolutions along the same line. The town of Selkirk, and the residents north of Winnipeg have been worked up over this matter for some time, and something ought to be done by this parliament. We had an example in the city of Ottawa only one year ago, of the fatal effects on health arising from the pollution of a navigable stream, we had an epidemic raging through this city which filled all our hospitals, and an emergency hospital had to be equipped in order to take care of the sick. Hundreds of people were ill in their own homes. We had over a thousand cases of typhoid fever in this city last year, and it cost the city the awful toll of 83 lives, owing to the criminal neglect of the city of Ottawa to take proper care of its sewage. I do not think this House and parliament can escape some of the responsibilities that rest upon us. This is the only body apparently that can intervene with the necessary legislation. While we have been sitting in this chamber during the last two or three months, working on financial and economic matters, and other public questions in which the people are interested, we have entirely neglected this extremely important matter which affects the health and lives of the people of this country. The prosperity of this country depends largely on the health of its people, it is one of the greatest assets we have got, and still we allow this system of poisoning the source of our water supply to go on year after year, and apparently nothing is done to prevent it. I have just mentioned that the typhoid fever epidemic in this city resulted in 83 deaths. According to Dr. Wylie, one of the best authorities I believe on the American continent on sanitation, the average human life is worth $50,000 to the state. If that be the case, from an economic standpoint the city of Ottawa last year lost through that epidemic over $4,000,000. Less than $1,000,000, we are told, would provide a proper septic tank for the treatment of the sewage.

In the city of Winnipeg we have had the same experience. We have had epidemics there of the most serious nature and I have no hesitation in saying that, if some drastic measures are not taken to remove the source of danger, the great city of Winnipeg will yet pay an awful price in the loss of hundreds and perhaps thousands of the lives of its citizens for its neglect to provide modern methods for caring for its sewage. But, I am more interested in the residents of my own constituency. The property of these people is being depreciated in value, and the lives and health of hundreds of the residents along the river are endangered by the impure state of affairs existing on the river. I was told by a gentleman living on the banks of the Red river south of the dam that when the water was gradually let out last fall the deposit of sewage opposite his own door was over three feet deep, and the odour arising from it was simply intolerable. The condition calls upon the government to take some drastic measure and I would ask the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) now to see that there is a thorough investigation made of the conditions of the river especially where men are working under his department. If we had that investigation made this coming spring perhaps we would be in a better position to deal with this matter effectively when the House meets again. I would urge the government in the meantime to take up one of the Bills that is on the order paper, make it a law of this country, and thus prevent the pollution of our rivers. I have a record here that is appalling, showing exactly what has taken place from the pollution of rivers in Canada and giving the death rate. Thousands of our citizens have been stricken by typhoid fever all traceable to polluted waters and I think the time has come when this parliament should act in an effective manner in order to make it impossible for the great sources of our water supply to be polluted. The city of Winnipeg is surrounded by rivers. The Assiniboine comes from the west and discharges into the Red river. The Assiniboine carries along the sewage of Brandon, Portage la Prairie and all the adjoining municipalities and, since the water has been raised in the Red river, the Assiniboine, during the summer, is practically without any current, it is practically an open sewer and it is a menace not alone to the people of the city of Winnipeg but to the people living along that river. This great basin of water that has been created between Winnipeg and the dam is fast becoming in the same condition. In my own town of Selkirk the residents dare not touch the water in the river. They cannot even give it to their stock with safety. The polluting of the water in the river has resulted in the pollution of Lake Winnipeg also. For ten or fifteen miles out from the mouth of the river a whitefish cannot live on account of the polluted condition of the water. I would ask the government to give this matter their earnest consideration and have

an immediate investigation made into the condition of the river north of Winnipeg, and take action at once to protect the health and lives of the people living north of Winnipeg on the Red river. We in Selkirk are determined to have this matter settled in the interest of the health of all concerned.

Mr. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, the subject which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bradbury) has brought to the attentioin of the government is undoubtedly a very important one. There has not been an opportunity during the present session to give consideration to the Bill which was introduced in the Senate by hon. Mr. Belcourt last session and again this session and which passed the Senate this session. My hon. friend (Mr. Bradbury) also introduced a Bill during the present session which deals, I think, somewhat along the same lines, with the subject to which he has just now called attention. There is no doubt whatever that this is a subject to which parliament must give its attention in the early future. It is impossible to have present conditions continue under the system which has been adopted. I have never looked into the question of law which would arise in connection with the dicharge by these various cities of their sewage into rivers, and I do not know whether the question has ever been tested in the courts. One would think that there might be a great deal of doubt, apart from any legislation of this parliament or of a provincial legislature, as to the right of a city to pollute the water that passes to those entitled to use the river below in such a manner as has been the case in different parts of the country. I can only say to my hon. friend at the present moment that we do thoroughly realize the importance of the matter which he has brought to the attention of the House. I would not like to say that there would be an opportunity at the present session to take up one or other of these Bills, because I am not sure that the form in which they have been presented, in one case in the Senate and in the other case in this House, would be regarded as precisely the best form in which the subject could be presented to parliament. There has not been an opportunity to give sufficient consideration to that question. It will, however, be taken into consideration, and in that connection the observations of my hon. friend as to the conditions, which he has so forcibly portrayed as prevailing on the Assiniboine and Red rivers, will have our most careful and earnest attention.

BETTER TERMS FOR PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. J. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.). Mr. Speaker, I wish to call your attention to a grievance that affects my constituency, and I do so with the hope that it may be remedied at an early date. By the passage of Bill (No. 115), under which largely increased subsidies will be paid to the province of Manitoba, the financial conditions of the other provinces will be somewhat affected, those of Prince Edward Island with the others. But in so far as the financial conditions relate to all the provinces, I presume that an adjustment will take place at some time, and when that adjustment takes place, I presume that Prince Edward Island will receive the same consideration as may be given to the other provinces. By some of the provisions of this Bill an injustice is done to Prince Edward Island which I think should be——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot refer to a previous debate in the House.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.)—removed without delay. When this Bill was in committee I called the attention of the government to this matter, and I really thought I was making some impression, but I am afraid I was too hopeful. On the third reading of the Bill, I again called the attention of the government to it, and I asked the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Borden), for an answer as to whether or not the special case of Prince Edward Island would be considered and dealt with during this session. I was a little surprised to find that the Prime Minister gave me no answer. I do not think it is usual to do that. When a member of this House, in the discharge of his duty, puts to the Prime Minister of the country a proper and pertinent question on a public matter, I think an answer is usually given. I do not know whether the Prime Minister wished to be discourteous to me or not—I hope not. However, it would not prevent me from doing what I believe to be my duty, and I will therefore have to ask the question again. Possibly, I did not make my position clear when I was speaking in committee or when I was speaking to the House on the third reading of the Bill. In order that there may be no doubt about that, I will refer to the clause of the Bill which makes special provision for a large subsidy to the province of Manitoba in lieu of her public lands.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. Hughes) is clearly speaking in violation of the rules of the House now by referring to a previous debate, and cannot be permitted to continue, unless the House is willing to ignore the rules which govern its debates.

Mr. HUGHES (Prince Edward Island). I am not referring to a former debate.

Mr. SPEAKER. My understanding of the rule is that the hon. member cannot refer to a former debate or discuss a Bill which has already been disposed of by the House.

Mr. HUGHES (Prince Edward Island). In order to make myself perfectly clear I wish to read the provisions of Bill (No. 115) concerning the boundaries of Manitoba, which give to Manitoba a large subsidy in lieu of her public lands, and I want to refer also to the clause in the statute of 1873, under which Prince Edward Island came into confederation, and which is very brief.

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course it is quite permissible for the hon. member to read a clause from a statute, but he cannot discuss Bills which have already been dealt with during the present session.

Mr. HUGHES (Prince Edward Island). Well, the House is quite familiar with the provisions of Bill (No. 115) respecting the Manitoba boundaries, and I need not refer to that. This statute of 1893 contains the terms under which Prince Edward Island came into confederation, and the clause which deals with the subject in hand is as follows:

That as the government of Prince Edward Island holds no lands from the Crown and consequently enjoys no revenue from that source for the construction and maintenance of local works, the Dominion government shall pay by half-yearly installments in advance to the government of Prince Edward Island $45,000 per annum, less interest at five per cent per annum upon any sum not exceeding $800,000 which the Dominion government may advance to the Prince Edward Island government for the purchase of lands now held by large proprietors.

That $45,000 is something less than 50 cents per head of the population of Prince Edward Island, and under the Manitoba Boundary Bill, passed this session, Manitoba will receive $1.25 per head of her population for precisely the same reasons as Prince Edward Island receives only 50 cents per head, and the amount of $1.25 to Manitoba will be increased as the population of that province increases. Now, Sir, I think this is a special discrimination against Prince Edward Island. Of course I do not think it was intended that injustice should be done Prince Edward Island in this matter, but justice can now be done to my province by treating it in the same way as Manitoba is treated. Then, as it is the only other province in the Dominion that stands in the same position, I believe that something should be done this session to remedy the injustice, and I would ask the Prime Minister if he will take it up and see that it is dealt with during the present session.

Right Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister). I have already informed the right hon. leader of the opposition that an announcement would be made early next week, probably on Monday or Tuesday, as to all the legislation that the government proposes to bring down during the present session. I do not feel myself called upon to make an announcement to my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) in advance of that statement which I have promised. I trust his feelings will not be at all wounded by my inability to take the course he suggests. No discourtesy is intended to him, but these matters have to be done in a certain way and after certain consideration. It is not possible always to answer in a definite way matters of the character which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) has directed attention to. I would like to say to him that the Premier of Prince Edward Island and his colleagues called our attention months ago, in a very effective, forcible, clear and lucid manner, not only to the matter to which the hon. gentleman has directed attention, but to other matters affecting the position of Prince Edward Island in its financial relations to the Dominion. The matter has had, upon these representations of the government of Prince Edward Island, very serious consideration by the present administration, but I am unable to make any announcement to my hon. friend to-day.

Mr. HUGHES (Prince Edward Island). I am afraid there is a mistake of some kind because I find that when the Premier of Prince Edward Island and his colleagues returned to that province they gave to the newspapers a list of the subjects they had brought to the attention of this government, and this particular subject was not in that list. The two subjects which they stated they brought to the attention of the government and forcibly pressed upon the government were, first, the payment to Prince Edward Island for the nonfulfilment of the terms of union in regard to winter communication from the year 1900 to the present time, and, second, for consideration in consequence of the extension of the boundaries of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member has already spoken.

Mr. HUGHES (Prince Edward Island). If there is any mistake in the matter I wish to have it corrected now.

Mr. SPEAKER. It appears to me the hon. gentleman is out of order.

Mr. HUGHES (Prince Edward Island). Will you permit me to say there appears to be an error somewhere because I am sure that this being the strongest and the best claim Prince Edward Island has, that the Premier would not have missed

it in the list which he announced he had discussed with the Dominion authorities. I do not know where the mistake occurred, but there appears to be one because there is a marked discrepancy between the statement of the right hon. the Prime Minister and that of the Premier of Prince Edward Island.

Mr. BORDEN. There is no mistake at all.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Supply.

SUPPLY.

Royal Northwest Mounted Police—Northwest Territories, Yukon Territory, provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan—Pay of force, $340,000; subsistenc, forage, fuel and light, clothing, buildings, repairs and renewals, horses, dogs, arms and ammunition, medical stores, billeting, transport, water service, stationery and contingencies, $410,000; to compensate members of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police for injuries received while in the discharge of duty, $3,000; total, $753,000.

Mr. BORDEN. The main estimates for this year are exactly the same as those for last year, but there was a supplementary estimate for that year. The estimates are for the pay and maintenance of seven hundred officers and men and five hundred men in Alberta and Saskatchewan at $900 each, amounting to $450,000 and 200 men in the Yukon and remote portions of the Northwest at $1,500 a year each, amounting to $300,000. The item of subsistence, $109,508, is based on 500 men in the headquarters district and subdistricts at thirty cents a day and on 200 men in the Yukon at seventy-five cents per day.

The item of forage, $55,000, is based on 400 horses at 25 cents per day, 80 at 40 cents per day, and 30 at 60 cents per day, according to the districts where they are employed. I have particulars also with regard to fuel and light, which are not different from those in previous years. So far as the pay of the force is concerned, I have already laid on the table of the House, at the request of the right hon. leader of the opposition, the order in council, which was issued after conference with the Commissioner and the Acting Commissioner of the Northwest Mounted Police, and upon their recommendation that it was necessary to make this increase in the pay of the force in order to maintain the force at the desired standard. During the first six years the pay is to increase by an average of fifteen cents per day for each constable. The amount of the increased pay is not included in this estimate. It will have to be provided for in the supplementary estimates for next year.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.)

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I desire to ask the attention of the committee for a moment or two, in connection with a very sad and distressing incident which occurred in the early part of the year 1911, and which resulted in the death of four persons belonging to the Northwest Mounted Police. In the month of December, 1910, Inspector Fitzgerald, of the Northwest Mounted Police, in company with three other constables whose names were respectively, Carter, Taylor and Kinney, left Fort McPherson to patrol the route to Dawson. These members of the force endured great hardships and sufferings from the outset of their journey, and in the end lost their lives. I desire to read to the committee a portion of the official report of Commissioner Perry on this sad incident:

Inspector Fitzgerald in his diary gives some inkling as to what was affecting his mind; it seems to have been the anxiety to perform the patrol and not return to Fort McPherson defeated. His expression, 'My last hope is gone and the only thing I can do is to return,' seems to indicate this. Had he been a less experienced traveller than he was, he would surely have turned back sooner.

The cause of the disaster may be summed up as follows:

1. The small quantity of provisions taken.
2. Want of an efficient guide.
3. Delay in searching for the lost trail.

The heroic efforts to return to Fort McPherson have not been exceeded in the annals of Arctic travel.

Corporal Dempster's reports show that the unfortunate men had wasted to shadows. All were strong, powerful young men, and in the best of health and condition when they left on their ill-fated journey. That they should have lost their lives is greatly to be deplored. It is the greatest tragedy which has occurred in this force during its existence of thirty-seven years.

Their loss has been felt most keenly by every member of the force, but we cannot but feel a thrill of pride at the endeavour they made to carry out their duty, and their gallant struggle for their lives.

I cannot express it better than in the following extract from a letter addressed to me by His Honour the Lieutenant Governor of Saskatchewan :

While the event brings deepest sadness to all, we feel that it is only an event such as this which can give greatest lustre and enduring remembrance to the splendid Force.

My purpose in mentioning this sad event to the committee is to suggest the desirability of voting an annuity to the mother and sisters of the late Inspector Fitzgerald, who now live in Halifax, and who were dependent upon the deceased son and brother. The last thoughts of Inspector Fitzgerald were for his mother, as shown in the brief and pathetic will written just

previous to his death, and which was discovered in his pockets. It was, I am informed, the intention of Inspector Fitzgerald to retire from the force during the present year, when he would have been, I believe, entitled to a superannuation of $1,000 per year. In the Halifax Public Garden, one of the most beautiful spots in all America, the citizens of Halifax have erected what is called the 'Fitzgerald Bridge,' as a mark of the esteem and high regard of the people of that city for Inspector Fitzgerald. I venture to make this suggestion to the committee, because the Prime Minister, representing as he does with myself, Halifax county, and which was the home of Inspector Fitzgerald, while no doubt very sympathetic in the matter, might feel reluctant on that account to establish a precedent and meet the suggestion I make to the committee. I think however, that this is a case in which parliament would be justified in voting a specific sum or an annuity to be paid to the mother of Inspector Fitzgerald during her lifetime, and I feel sure that, if the government can see their way clear to do so, it will meet with the support and commendation of the House. What I say respecting Inspector Fitzgerald is, of course, intended to apply to his companions in death.

Mr. THOMPSON (Yukon). I rise to express my sympathy with the hon. junior member for Halifax, who has just so well expressed his sentiments with regard to this tragedy of the north which resulted in the death of Inspector Fitzgerald and his party. It strikes me that it would be a most fitting thing for this parliament to recognise the services rendered to Canada, and the empire by Inspector Fitzgerald, who laid down his life in those northern wilds in the discharge of what he considered to be his simple duty. The North-west Mounted Police have done a great deal in conquering the wilds of the north and the west, and in giving to the people of those sections of our country peace, law and order. I have lived in the Yukon for some twelve years, and I can testify, as I do most enthusiastically, to the splendid work they have done, and are doing on our frontiers. Our boundary marches with that of the United States on the 141st meridian west from Mount St. Elias to the Arctic ocean, and the United States and Canada have settlements on either side of that boundary line, and also on the littoral of the Arctic ocean. It became necessary some years ago, in the opinion of those belonging to the Northwest Mounted Police, to establish a patrol annually from Dawson to Herschell Island.

This patrol leaves Dawson in December or January of each year usually. In the year in which Inspector Fitzgerald met his death that patrol left Herschell Island, or Fort McPherson, for Dawson. Inspector Fitzgerald was accompanied by three other men. It seems that on this particular patrol, the inspector neglected to take a proper guide. He had a guide with him whom he thought could guide him through that labyrinth of streams, mountains and passes which exist on that trail, but his guide failed him. He continued his route thinking he could, with the knowledge he had of the trail, succeed in making Dawson, but we know now that he could not under the circumstances, have done so. His diary is a pathetic document in view of the events which finally cost him his life. Here is an entry dated 17th January:

> Twenty-three below. Fine in a.m. with strong S.W. wind which turned to a gale in evening.

He goes on to explain what he did that day and continues:

> I left at eight a.m. and followed a river running south, but could not see any cuttings on it.

That is he could see no marks.

> Carter is completely lost and does not know one river from another. We have now only ten pounds of flour, and eight pounds of bacon and some dried fish. My last hope is gone, and the only thing I can do is to return, and kill some of the dogs to feed the others and ourselves, unless we can meet some Indians.

Unfortunately the party never met any Indians, and in eating the dogs they were taken down by a peculiar disease which sometimes comes to men who have to live on dog flesh as these poor fellows had to. Inspector Fitzgerald carried with him despatches from the police post on the Arctic Ocean, and customs revenues for our government. These were found intact in one of the last camps which he made. There is little more to add, Mr. Chairman, except on my part to say, that I think it would be a most fitting thing for this parliament to recognize in some measure the services which Inspector Fitzgerald performed. An hon. gentleman asks me what about the other three members of the party. They met their deaths a little earlier than Inspector Fitzgerald. The guide who went out to examine the trail, and if possible discover the bodies of the members of the patrol, found two of Inspector Fitzgerald's policemen dead and, cared for them as best could be done. Next they found another policeman, and finally Inspector Fitzgerald himself who was the last to die. I think that some fitting recognition should be made of the services of all four men, but

particularly of Inspector Fitzgerald himself who died in doing his duty.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. With regard to the estimates which are now asked for by my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) there are no comments to be made at all. The money will be cheerfully voted, it is well deserved by the force. I have read with some care the report of the Mounted Police which was brought down some time ago by the Prime Minister. In connection with that report two things struck me. One was the advisability of increasing the pay of the men. The commissioner of the force states how difficult it is to maintain the required quota of men on account of the inducements which are offered in the Northwest provinces to young men in good health and brains. It is natural to suppose that members of the Mounted Police, whose pay is rather scanty may be induced to leave the force on account of the greater attractions other occupations offer, and of the even probability of their making a good deal more for themselves than they could if they were to remain in the force. I am very glad that the leader of the government, who has charge of the Mounted Police Department has already brought in a resolution to increase the pay of the Mounted Police which will give them more inducement to remain in the service, and when these resolutions are brought down the money called for will also be cheerfully voted. There is another thing which has struck me, as to the advisability, or otherwise, of extending the posts of the Mounted Police northward. Settlement is moving northward all the time. It has now reached the Athabasca river. It will reach by and by the Peace river district, and no doubt will extend, more or less, from that region up to the Arctic ocean. My hon. friend, I believe, will be compelled, as time goes on, to extend the police posts further north. Whether he can do that without increasing the force is a matter as to which I offer no opinion; but probably he will find it possible to decrease the number of posts in the well settled portions of the district of Athabasca and the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, and extend them farther northward. With regard to the tragedy which has just been referred to by my hon. friend from Halifax, and my hon. friend from the Yukon, for my part I will say, if my opinion counts for anything in the matter at all, that I will be very glad to see recognition given to the families of Inspector Fitzgerald and his companions. This is perhaps a little irregular, but the tragedy is one that is not likely to occur anywhere else. The patrolling done by the force in this northern region, from the Yukon to the mouth of the Mackenzie river and to the Hudson's Bay Company posts, is a work which requires not only courage, ability and moral force, but all the qualities which may characterize the human mind and human intellect. In looking over the report of the tragedy as it occurred, it seems to me that Inspector Fitzgerald was imprudent in starting with so little provisions as he did, but this does not detract at all from his merit in responding to the call of duty. Inspector Fitzgerald and his party should have had another team of dogs, and carried more provisions, and had they done so they probably would have escaped the calamity which befell them. But this in no wise detracts from the heroism he displayed, and if the right hon. gentleman who is in charge of the force should ask for some testimonial to be given to his family, for my part I shall cheerfully support it.

Mr. WHITE (Victoria, Alberta). I would like to add a few words in support of what has been already so well said by the junior member for Halifax with regard to the tragic death of Inspector Fitzgerald. It was my privilege to know Inspector Fitzgerald personally, being an old member of the Northwest Mounted Police—though before the time that Inspector Fitzgerald entered the force—and I have some knowledge of the duties which members of the Northwest Mounted Police are called upon to perform. There is an opinion in the western country, and particularly at the post at Fort Saskatchewan to which the late Inspector Fitzgerald belonged, that he was called upon to perform an unnecessary duty. It is believed at least, that he was called upon, on account of his remarkable and distinguished record, to perform something that was altogether out of the ordinary, something beyond what is expected of the Northwest Mounted Police. It is believed in the district I have referred to by old associates and friends of Inspector Fitzgerald that it was perhaps to make a nice report that the police had such a complete system of patrol from the international boundary to the Arctic circle, that he was called upon to undertake that duty.

It is well known that they were not going out for duty in the way of looking after criminals or to relieve settlers in distress because this is an uninhabited region, and I hope that the request of the hon. the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) will receive the consideration of the right hon. the Prime Minister. I do not know why it is but we have always found it very difficult to have anything done for the Northwest Mounted Police, one of the best military or semi-military organizations in the world. We read a great deal about the great things they have done, but members of that force who have been un-

fortunate enough to meet with accidents in the discharge of their duty have found since the organization of the police that they have received very little attention from the heads of the department in the east. The government has always been willing to recognize and reward members of other military corps for any service done. When the Royal Northwest Mounted Police were organized in 1874, they received 75c. a day, and at the end of their service they were given a free grant of land of 160 acres. In 1879, the Conservative party came into power, their pay was reduced to 50c. per day and their scrip was cut off, they lost the grant of land although at that time land was of no value whatever. During the rebellion of 1885 they were asked to do the hardest duties on the field, they did the scout duty, and as they had knowledge of the country the most dangerous work fell to them. But when it came to the rewards after the rebellion, although some corps that were under orders in the east received their scrip, the Northwest Mounted Police received no bounty at all. A great many companies that went to the west were sent to police posts and did garrison duty while the police went out to do the fighting; the eastern corps that did garrison duty at the posts received their scrip, while the police received no consideration at all.

I mention these facts simply to point out that for some reason or another the police have not been getting a square deal. They perform duties not performed by any other organization of the kind in the world. During the six years I served in the police force I was called on to act as sheriff for some months. I have acted as collector of customs, and the man who relieved me received $1,800 a year. There is a feeling among the mounted police that they are not receiving what they should receive, and I am glad to notice that a small increase of pay has been made, but, it is very small. There is an increase of only 15 cents a day, but that is not at all equal to the increase in wages in other walks of life and in the cost of living. Wages of other men have nearly doubled since the police were first organized, and yet the police to-day receive only 75 cents a day for performing their difficult duties. A policeman when sent out on any particular duty has no option, he is not able to refuse the duty if he does not like it. I have known a man to receive a year in the cells for simply refusing to obey an order. When they are ordered to do any work they have to do it, and I think they are entitled to a greater increase than is proposed.

It would be a shame to see the mother of such a man as Inspector Fitzgerald have to suffer want because her means of livelihood are taken away owing to the death of her son. The government might well give her the pension that was earned by Inspector Fitzgerald for the 20 years he served, as a bounty as long as she may live, and, while I do not know the others, I think they also are entitled to some consideration. I hope the Prime Minister will look into this whole question, not only with reference to Inspector Fitzgerald, but to the police generally. It looks as if the deputy head of the department is anxious to demonstrate to the people of Canada how cheaply an organization of that kind can be kept up. The initial pay might well be increased to a dollar a day, and I do not think any one would think these men were even then being fairly paid.

Mr. BORDEN. I appreciate all that has been said in commendation of the force, in which I have always taken a very great deal of interest. I can assure my hon. friend who has just taken his seat, and who, I understand, was a member of the force for some years, that so far as I am concerned the Northwest Mounted Police will always get fair-play and a square deal as far as I am able to give it to them. The statute fixes $1 as the maximum pay for constables. We are increasing the pay in the first year by the order in council lately passed to the extent of 25 per cent; it was 60 cents, it is now 75 cents per diem, and in the sixth year it reaches the maximum of $1. Formerly the constable did not reach the maximum until the ninth year . I am perfectly well aware that, compared with the rewards that come to men engaged in other vocations, this is not much, but still the pay now provided is larger than ever before, and I think it is practically the same as the pay in the permanent force

My right hon. friend has alluded to the probability that posts still further north will require to be established. I think that is very likely to be brought about. In the brief experience I have had, a great many applications have come to the department at Ottawa from time to time for the presence of a constable in new communities which are springing up so continuously and so rapidly in the great prairie provinces. We are endeavouring to supply these demands as rapidly as possible. I have heard it suggested in this House on more than one occasion that the force might advantageously be reduced. Up to the present time I can see nothing that would lead me to such a conclusion. While I have not been able to give to that question the consideration which it would demand before taking action, the inclination in my mind at the present time, without speaking in a definite and conclusive way, would point to the opposite direction. I think, if any change is likely to be made in the constitution of the force,

it would be in the direction of increasing it rather than diminishing it.

Now, with respect to the very regrettable accident and loss of life which occurred two years ago on the Dawson and Macpherson patrol. This patrol, I understand was established about ten years ago, and the accident which took place a year ago was the first serious accident that has ever occurred in connection with the patrol. This patrol has been made in the winter for several years past, with the object of keeping communication open with Fort Macpherson and the Mackenzie river, and carrying the mail between those places. Without it nothing could be heard from the Mackenzie river from the close of navigation of one season to the opening of the next—a matter of seven or eight months. The distance in direct line is 275 miles. Distance as travelled by patrol, 470 miles. The time usually taken is about 30 days each way. This year the patrol left Dawson on the 6th of January and returned on the 10th of March, making the round trip in 69 days.

Here are the details of the party who were frozen to death on this patrol in the winter of 1910-11:

Inspector F. J. Fitzgerald; age 42 years; 22 years' service.
Constable R. O. Taylor; age, 28 years; 5 years' service.
Constable G. F. Kinney; age, 28 years; 4 years' service.
Special Constable Sam. Carter; age, 42 years; pensioner after 20 years' service.

The above party left McPherson on the 21st of December, 1910. The bodies were found on the 21st and 22nd of March, 1911—Inspector Fitzgerald and Special Constable Carter, 25 miles from McPherson, and those of Constables Kinney and Taylor about 35 miles from McPherson. The party had travelled 264 miles from McPherson when they turned back. The cause of the disaster has been attributed to lack of a competent guide and an insufficient supply of provisions. During the present year two relief stations have been built at the following places: Martin's Cabin. about 250 miles from Dawson, and Trail Creek, about 130 miles from McPherson, each stocked with ten days' rations for five men and ten days dog feed for 15 dogs. So that whatever precautions seemed desirable, were taken to prevent any recurrence of the unfortunate fate of these men.

I concur with what has been said by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) and by other members of the House with regard to this subject. One feels specially touched by the entry in the diary of Inspector Fitzgerald, and especially by his will, which was found in one of his pockets, and which evidently had been written with a piece of charred wood. Here is how it read:

All money in despatch bag, and bank, clothes, &c., I leave to my dearly beloved mother, Mrs. John Fitzgerald, Halifax. God bless all.

F. J. FITZGERALD, R.N.W.M.P.

It may be said of Inspector Fitzgerald that whatever error of judgment there may have been in respect of guides and supply of provisions, he bore his part in that journey to the grave in a way that will inspire the respect and admiration of every man in Canada. I feel especially proud because he was born and brought up in the constituency which my hon. friend and myself have the honour to represent in this House. It is impossible for me at the moment to make any definite announcement with regard to the subject my hon. friend from Halifax has brought to my attention to-day, and of which he has spoken to me in private. But I may say to him and to my right hon. friend, that I feel very earnestly the desirability of making some recognition to the families of these men who lost their lives under the circumstances I have mentioned. It is a matter to which I hope to give attention before the end of the present session.

So far as the members of this force are concerned, my hon. friend from Victoria will remember that there is a provision made by way of pension which inures to these men after a certain service in the force. However, I want him to understand that as to giving these men every consideration possible, having regard to the usual practice in such cases, I am disposed to agree very much with what he has suggested. Let me say to him, however, that so far as the permanent officials of the Department of the Northwest Mounted Police are concerned, I do not think there is any room for the criticism that they are not inspired by a very sincere sympathy with the force. The Controller of the Northwest Mounted Police, Colonel White, is disposed, so far as I know his character and disposition—and I think I know him pretty well, to give every possible consideration, under the law by which he is guided to the officers and men of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police. I know there is no man in Canada who has that force in higher regard than Colonel White, there is no man in Canada who is inspired by a more sincere sympathy with the officers and men of the force than the gentleman who is at the head of it at the present time. I think, therefore, there need be no idea in the mind of any hon. member of this House that, whether from the permanent head of the department or from myself, that force will not receive the utmost possible consideration and sympathy.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not think that the numbers of the force ought to be reduced. There has been an impression in the east that, as the new provinces are getting more populated and civil government is becoming better organized, the force might be dispensed with in those provinces. Anybody who takes the trouble to read the report which has been placed on the table of the House will come to the conclusion that it would be a misfortune if the protection which is given to the settlers should be withdrawn. Any man who reads this report will realise the protection, security and encouragement which are given to the settlers when they see the uniforms of the mounted police around them. If the settler has trouble of any kind he goes to the mounted police, and he is sure to have redress. In a multitude of circumstances the presence of the police gives to him a security which he could not have in any other way. The patrolling of the different sections which has been carried on by the police for many years has given to the country a security that otherwise it could not have had. In regard to the patrolling of the north, to which some exception, I understand, has been taken by my hon. friend from Victoria, Alberta (Mr. White), I think that, on the contrary, it has been of eminent service to the country. This service was organized some ten years ago, when I had the honour to have the police under my charge, and the chief reason which led the government to take that course was the desirability of asserting the authority of Canada in these northern regions. At the present time the mouth of the Mackenzie river is used by American whalers as the base of their operations in summer time. They are in contact with the settler. They took pelts away without any regard to law and it was advisable that we should have a force there, not only for the purpose of asserting our own authority, but also for the protection of the natives against the too close proximity of the American whalers. The force has done eminently good service in that respect. We have asserted that authority in these districts and that alone would be sufficient to warrant these yearly expeditions which have taken place from the Yukon to the mouth of the Mackenzie river. In summer it is quite easy to communicate from Athabasca Landing with the mouth of the Mackenzie river, but in the winter it could not be done in any other way than that in which it has been done, and in this respect the service is performing an important duty.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria,Ont.) I desire to say a word in reference to one of the remarks made by the hon. member for Victoria, Alberta (Mr. White). The mounted police is not a military force, and at the time of the Northwest rebellion, and also previously, it had to perform the service of the regular troops. Immediately afterwards the volunteers received their land grants and recognition in the way of a medal. The mounted police never received any land grant, and yet all governments in Canada have refused to recognize them as a military body.

Mr. WHITE (Victoria, Alberta). Although they were not a militia corps they were attached to and under militia officers, and performed military service.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria, Ont.) Yes, that is the point I am making. Regular soldiers did the same thing. They were treated as regular soldiers and not as volunteers. The regular soldier got no land grant; all he got was a medal, and the mounted police were treated as regular soldiers. Supposing one of the officers of the mounted police happens to join the militia service of the country, all his service in the police counts for nothing, although in the past it was much more developing service than the militia service as the mounted policeman in the old days, acted as sheriff, commissioner, inspector, and almost in every capacity from that of a judge down. This service is not counted at all in the militia service. I have always felt that the police have been rather hardly dealt with in not having any credit given to them for their service in 1885.

Ocean and river service—maintenance and repairs to government steamer and ice-breakers, $1,000,000.

Mr. McKENZIE. Would the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries inform me how many ice-breakers he has now on the Atlantic?

Mr. HAZEN. We have three ice-breakers. The 'Montcalm' and the 'Lady Grey' are used for the purpose of breaking ice on the St. Lawrence river and the 'Earl Grey' is engaged with the 'Minto' in keeping open communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland.

Mr. McKENZIE. Are the boats engaged in the service between Pictou and Prince Edward Island?

Mr. HAZEN. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is one of them exclusively an ice-breaker or does she carry passengers and freight and mail as well?

Mr. HAZEN. She does.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). What would be the policy of the minister respecting repairs to government steamers? Will he ask for tenders or will such work be assigned to persons whom his department may select?

Mr. HAZEN. I am informed that in many cases the work of repairing steamers cannot satisfactorily be done by tender. We have now at Halifax quite an extensive plant in connection with the naval yard there and a very considerable number of the vessels are now, I understand, being repaired at Halifax by the department. There are cases where it would be in the public interest to ask for tenders; there are other cases where it is inadvisable to do so, and there are other cases where it is much more in the public interest that we should have the repairs done by our own department at Halifax. I will always consult the officials of the department, who are better informed on the subject than I, and I shall endeavour in every case to do what is best in the public interest.

Mr. LAW. Is it the policy of the present government to continue the system in force under the old government with regard to provisioning the government steamers?

Mr. HAZEN. I intend to continue the system now in force which is, that instead of the government purchasing the supplies itself, it makes a contract with the steward or some officer of the vessel under which he has a certain allowance for each officer and man to provide the meals on board the government steamers. I am told by the officers of the department that this has proven much more satisfactory than the system in vogue some years ago under which the department employed a steward who purchased supplies for the department and fed the men. I am told that under the old system the meals were not as good and the cost much greater than under the present system. It is intended to continue the present system.

Mr. LAW. I am glad the minister has made that statement because I think the system in vogue for the last few years has been very satisfactory. Will the steward or the captain who has the contract to supply the meals to the officers and crew, be subject to the patronage committee, or will he have the privilege of buying his stores wherever he can buy them cheapest?

Mr. HAZEN. He is not subject in the slightest degree to any patronage committee. A contract is entered into with him and he is free to buy the supplies where he can do so to the best advantage.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Have any steps been taken to get over the difficulty which occurred in St. John, where different people supplied goods to the steward of one of these steamers and have not been paid? The steward left the country without paying these merchants, and it has been asserted by quite a number of them that they thought when they were furnishing these goods they were furnishing them to the government and not to the steward personally.

Mr. HAZEN. I am sorry I cannot tell my hon. friend that that matter is finally disposed of. Mr. Doutre has been instructed by me to make a very careful investigation into the facts, and I expect to have a report from him in a short time. A man named Cogswell contracted to supply meals on one of the steamers under contract, and he ran up bills in different parts of the country where the steamer called, to the extent of over three thousand dollars, which have not been paid. The claim is made that those who supplied the goods to Cogswell believed that he was an official of the department, and that when they were supplying the goods they were really supplying them to the government. Of course, even though we are not liable legally, we may be liable in equity. There are instances in which it is hard to believe that those who supplied Cogswell thought they were supplying the government, because they went on month after month rendering bills to Cogswell himself, and not to the department. They contended that as Cogswell went to their places of business in the uniform of the service, that they got the idea they were selling direct to the government. We have taken means in the future to guard agains the recurrence of such a thing. We are insisting that every steward with whom a contract is made in the future will have to give the bonds of a surety company for the faithful performance of his contract, and also to indemnify against loss those who furnish him with goods. The Department of Justice has not yet approved of the form of bond submitted.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It would be a very natural thing for these people to render bills to the steward, and that point ought not to be strongly insisted upon in their case. Prima facie it might be assumed that the suppliers thought they were dealing with the government through the stewards. Of course, it may be that some of them had knowledge, and I am very glad the minister is looking into the matter, and I am sure he will deal with it from an equitable standpoint. Of course, if they had a legal claim, I would not be making this appeal, because they could go to the Exchequer Court.

Mr. HAZEN. I do not feel justified in asking parliament to vote money for this purpose in the absence of a report of one of the responsible officials of the department, and I expect to have that report soon. For instance, one of the banks claims $800 on the ground that it discounted notes which Cogswell had given to some of these mer-

chants for supplies. It is rather difficult to believe that the bank and the merchants who took Cogswell's personal notes believed they were dealing with the government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Suppose Cogswell had said that parliament had not yet voted the money, as is often the case.

Mr. HAZEN. There might be something in that.

Mr. LAW. I am glad to hear the hon. minister is giving the matter consideration. I know that people in Yarmouth supposed at the time that the department would be liable for the Bill. Of course, there was no necessity for Mr. Sanders or any one else making a claim on the department until the steward defaulted. I hope the minister will see his way clear to pay the bill.

Mr. HAZEN. My disposition is to pay it if I can justly and fairly do so, guarding the future by requiring bonds to be given.

Mr. MACDONALD. As a matter of fact, in the ordinary course of business, do any of the accounts for supplies that have been obtained by the stewards reach the department?

Mr. HAZEN. No. A contract is made with the steward, under which he supplies each officer and man on the ship at so much a meal. The number of meals, I presume, is certified to by the purser, and the department pays the steward on that basis.

Mr. MACDONALD. As a matter of common knowledge, parties who would supply goods under the circumstances mentioned in this case would do so under the idea that the steward was only a medium between the government and them for the purpose of purchasing. The fact that the stewards made those contracts has not been specially understood by the general public unless it was drawn to their attention. I wish to refer to another matter, to which I called the attention of the minister in the early part of the session, namely, that a man had been employed as pilot on one of the winter boats plying between Pictou and Georgetown who held no certificate as pilot. The answer given to me by the minister was that he was only employed temporarily. I am informed that this man Boute is a man who had no qualifications whatever. I do not think he was a certificated master. He had only been floating about on sailing vessels in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and he was appointed pilot on this government steamer. Of course, the law is very clear that to be employed on any other kind of steamer he would have to be a regularly licensed pilot. I know that down to the early part of February this man, who had no right to be there at all, was still acting as pilot on this steamer. If the steamer had gone ashore or there had been any other difficulty, the minister would have been in an unfortunate position before the House.

Mr. HAZEN. I asked my deputy to look into the law on the subject after my hon. friend had called my attention to the matter, and I was informed by the deputy that there was no law whatever making it necessary that the pilot should have a certificate or a license, but that all that was necessary was to appoint a man who was qualified for the position. This man, I may say, was recommended as being highly and thoroughly qualified for the position before he was appointed by the department. After the hon. gentleman called attention to the matter in the House, further inquiry was made, and the department was satisfied that the man was qualified to discharge the duties he was called upon to discharge. It may be that my hon. friend is right that there was an omission in the law, and that it might be desirable that a man should be required to have a certificate for the discharge of the ordinary duties of a pilot. But a man who has been in the habit of going to and fro between the same ports every day as an officer on a ship could perhaps be as safely trusted to guide the ship in case of a storm or fog as any pilot.

Mr. MACDONALD. I think the Minister is stronger in the first part of his answer than in the last. If he believes his conclusion, there is no need of any vessel being piloted. The great difficulty of handling these steamers in wintertime is that they may run aground; and while a man may know the headlands and the lighthouses from going around in a schooner in the summer-time, it cannot be argued that such a person would have the accurate knowledge that a pilot would have who was specially examined for the purpose and with long experience of taking vessels through harbour entrances. It may be that government steamers have hitherto been exempted from the provisions of the pilotage law, and I am aware that in summer time they do not employ pilots; but in the winter season, when they are navigating waters which are not free from danger, in regard to the depth, and where there are three pilotage districts running upon one another, it seems to me that the Minister is running a great risk in taking the recommendation of his political friends in Prince Edward Island, who said, we will not give you a pilot, but we will give you one who suits us politically. In Captain Brown of the 'Minto' the Minister has an officer of long experience, who knows the conditions there; but instead of promoting

to the place of Captain Finlayson, as he should have done, the first mate, who had experience there for a great number of years, who knew the conditions that have obtained in later years, and who had the advantage of close communication with Captain Finlayson, the Minister again listened to the voice of the tempters from Charlottetown, and sent to British Columbia for a man who had been employed on those steamers 15 or 16 years ago, but had nothing to do with winter navigation in the meantime, and practically tells the thoroughly competent and well-trained men on the vessel that he will not have them at all. There was a rule that obtained in the Marine and Fisheries Department, which I am sorry to see the Minister breaking, that was, that in regard to all officials in this branch of the service, promotion should be based upon seniority.

A man who entered the service of the government in any one of these steamers in any responsible capacity connected with sailing the vessel, or in the engineering department, was promoted according to seniority. My hon. friend (Mr. Hazen) due, I take it, to the great pressure that was exerted upon him at the inception of his career in the department, broke through that rule. He accepted the recommendation of the two members for Queens county, sent to British Columbia and brought down a man who had not been near the Gulf of St. Lawrence for the last 15 years. I hope the Minister will not violate the rule as to promotion by seniority again in regard to these matters. This year the department has been very fortunate, although my information is that a few weeks ago Captain Murchison, the man who was brought from British Columbia was on the point of leaving the vessel, she being in such great peril. The conditions were such that he made all preparations for leaving the ship, and had not the wind fortunately changed and the ice begun to move the other way, this vessel commanded by the man just mentioned would have been a complete loss. I refer to these matters because I want to urge upon the minister the continuance of the prudent policy that was adopted by the late administration of making promotion by seniority, and of voicing the complaint, which I think I have a right to make, as being in the public interest, that the minister did net retain Mr. McPherson. I do not know what answer the Minister would have been able to make to the country if this vessel had been lost in consequence of his disregarding a well understood rule, and appointing to the command a man who had been absent from the service for ten or fifteen years.

Mr. HAZEN. I may say to my hon. friend that from my observation, and from what I can learn, if there ever was such a rule as he speaks of with regard to promotions, it was quite as much honoured in the breach as in the observance.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). Oh no, not at all.

Mr. HAZEN. That is my information, and I think it is quite correct. With regard to Captain Murchison, I received the information that he was in every way qualified for the position to which he was appointed. He held the necessary certificates of qualification, he had had very large experience, and his whole record was that of a man who was thoroughly competent to discharge the duties of the position to which he was appointed. I do not think it was a matter of luck on my part, but because we had a very careful and competent navigator in the person of Captain Murchison, that the service has been as successful this year as it has been in the past. My information further is that Captain Murchison was previously in the service of the government, but that a number of years ago he felt that he was being very unfairly treated, and he was forced practically to resign his position. Restoring him to the service and giving him command was, I think, a mere act of justice and the righting of an injustice which he had suffered in the past. That would not have been sufficient reason for making the appointment, had he not been well qualified for the position not only by possessing the necessary certificates, but by his standing as a navigator and as an experienced man.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.) Has the first officer on the 'Minto' resigned his position?

Mr. HAZEN. What is his name?

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, P. E. I.), McPherson, I think, and I am told that he resigned in consequence of being passed over. I would like also to know who has been appointed in his place.

Mr. HAZEN. I understand that Mr. McPherson, who is the man referred to by my hon. friend, practically resigned. He asked for a very long leave of absence, suggesting, I believe, that it was not his intention to return to the ship.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). Because of another man being appointed ?

Mr. HAZEN. No, I am told he gave no reason. There is nothing on the files of the department to show that he received other than fair treatment.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, P. E. I.). I endorse to a large extent, the remarks made by the member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), that having in mind the success

of this service nothing will take the place of experience; and while Captain Murchison may be a very good man, yet it must be understood he has been out of the service for quite a number of years. Whether or not he has had as large experience as the man who was in charge of the vessel, is just a question. The principle of promoting men in the service—that service at all events—is certainly a sound one, and it should be kept in view in the appointment of the junior officers. In the event of the sickness of the captain or his absence through any cause, or his removal by death, the next officer ought to be qualified to take his place and thus the principle of promotion should go into effect. The officers, in order to get the best service from them, should be given to understand that promotion will come by seniority. Now, I understand that the steamer 'Minto' was in a very precarious position at one time during the winter season although it may have been through no fault of the captain. I would ask the minister if the vessel at that time sustained any particular damage, and if it will be necessary to send her to Great Britain to receive the necessary repairs?

Mr. HAZEN. The 'Minto' has sustained no special damage at all.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.). But some repairs will be necessary ?

Mr. HAZEN. I think every season repairs are necessary to every boat in the service.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, P. E. I.). Will there be any more repairs required during the coming season than are ordinarily called for ?

Mr. HAZEN. No.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, P. E. I.). And the repairs can be made on this side of the Atlantic ?

Mr. HAZEN. Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Was any change made in the departmental regulations last year respecting the uniform to be worn by seamen on the government steamers employed in the fisheries protection service ?

Mr. HAZEN. I do not think so. Certainly I never heard of it. No change has been made in that regard since I have been at the head of the department.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). There were no regulations to the effect that when on shore, or off duty, the men were prohibited from wearing the ship's uniform?

Mr. HAZEN. Not in any of the ships that are under the control of the Marine Department.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Perhaps I am mistaken.

Mr. HAZEN. In saying this I am speaking of the Marine and Fisheries Department, not of the Naval Service.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). Has the minister been making any inquiries regarding the points between which the car ferry service is to run ?

Mr. HAZEN. I may say to my hon. friend, that matter is being dealt with by the Railway Department, not by the Marine Department. I can tell him, however, that full inquiry will be made as to what is the most desirable location for the car ferry before a decision is come to.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). Perhaps the minister can tell me who the marine expert of the Railway Department is ?

Mr. HAZEN. I am afraid I shall have to refer the hon. gentleman to the Minister of Railways for an answer. I do not know of any marine expert in the Railway Department.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). It is rather anomalous that when this government is starting upon a proposition to run a car ferry across the straits of Northumberland involving such a large expenditure, they are doing so without having any information whatever as to the conditions, or any information from the proper source from which we should have it.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows that no one in the Railway Department has had anything to do with this question of a winter service. The question of obstruction to navigation here can only arise with reference to the winter months. One would suppose that the government before undertaking this expenditure would have taken steps to obtain all the information procurable and I am surprised that the officials of the Marine Department have not been called upon to deal with it.

Mr. HAZEN. It does not seem important which department deals with this question so long as it is dealt with intelligently and thoroughly. As this car ferry will be simply a part of the government railway system, connecting the railway on the island with the Intercolonial railway on the main land, it is right that it should be managed by the Railway Department. While the inquiry is not being made by my department all sources of information possessed by the Marine Department are being placed at the disposal of the Railway Department. A

former professor at Queen's University, Professor Kirkpatrick, has been appointed to gather all information with reference to the selection of a route for the proposed car ferry. Professor Kirkpatrick is thoroughly qualified and has no local feeling. He is in touch now with the captains of the government boats running between Prince Edward Island and the mainland and other navigators with experience in those waters, and I am sure that he will submit to Council information upon which Council can come to a correct and sane conclusion.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). The government decided to undertake this project without getting information even from the hon. gentleman's own department. I do not hesitate, with full responsibility, to make the prediction that the car ferry in winter time will be a lamentable failure and the government will have to take the full responsibility of it. They should have looked into the question before deciding to commit the country to this expenditure.

Mr. McLEAN (Queens, P.E.I.). Does the hon. member object to the car ferry?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). I say that the expenditure of the money of this country for the construction of a car ferry in winter is one of the grossest errors this country ever made, and I predict it will be a failure and that the government will repent it. My complaint is that the government put the cart before the horse, they decided to spend the money and then to find out whether it could be spent. I had the papers showing the information the government had before them when they reached their decision and if these papers are accurate the government went blindly into this project.

Mr. HAZEN. My hon. friend is entirely in error. It is admitted that the car ferry would be of great value to Prince Edward Island. The information which the government is obtaining now is information to decide as to the proper route on which to establish a car ferry in order to make the connection between the railway and the island and the mainland.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). Does the minister undertake the responsibility of stating as a minister that he or his government had anything before them that would show that they had the slightest ground for believing that the operation of a winter car ferry there would be a feasible proposition in January, February and March?

Mr. HAZEN. I am surprised to hear my hon. friend opposing this proposition.

Mr. MACDONALD. Time will vindicate me.

Mr. HAZEN. My hon. friend has before indulged in the pastime of putting on the veil of prophecy. That is not a safe occupation for a public man. No great public work has yet been undertaken in Canada without some member in this House prophesying that it would be an utter failure, yet all our public works have turned out to the benefit of the country. I do not want my hon. friend to be placed in that class of false political prophets by any rash utterances he may make on this question. However, that has little to do with the estimates before the House.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). It has something to do with them, we are voting money for winter communication. My hon. friend is quite welcome to the feeling that it is a very dangerous thing for an hon. member to make a prophecy in regard to a question of this kind. It is one proposition to make a prophecy as to whether a great public enterprise can be constructed over land and what it will cost, and another as to a question of this kind. I have lived all my life alongside the Straits of Northumberland, and I have seen the conditions there for the last 45 years. It would have been prudent and wise for this government not to have put the cart before the horse, but to have made some inquiry as to the possibility of operating a car ferry in the Straits of Northumberland in the winter months before committing this country to that expenditure.

Mr. HAZEN. Does my hon. friend not think it would be an enormous advantage to the island to have a car ferry if only in the season of the year during which there is no danger of the interruption of communication so as to avoid the three breakings of bulk in the shipment of the products of the island?

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend is running away from the point, as he very well knows. The question as to whether a car ferry would be a good thing in summer is an entirely different thing from the question as to whether it could be operated in winter. I venture to say that he cannot find among his friends who live along the shores of the Straits of Northumberland, not even in the province of Prince Edward Island, who will tell him that a car ferry is possible in those straits in the winter months. The correspondence shows that the Department of Railways had nothing whatever before them.

Mr. McLEAN (Queens, Prince Edward Island). Why is the hon. gentleman opposed to it?

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend (Mr. McLean) knows that the reason why this proposal is being imposed upon the people of this country was in order to influence the elections in the province of Prince Edward Island. The correspondence shows that the Department of Railways had nothing whatever before them which would lead any one to believe that it was feasible. I say again that the government should be condemned, because they are committing the country to a great expense for what is supposed to be a substitute for this vote, this vote for maintaining winter communication with Prince Edward Island by the steamers 'Earl Grey'and the 'Minto' which have, within the last few years, performed that service as well as it could possibly be performed. The time lost and the inconvenience have been of the smallest possible character, having regard to the conditions that exist and will exist as long as nature creates them. I say we have here evidence that the government is proposing to make a substitution for this vote without having taken the opinion of any man, of any one in the Marine and Fisheries Department, or any one of those who have had to do with the navigation of these straits during the last twenty-five years. But after having decided to embark upon this enterprise, after they have initiated this thing, then they say, we will look around and see whether it is possible to do this business, and although it is assigned to the Minister of Railways to deal with the question the Minister of Railways has no marine experts in his department. Professor Kirkpatrick of Kingston may be a very good civil engineer, but civil engineers are not people you would think of consulting whether a car ferry can cross the straits of Northumberland in the winter months. I say that professor Kirkpatrick, who has lived in Kingston all his life, and who has not been accustomed to ice navigation, would not be a man who is equipped in the slightest degree with the knowledge to state as to whether any kind of a steamer could operate in the Straits of Northumberland during the winter months. I say before the government decided anything they should have sent for Captain Brown, for Captain Murchison, for Captain Finlayson, men who know the conditions, and if they had sent for them and got their opinion before the government had started upon this enterprise, they would have told him that such a thing as a car ferry carrying freight and passengers crossing that tide during the winter months is simply absurd and grotesque. I am astounded that the minister should have told us that the matter was in this position, that not a single one of his officials were ever asked their opinion as to whether this thing is possible. They tell us that there is a ferry running on the straits of Mackinaw, which are not comparable at all to these straits, the conditions are entirely different. When the correspondence moved for by my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) the other day was brought down, it appeared that outside some representations made by my hon. friend from Queens, Prince Edward Island (Mr. McLean) to the Prime Minister, it was because some statement had been made at a meeting at the market hall before the election last year, that this whole problem of winter navigation could be solved by the operation of a car ferry in the winter months, that the government proceeded to commit the country to the expense and solution of the problem in that way without having asked the opinion of a single man who knew anything about the subject whatever.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

RAINY RIVER RADIAL RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 121), respecting the Rainy River Radial Railway Company—Mr. Beattie.

On section 1,

Mr. OLIVER. Is the hon. member in charge of the Bill present?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Goodeve). No.

Mr. HAZEN. There are no amendments to this Bill.

Mr. BOYCE. This is just granting the ordinary extension of time to construct.

Mr. OLIVER. It would be in order to have somebody acquainted with its contents to say what the purport of the Bill is.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 98), respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company—Mr. McCraney.

Mr. OLIVER. Would the hon. member in charge of the Bill give a few words as to its purport?

An hon. MEMBER. He is not here.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Goodeve). I will read the clauses if the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) desires.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to know what the Bill is about. I think it is only fair and courteous to the House that when a Bill is presented for consideration there should be a statement as to the purport of the Bill.

Mr. BOYCE. In the absence of the promoter of the Bill, who is one of the hon. gentleman's own supporters, I can give the hon. gentleman some information in regard to this Bill. The Bill provides for an extension of the time for the construction of certain lines. It went through the committee with certain amendments. This Bill occasioned some difficulty in the Railway Committee and necessitated further advertisement with regard to additional powers that were required. The additional advertisement passed the Standing Orders Committee and came back to the Railway Committee, and in order that all matters might receive special consideration it appeared to be necessary to relegate the Bill to a special committee for report. That special committee inserted paragraphs 8 (a), 8 (b), 8 (c), and 8 (d), after hearing the parties and giving due consideration to the situation. Many of the privileges that were asked were not allowed by the special committee, but the Bill comes to us after consideration by this special committee, and after the report of that special committee had been adopted by the Railway Committee.

Mr. OLIVER. I am aware that the hon. member (Mr. Boyce), is not responsible for the Bill, and it would be an occasion for the hon. Minister of Railways, or the chairman of the committee, to be present in order to attend to this feature of the case. If my hon. friend is acquainted with the purport of the Bill he might state shortly what the Bill proposes to do. He has given an account of the procedure whereby the Bill arrives at its present position, but he has not told us the purport of the Bill.

Mr. MACDONALD. I quite agree with my hon. friend on my right (Mr. Oliver), that the good practice which has always prevailed in the House of the Minister of Railways being here when Bills of this character are before the House, should obtain. As regards the Bill there is nothing in it which is contentious. It gives power to the Canadian Pacific railway to construct certain new lines in the west, all of which were supported by the people in the districts interested, and it also contains a provision of a special character enabling the company to deal with some situation that has arisen in Montreal in connection with the extension which they are making in that city, and as to which this special committee was appointed. The clause which came from that committee is the one which was adopted by the full committee.

Mr. BOYCE. Adopted in part.

Mr. MACDONALD. Yes. But the practice of the Minister of Railways and the Chairman of the Railway Committee being present when Bills of this kind are under consideration, is one that has always been followed in the past and should be followed now because the House is entitled to their presence in order that they may explain all these things.

Mr. BOYCE. I made the explanation that I have just given at the special request of the Chairman of the Railway Committee who is unable to be here to-night. I would again remind my hon. friend that it is one of his own supporters who has charge of this Bill.

Mr. MACDONALD. I am entirely in favour of, and in sympathy with, the Bill, but I do not blame my hon. friend on my right (Mr. Oliver), who was not at the Railway Committee and who, I think, is not a member of the committee, for asking that the Minister of Railways should be here when railway legislation is up. He has always been here in previous parliaments and why he is not here now no one can tell.

Mr. NESBITT. The Bill was thoroughly considered before the Railway Committee and as the promoter wants it put through, I would like to see it passed. I do not think there is any reason why it should not pass.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Goodeve). If it is satisfactory to the committee, I will read it clause by clause.

Mr. OLIVER. It is not necessary at all, but what I say is that, to the members of this House who are not members of the Railway Committee, or who were not present at the Railway Committee, it is the most ordinary courtesy that they should be informed as to the purport of a Bill before they agree to it. That is all I am asking for with regard to the present Bill.

Mr. STEVENS. There are a number of members of the Railway Committee present who are prepared to discuss the matter when the Bill is read.

Mr. HAZEN. There is no objection to it.

Mr. OLIVER. None whatever if it will be stated by somebody what it is intended to do. I think the House is entitled to that statement.

Mr. BOYCE. My hon. friend's contention seems to be a reasonable one, and I shall endeavour in the shortest manner

possible, at the request of the Chairman of the Railway Committee, to give him the information. I may have given it very shortly and very inadequately, but I shall do the best I can, and if he wants a further explanation I will endeavour to give it.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend gave an explanation showing the steps whereby the Bill arrived at the present position, but he did not give the purport of the Bill. That is what I was asking for. However, my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) has given a statement of the purport of the Bill.

Mr. BOYCE. I think my hon. friend will find if he reads 'Hansard' to-morrow that I did mention the general purport of the Bill.

On section 8,

Mr. NESBITT. This Bill was referred to a subcommittee of the Railway Committee, and as this was a special clause for a special purpose concerning expropriations, the subcommittee sent word to all the proprietors of land interested and asked them to come before the committee and give evidence if they thought fit to do so. As they did not appear, the subcommittee reported that clause back to the committee.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 38), respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Staples.

On section 1,

Mr. BOYCE. This is a Bill authorizing an extension of time for the construction of certain branch lines of the Canadian Northern railway in the west. The Bill was fully discussed before the committee, and the local governments affected were communicated with. A good deal of time was spent upon the Bill, and the amendments that have been inserted by the committee were inserted after consultation and agreement with the provincial governments. The Bill also provides in other respects for the construction of other lines of railway which are mentioned in it.

On section 4,

Mr. OLIVER. Do I understand that the lines which this parliament is granting authority for, are identical with the lines which the provincial legislature has authorized?

Mr. BOYCE. I understand that that was the point on which all the discussion ensued in the Railway Committee; and in order to make it absolutely certain that that was the case, the provincial authorities were communicated with, and the insertion of these amendments is the result of that correspondence.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

REVILLON FRERES TRADING COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 114), to incorporate Révillon Frères Trading Company.—Mr. Barker.

Mr. BARKER. Révillon Frères is a great French trading company, having very large interests in the wilds of northern Canada, where hunting has been carried on, for the purpose of fur trading. They have had a large establishment for years in Montreal, they nave another in Paris, France, and I believe they have a branch in the United States. They got a charter here some ten years ago through the office of the Secretary of State, and carried on business under the impression that they were a duly authorized corporation. Later they found it necessary to get an Act passed. But the banks through which they carried on their business in looking into the authority of the directors, discovered that in the original charter no provision had been made for first or subsequent directors, and that there was really no person to represent the company. Last session a Bill was introduced to incorporate Révillon Fères, it went before the committee of the House, and was then referred to a special committee to look into all the facts. The Bill was reported to the House and passed by the House. It then went to the Senate; but unfortunately, owing to the sudden termination of the session, it did not pass. So once again this company found itself without any legal authority. They introduced their Bill again this session, this time in the Senate. It has now passed the Senate practically as it passed this House last year, with the exception of a word or two of a merely formal character in section 5 and a new clause, section 11, which was introduced in the Senate committee to provide for the method by which this company shall have representation of the board in Paris as well as here. The section as introduced was accepted by the company, but the law clerks of the two Houses thought that the words now added to section 11 are more appropriate and more fitly express what was intended. With that exception, the Bill is as it was passed by this House last year. The story of the company is simply that years ago Révillon Frères, large furriers in Paris, obtained large properties in our north in carrying on their fur business, and as the game disappears, they propose to colonize and sell their properties

to settlers. That is the whole object of the Bill. The company has four directors, of whom two live in Paris and two in Montreal, and the clause added by the Senate provides that the company may by by-law settle what are the particular functions of the section of the board in Paris and what are the particular functions of the section in Montreal, and where there should be representation of both sections.

Mr. McKENZIE. How does it come that a trading company of this kind has a Dominion charter?

Mr. BARKER. I understand that it occurred in this way. Révillon Frères were enterprising French furriers, and looking abroad, they concluded that the northern wilds of Canada would furnish them with a supply of furs, and they started a company. They are now a very wealthy concern, owning large districts, and they desire that these shall be held in the name of a company properly organized.

On section 11,

Mr. McKENZIE. I notice that this company have the power to make by-laws. Will those by-laws have the force of law, or have they to be sanctioned by the Governor in Council? My reason for asking the question is, that I understand the practice to be that by-laws made by companies or corporations require the sanction of the Governor in Council. That is the practice of the provincial legislature.

Mr. HAZEN. It is not the practice in all the provincial legislatures.

Mr. BARKER. The practice is not invariable. There are certain by-laws made expressly subject to the Governor in Council for a particular reason. I would not object in the least to putting such a provision in the Bill, but all this proposes to do is to divide the work of the board; that certain work must be done by the whole board, and certain other work may be divided between the Montreal section and the Paris section. This is a trading corporation that has been in existence for 10 or 12 years, and it is not desirable to put in any restrictions that are not absolutely necessary.

Mr. McKENZIE. It is not unusual to do this in the part of the country that I come from. In this case the company is a trading corporation, and any by-law they pass may be binding upon the people that deal with them and have the force of law. It is not right that the company, or their directors, should be able to make laws binding upon the world that deals with them on their own motion without any restriction whatever.

Mr. BARKER. These people have been trying for ten years to get incorporated and will agree to almost anything. At the same time, I may point out to the hon. gentleman, who is a lawyer himself and therefore knows the custom, that whenever a bank or business body wants to deal with this company they will inquire as to what their powers are under their by-laws. That is the ordinary routine in the case of all these legal questions. It is very undesirable, I should say, that a trading corporation like this should be hampered in any way.

Mr. McKENZIE. If it is not customary, I do not want to press any objection.

Mr. BARKER. It is certainly not customary in Ontario, except where a by-law may be for the purpose of altering the capitalization of the company. There is nothing of that kind in this Bill at all.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CONTINENTAL CAN COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 119), respecting certain patents of the Continental Can Company.—Mr. Fripp.

Mr. NESBITT. This Bill renews a patent, and therefore I would like to have it explained.

Mr. FRIPP. The object of the Bill is to remove the patent from the operation of section 38 of the Patent Act to section 44, a very simple matter. Under section 38 of the Act a patent that is not manufactured continuously expires. Section 44 gives the patentee the opportunity to appear before the commissioner and revive the patent, or have a chance to hold it at all events. There is nothing unusual about the purpose of the Bill.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend is mistaken in the theory that this proposition is not an unusual one. It is a case in which a foreigner obtained a patent in this country and did not carry out the conditions of the patent. He did not begin to manufacture in Canada within the time limit. After he has failed to comply with these conditions, which are only reasonable, I fail to see any reason why we in Canada should give any special treatment to an outside patentee who does not observe the provisions of the law. It is not the usual practice by legislation to permit the patentee to come in and claim rights and privileges under another section of the law. In previous parliaments Bills of this kind have always been viewed with the greatest possible suspicion, and some evidence had to be presented that there had at least been some effort on the part of the patentee to comply with the provisions of the law before he received consideration. There have been

cases where men had initiated arrangements that would ensure the manufacture of the article patented, but difficulties have intervened. This fact parliament has taken into consideration, and some leniency has been shown to the patentees and their rights have been preserved, but it is not such a matter-of-course proposition as the hon. member for Ottawa suggests. I think the case he has made out is no case at all. We ought to have more facts in regard to the Bill before we pass it.

Mr. FRIPP. My hon. friend is mistaken. The facts were all laid before the committee, all possible objections were considered and the committee decided to report the Bill without amendment.

Mr. MACDONALD. When the Bill was read a second time the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) and I both refused to be bound by the report of the committee.

Mr. FRIPP. My instructions from the solicitor in charge of the Bill are that they have manufactured in Canada but have not manufactured continuously in Canada as the Act requires.

Mr. NESBITT. I am opposed to the renewing of patents unless some very good reason is given. We should certainly have some better explanation than the hon. member (Mr. Fripp) has given.

Mr. FRIPP. This is not a case of renewal. It seems that this patent was issued under section 26 of the Patent Act and the patentee desires to come under section 44 of the Patent Act where he thinks his patent should have come originally.

Mr. OLIVER. Then there must have been an error in the Patent Office and we should hear from the Minister of Agriculture. It is not desirable that a practice should be established that patentees who have forfeited their rights may come to this House for relief.

Mr. FRIPP. The statute expressly provides by section 44 for such a case as this, where an article has not been continuously manufactured. Then the Commissioners shall have an opportunity to hear both the patentee and any person desiring to use the patent under license, and after hearing both sides, he may decide whether the patent is forfeited or is to continue.

Mr. MACDONALD. But this man did not come within the time prescribed by the statute and now comes to parliament for a restoration of his rights.

Mr. FRIPP. No, I think not. But he does not want to have his patent declared null and void, he wants section 44 invoked in his favour.

Mr. McKENZIE. I do not understand what is wanted, we have had no clear explanation of what has happened. If the patentee has complied with the law there is nothing necessary now. I know the department are not in favour of this tinkering with the law. It is the policy of the department to make them comply with the statutes unless there is strong reason to the contrary.

Mr. BURRELL. The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) thought they should have a statement from the Minister of Agriculture. The Minister of Agriculture, of course, does not profess to be an expert on patents. I frankly say that I do not know all the details of this Bill. But I point out to my hon. friends opposite that they are exercising, I think, a certain amount of virtuous indignation on patent Bills of this kind, and within my knowledge of this House it has been the practice to put through a larger number of these Bills when my hon. friends were in power than it is during the present session. I do not say that I am in favour of it, as hon. gentlemen opposite know perfectly well the stand of the department is generally against special Bills, and I think rightly. If there were too wide a gate left open it would mean that everybody would get careless about their patents, knowing they could come here and get a Bill shoved through without any bother. For that reason, I think the policy generally should be not to put through Bills of this kind without valid reason. I will say this, that it is a customary thing, after a reference of all these Bills to the Private Bills Committee, to have the Deputy Commissioner of Patents there, or one of the officials, who generally takes a stand against the Bill. It has also always been customary, when there are special reasons or special hardships involved in a particular case, to deal with it on its merits, and it is usual, I think, to get the judgment of that committee to say whether these reasons are sufficiently strong, and if that is the case, to waive the general procedure of the committee. I am not aware of any cases, certainly not any that I can recall, of a Bill of that kind passing the Private Bills Committee being turned down by the House. Unless it is pointed out to me that this is a particularly weak case, I do not know that it should be turned down. I would point out, however, that in nearly all these cases reported from the committee to the whole House, the report is almost always formal, and I think I only recall one instance during my experience of four sessions when the report of the committee on a Bill has been rejected or turned down, and there has been a report throwing it back on the committee again. I think the leader of the opposition, when he was the leader of the government, enunciated as a general principle that Bills which have

passed a committee of this House, without some extraordinary reason, should be allowed to pass the House.

Mr. MACDONALD. But the committee has been reduced in the meantime.

Mr. BURRELL. Still, it appears to work fairly satisfactorily. The attendance at all of these committees is sometimes slim. But I think he will acknowledge that if there are strong objections they are generally put up in that committee before the Bill comes to the House. However, I have no strong feeling in the matter, and I am willing to let it stand if the committee desires it.

Mr. NESBITT. I am sure we are obliged to the minister for his explanation that because certain patents were renewed under the old government, that is reason why this patent should be renewed.

Mr BURRELL. I do not think that is a fair interpretation of my argument. I simply pointed out that it was a usual thing to accept the report of commissions. This is not a party question at all. I have stated my position on the general policy, and I do not think my hon. friend should just take that passing remark as the body of my argument.

Mr. AMES. We have already passed three Bills of this kind during the present session.

Mr. NESBITT. There was a Bill brought in the other day by the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) that was amended in committee. So the reference of the Standing Committee is not always taken by the House Committee. I do not suppose there would have been any trouble about this Bill had the hon. gentleman explained to us why he wanted to get it. I do not know myself why he should apply under section 44.

The hour for Private Bills having expired, House resumed in Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY.

MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS TO GOVERNMENT STEAMERS AND ICE-BREAKERS.

Mr. McLEAN (Queens, P.E.I.). Before recess the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) made the broad statement that a car-ferry across the Straits of Northumberland was not feasible in the winter time. I do not know where he gets his information. I suppose, if he has been observing the ice in Pictou harbour or along the southern coast of Nova Scotia, he has come to the conclusion that a car-ferry would not be possible in that part of the Straits of Northumberland. But surely other people besides the hon. gentleman have been observing conditions there. For over thirty years the captains of the ice-boat at Cape Tormentine and Cape Travers, and the captains of the government ice-breaking steamers, have sent daily reports of the condition of the straits to Ottawa, and that information is to-day in the possession of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

If the hon. gentleman will take the trouble of going over to the Department of Marine and Fisheries he will find there a daily report of the conditions in the Straits of Northumberland from the year, I think, 1881, or previous to that. The conditions are not as he has stated them to this House. We have had, for many years, ice-breaking steamers. Those steamers have very fairly conducted the business between Prince Edward Island and Pictou, and between Charlottetown and Pictou. There have been this year very few stoppages. But, those steamers have not the power or the strength that we say they should have, and they do not constitute a fulfilment of the terms of confederation between Prince Edward Island and the Dominion that we should have continuous steam communication between the railway on Prince Edward Island and the railway on the mainland. My right hon. friend the leader of the government (Mr. Borden), speaking in Charlottetown on the 8th of September last, made the statement that if he were returned to power he would fulfil to the letter the terms which were entered into between the Dominion and the province in 1873. I will read for the information of the committee the language which was used by the right hon. gentleman on that occasion:

> And now, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, I come to a question of vital importance to your prosperity. I refer to the transportation question. You can never fully enjoy the benefits of the market of Canada and the outside world under your present dislocated traffic arrangement. I believe the conditions at the present existing are not such as you anticipated when you gave up your status as an independent colony and became part of the Dominion. A solemn compact was then entered into, binding as well on the government of Canada as on you as a province, and the hardship is manifest that whilst the Dominion have exacted a strict performance on your part they have not in my judgment used reasonable diligence to obviate your insular disadvantages in this regard. I believed that instead of this subject being controlled by different departments it should be under the supervision of one department only, and your steam communication with the mainland should be arranged in conjunction with the island railway and the Intercolonial railway thus doing away with the exasperation of the three short hauls.

Now, the only way that this can be effected is by having a car-ferry or by the construction of a tunnel. We found when we came up here and were in conference with eminent engineers that it would take something like twelve years to construct the tunnel. We thought that was too long to wait, a third of a lifetime, and we asked the government to give, in fulfilment of this promise made by the right hon. Prime Minister, a car-ferry. The government immediately acceded to our request. I was in this House between 1904 and 1908, and on many occasions during that time I and my colleague (Mr. Martin), brought this question before the consideration of the House. The right hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), had made a promise to the people of Prince Edward Island in 1891, that if he should be elected at the election which was then ensuing he would see that our transportation problem would be solved. Although he sat in this House from 1891 and was leader of the government for fifteen years, he never raised his voice to say anything for the people of Prince Edward Island. But, when my right hon. friend the leader of the government (Mr. Borden), came into power, although he had made this promise exactly in the same words, that the right hon. leader of the opposition had made it, he immediately fulfilled his promise, and the people of Prince Edward Island are getting the justice now that they ought to have got thirty years ago. It is only fair that this government should fulfil the promise made by the Prime Minister to the people of Prince Edward Island especially when they know now that it is a feasible matter provided the government give us a car-ferry of sufficient power. If we have a boat of 10,000 horse-power strongly enough constructed to force its way through the ice, our transportation problem will be solved whether the boat is run to Pictou or not. The question has been raised as to where this ferry will be run to. I have no doubt that my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) would like to see it run to Pictou, because I suppose if it does not run there Pictou will be a dead issue in so far as anything material coming out of the traffic between that point and Prince Edward Island is concerned. To-day the business in Pictou practically all comes from Prince Edward Island, and if this car ferry is put in operation within the next two years possibly it may run between Charlottetown and Tatamagouche or between Cape Traverse and Cape Tormentine, and that is why the hon. member for Pictou denounces the government for giving the people of Prince Edward Island the justice they should have had years and years ago.

Mr. MACDONALD. I do not propose to continue this discussion very much longer at this stage because, while this matter is perfectly in order in regard to this item, it being to provide for the boat which is being constructed in connection with winter navigation, I shall discuss it at greater length when the estimates of the Minister of Railways come before the House. My only reason for introducing this matter at this stage was to ascertain from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries whether any of his officials, or anybody connected with his department, had ever made any report to the government previously to the government deciding upon a policy in this regard so as to find out whether or not the government had any information before them when they decided upon their policy. I have learned to-night that, in so far as the people who ought to know anything about this matter are concerned, the government had no report from them and, against the enthusiasm of the hon. member for Queens, P.E.I. (Mr. McLean) and those who say that my opinion about this matter is not worth anything, I might tell them that I have before me all the papers connected with it which have been brought down, and I may say that I cannot find from any engineer, or any public official, responsible or otherwise, in any department of the government, any report that would justify the theory that a car-ferry can be operated in the Straits of Northumberland in the winter-time. Indeed, in the discussion that went on before six o'clock, I felt that perhaps I was unfair to the minister in discussing the question at this stage, and I went and looked through all the papers carefully to see whether it was really proposed that the car-ferry should be operated in the winter-time. If the proposition involved simply the operating of a car-ferry during certain months of the summer that was one thing, but if the government, in asking this vote for winter steamers, intended to substitute other means of communication during a part of the year, that was another matter. I took the responsibility of saying before dinner that the proposition to operate a car ferry during the winter-time would result in absolute failure. I am supported in that view by the only official of any department of the government that ever looked at the question and took the responsibility of making any report upon it. I have in my hand this letter from the former Deputy Minister of Railways, Mr. M. J. Butler, who writes on the subject as follows:—

Your letter of the 16th instant addressed to the hon. the minister, re proposition to put on a modern and powerful icebreaker and car carrying system steamer, across the strait of

Northumberland, has been referred by him to me for reply.

I am of the opinion that no such steamer can be designed, at any reasonable cost, to do the service during the winter months, nor do I think it possible to make such a project pay its way.

That is the only opinion of any official in regard to this matter that is before the government, and when the Prime Minister wired my hon. friend (Mr. McLean, Queens, P.E.I.) on the eve of a provincial election, that they proposed to inaugurate this car-ferry scheme, the Prime Minister wired without any report from anybody who knew anything on the subject which enabled him to justify any such policy. We have here a report from Mr. Bowden, chief engineer, who tells us that he had not time to look into the matter. When we look into the statements of my hon. friend we find that his estimates are based upon the assumption that one ferry steamer will be sufficient for the purpose. The hon. gentleman has given up the tunnel, he has given up the winter steamer proposed to be built in addition to the 'Earl Grey' and 'Minto,' which would give the people of Prince Edward a complete winter service, and he is willing to have one ferry steamer as an experiment—and which he will be bound to admit is an experiment of the first order—when he has not a single person on record in this government or in the departments of the government to say whether this scheme will be in any degree adequate. I should apologize to the Minister for going into this discussion on his estimates when this question is perhaps more germane to the Railway Department which is supposed to deal with it.

Will the minister be good enough to get me a statement of the number of passengers carried by the winter boats during the season of 1910-11?

Mr. HAZEN. Does the hon. member mean the boats that run to Pictou, or does he include the passengers on the ice-boats?

Mr. MACDONALD. I would like to have the total number of passengers that crossed at both places; the quantity of freight that was carried in the winter months and the cost per ton for carrying that freight. Will the minister be also good enough to get me the same information for the months of January and February of this year?

Mr. HAZEN. I shall be glad to get the information for my hon. friend. Meantime I would call the attention of my hon. friend to the following which is to be found on page 19 of the last report of the Marine Department:

The Earl Grey made 44 round trips, carried 118,532 packages of freight, weighing 5,791 tons.

Her earnings were:—		
Receipts from freight..		$ 8,497 38
" passengers		3,571 75
" berths, 977..		977 00
" meals, 1,404..		140 40
Total earnings..		$13,186 53

The Minto made three round trips, carried 77,196 packages of freight weighing 1,994 tons.

Her earnings were:—	
Receipts from freight..	$ 2,575 82
" passengers..	1,809 25
" meals, 714..	71 40
" berths..	423 00
Total earnings..	$ 4,879 47

Mr. MACDONALD. I would like to know the cost per ton of loading and unloading that freight at Georgetown and Pictou last year and this year?

Mr. HAZEN. I will get that information. I do not feel that my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald) has anything to apologize for in bringing this matter up, because it is an important question, and it has to be discussed some time during the session. But, I fear my hon. friend forgets that the people of Prince Edward Island not only want to get better communications during the winter, but they also have the very vital grievance that in shipping their products from the island at all times of year there are practically three different hauls: the haul over the island railway to the steamer, the steamer carriage to Pictou or Cape Tormentine or Shediac as the case may be, the haul on the Intercolonial railway through to destination and the loading and unloading at each transfer. That is a substantial grievance which the people of the island want to have remedied. It would be of enormous advantage to them if a train ferry were established so that they could put their freight and products on the car on the island and not have to break bulk until that car reaches its destination in Canada or in the United States. Such a system would of course enable them to have cars equipped with cold storage compartments so that their perishable products would be carried in good condition direct to the consuming markets. That is one great advantage which will be accomplished by the car-ferry. My hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald) says that the government acted in this matter without information, but I do not think it is open to the hon. member to say that. It is true the papers before the House are rather meagre in the information they contain, but there are reports in the Department of Marine and Fisheries showing day by day the condition for the last 30 years so far as navigation between Prince

Edward Island and the mainland is concerned. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald) may fairly give the government credit for having some knowledge of these reports and he might also bear in mind that there are men around the Council Board who live close to the island and who have been for years interested in this very important question. Ice-breakers are not a new thing; every year there is more work done by them; they are making progress on the St. Lawrence river, where navigation is open earlier now than in the past owing to their operations between Montreal and Quebec. My hon. friend may be easily within the range of probability when he says that if an ice-breaker is constructed as a steam ferry, with proper power and proper weight, then during the greater part of the winter season that ferry can give continuous communication between the island and the mainland.

Mr. MACDONALD. What would you do when she cannot cross?

Mr. HAZEN. There may be times when she cannot cross, but of late years there are fewer occasions when the steamers cannot ply between the island and the mainland than there were formerly.

Mr. MACDONALD. Quite so.

Mr. HAZEN. The great trouble is that in having to break bulk three times the Prince Edward Island farmer shipping his products to the consuming markets is put at a great disadvantage compared with the farmer on the mainland, and that disadvantage not only extends to the time consumed in transit but to the cost of carrying the freight as well. The three different services now required to ship products from the island to the markets on the mainland mean of course higher freight rates than if there was a continuous haul as there will be when the car-ferry is established. I will have the information, perhaps on Monday, which my hon. friend has asked for.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, P. E. I.). In the event of a car-ferry being established, is it the intention of the government to charge the same rates to and from Prince Edward Island as are charged now for similar distances on the mainland? I would gather so from the statement of the minister.

Mr. HAZEN. The matter has not been discussed. I am not familiar with the details but it seems to me that if a car-ferry is established the result must be to lessen all the freight rates.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, Prince Edward Island). I presume that the reports which the department has with regard to the conditions of the ice in the Straits of Northumberland year after year have been prepared for the purpose of showing the practicability of a car-ferry, or are they just the ordinary reports on the ice conditions?

Mr. HAZEN. The reports were made, I suppose, before a car-ferry had been thought of; but they are reports for the purpose of giving the actual conditions of the water and the ice in the Straits from day to day; and with these reports one could form a fair idea of whether the conditions would be suitable for the operations of a car-ferry or not.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, Prince Edward Island). Would these reports not have to be compared with the reports on other places where car-ferries are operated?

Mr. HAZEN. I have no doubt that is what the engineer would do.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, Prince Edward Island). Can the minister tell me where the 'Minto' was, say between the 20th and the 30th of September last?

Mr. HAZEN. I have no doubt that could be told at once by reference to the files of the department. The deputy minister thinks it was at Halifax.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, Prince Edward Island). My information is that she was in Hudson bay. The reason I ask is that I am informed that two of the men who were on board the steamer while she was there were removed from the service before the winter service commenced. I am informed that these men went on board the 'Minto' in the summer season when it is difficult to get men. One was the chief steward, named Noah Garnum, and the other the boatswain, Benjamin Graham.

Mr. HAZEN. The deputy minister informs me that the crew were engaged for the voyage to Hudson bay and back, and that after the voyage for which they were engaged ended, they were paid off. It was in October that they came back.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, Prince Edward Island). Some years ago it was the rule that the men who went into the service at a season of the year when it was hard to get men, got the preference when the season arrived when it was easy to get men, and I think that would be fair, if their qualifications were satisfactory. These men could not by any possibility be charged with having taken any part in the elections, because at the time of the elections they were in Hudson bay. Therefore, it would seem to me to be a hardship to dis-

pense with their services, or at least not to re-engage them.

Mr. HAZEN. Do they want to be re-engaged?

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, Prince Edward Island). That is my information. Men who are willing to go into the service in the summer season, when work is plentiful, are anxious to remain in the winter service, when work is hard to obtain. The minister will agree with me that it was a real hardship to these men to be used in that way. I do not happen to be personally acquainted with them, and consequently I imagine that they were not very active in politics. They were appointed just because they were good men and because others could not be obtained at the time.

Mr. HAZEN. I have personally no knowledge of the facts to which my hon. friend refers, but I am informed by the officials of my department that that there never has been the slightest difficulty in getting men either in the summer or the winter for service on these boats, and there has never been an understanding such as my hon. friend has described. The men were employed for a certain voyage to Hudson bay. When the contract was fulfilled and they returned home, they were paid off. There was no obligation on the department to hire the same men again. Whether the two men wanted to be engaged again or not I have no knowledge; but in any case there was no breach of contract or any fair ground of complaint even if they were not hired the second time.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, Prince Edward Island). The officials of the department are not correct when they say that in no case has there been difficulty to get men in the summer season. To my personal knowledge there has been difficulty.

Mr. HAZEN. The Deputy Minister says that in his experience there has not been any difficulty, and I must naturally accept the statement of the official of the department.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, Prince Edward Island). That may be, but the information is not correct. It has been difficult in past years to get men in the summer season, and it has been the practice to give the men who have been on the boats in the summer season the preference in the winter. I have personal knowledge of that. The practice followed in engaging men for the winter season has been for the members supporting the administration to meet the captains of the boats and the agent of the department in the agent's office at Charlottetown.

Mr HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.)

Mr. HAZEN. That has been the practice, has it?

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, Prince Edward Island). Yes, and it is not a bad practice, and it would have been far better if that practice had been followed last winter. I do not think that the captains were consulted in the matter, and I have an idea that the agent was not very much consulted, either. But I say unhesitatingly that formerly the men who went into the service in the summer season, when it was difficult to get men, received the preference if they wished to remain in the service, and further, those men who were considered efficient and valuable by the captains were allowed to remain if they wished to do so. The practice was to consult the captains and the agent, but particularly the former, and it was not a bad practice, by any means. I do not think a good practice was followed when the winter crews were hired last fall.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Does the department propose to proceed with the construction of a lightship to be placed off the mouth of Halifax harbour as had been decided upon, I think, by his predecessor in office?

Mr. HAZEN. That has been recommended by the Lighthouse Board. Last year the lightship was brought from Anticosti and was anchored off Halifax harbour, and I believe there the results were good. But the opinion of the Lighthouse Board, which as my hon. friend knows is an advisory board concerning lighthhouses and aids to navigation, is, that it is running too much risk probably to depend upon the one lightship for both places, that if any disaster occurred to the lightship when it was at Halifax it would not be available for service at Anticosti the following year, and immediate steps will be taken for the construction of a lightship to be stationed off Halifax harbour.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). And tenders will be asked for, I suppose?

Mr. HAZEN. Yes, there will be public competition.

Mr. McKENZIE The speech of the hon. member for Queens, P.E.I., renders it necessary to make a few observations in reply. I am sorry that the hon. gentleman, who is usually good-natured and affable, thought it necessary to drag in party politics in connection with the matter of an improved service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland.

Mr. HAZEN. Surely, I did not indulge in party politics.

Mr. McKENZIE. I referred to the hon. member for Queens, P.E.I., not to the minister. The minister is breaking away from

his usual custom, he is free from party politics to-night, and I congratulate him upon it. It was not, I think, in the very best taste for the hon. member (Mr. McLean, Queen's, P.E.I.) to associate with this question the strongest terms that could be employed in connection with party politics. I think he can rest satisfied that from Scatarie to Amherst, in fact throughout the whole province of Nova Scotia, he will find the greatest possible sympathy for Prince Edward Island, and the greatest possible desire to give that province the very best accommodation that is available. But the hon. gentleman has made the statement that the leader of the opposition, although he had been 15 years in power, had never raised his little finger to improve the conditions in regard to the ferry service or the connection between Prince Edward Island and the mainland.

That leads me from a party standpoint to ask the minister to give a statement of the improvements that were made in the transportation service between Pictou and Charlottetown, and generally between the mainland and the Island, by the construction of boats, etc., during the régime of the late administration. It may be a little cumbersome and involve the giving of figures that would not be necessary, but the statement of he hon. member for Queens is of such a sweeping character and such an indictment against the late government, that it is only fair to the Liberal party that we should have some knowledge of what was done by the late government to improve the communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland by means of new and powerful steamers.

Mr. McLEAN (Queens, P.E.I.). The statement which I made was that under the terms of confederation it was agreed that our system should be connected with the railway system of the main line, and that although Sir Wilfrid Laurier had promised the people of Prince Edward Island in 1891 that if he were returned to power he would fulfil the terms of confederation in that regard, he never raised his finger to remedy the conditions although he was in office for fifteen years subsequently.

Mr. McKENZIE. That is exactly what I said.

Mr. McLEAN (Queens, P.E.I.). I was not talking about the steamers at all, I was talking about a car-ferry by means of which the two railway systems could be connected. Of course we have had steamers on that route. We have got powerful steamers there now, but as they are not powerful enough to perform the work properly, the government are giving us one that will be powerful enough, and thus fulfil in my judgment the terms of the compact between us and the Dominion.

Mr. McKENZIE. The hon. gentleman and myself are not strangers to each other in this parliament. I remember well the first speech my hon. friend made in this parliament in 1904, and it was on the subject of the tunnel. That was his particular hobby, and he would have scouted at that time any such thing as a car-ferry. It is a new toy that he has secured this year and one that is absolutely brand-new.

Mr. McLEAN (Queens, P.E.I.). Are you in favour of the car-ferry service?

Mr. McKENZIE. We never heard of the car-ferry at that time, but now from the delight which the hon. gentleman manifests, it is quite evident that he has a new toy. Perhaps he will find that like most rubber toys its usefulness will disappear by and by, and it will not be as satisfactory a year from now as he deems it to be to-day. But the hon. gentleman made the emphatic statement that we did not improve the conditions in the matter of communication between the island and the mainland during the fifteen years that the Liberal government were in power. He has repeated the statement, and that is the reason why I think it is only fair to the late government, that we should have some knowledge of what was done for the betterment of the communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.). I also want to make a few remarks that have been called for by the observations of the hon. member for Queens, P.E.I. The fact of the matter is that the car-ferry was first mooted, so far as I remember and so far as the papers show, by a gentleman named George E. Full, who came here on a delegation, I think in 1906 or 1907, and strongly advocated that project. The hon. member for Queens, P.E.I., was a member of the House at that time, and I am satisfied that the proposition was not treated seriously then by the great majority of the people of Prince Edward Island, and a great majority of the people interested in the subject; it was treated rather as a ridiculous proposition. I am inclined to think my hon. friend from Queens, P.E.I., likewise took that view of it at that time, because being a member of the House he would be alive to the importance of bringing forward any proposition of an advantageous character to the province and to the people whom he represented, and it would be his duty to do so. I am quite sure he would do his duty in that respect, and the fact that he did not bring the matter up tends to convince me that neither he nor anybody else thought this car-ferry service would be practicable between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. I hope that it will be practicable, and that it will be found to be of great advantage;

and to a certain extent I am quite willing to give the government a good deal of credit for taking up any proposition that would remove the difficulties under which Prince Edward Island has laboured so long in regard to transportation. But I do not know that this car-ferry service will be a solution of the difficulty, in fact I may frankly state that I am afraid it will not. I hope that it will, but the conditions under which the project was taken up and the haste with which it was announced last fall tend to arouse suspicion.

Mr. HAZEN. Do you not think there has been delay enough?

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.) There was no great advantage, so far as the car-ferry was concerned, in taking the project up at that time. But there was a purpose which the car-ferry idea has served. It has largely contributed towards the election of a Conservative administration in the province of Prince Edward Island.

It has had that effect already. Whether it will have the effect of solving the transportation difficulties I am not sure. However, I shall give the government credit so far as it has gone of being willing to try it and to spend some money, but to say that the late government did not seriously and effectually contribute towards the improvement of the transportation service between the island and the mainland, is ridiculous. If my hon. friend from Queens (Mr. McLean) feels like condemning the late government for not taking up the car-ferry project he himself should bear part of the condemnation because the project was first brought forward by Mr. Full while my hon. friend was a member of the House, and if in the end this scheme becomes a success a large part of the credit should be given to that gentleman who first proposed it.

Mr. CARROLL. I do not know if information was given as to whether or not the government has had technical advice of experts as to the feasibility of this scheme. In answer to questions the other day the Minister of Railways made the astounding statement that this car ferry service was to be in operation in a couple of months.

Mr. COCHRANE. I never said anything of the kind.

Mr. CARROLL. To make sure of it I looked up 'Hansard' and found it there. I understood from the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) that an eminent expert Mr. Butler has said that this plan is not feasible, and it strikes one as surprising that the government expect to have this car-ferry service in operation so soon without having technical knowledge and advice as to its feasibility.

Mr. HAZEN. There is no question about the feasibility of a car-ferry as they are in successful operation in other places. The only question is as to what portion of the year you will be able to operate it and as to the proper place to make the connection between the mainland and the island. The matter is now being thoroughly inquired into by the officials of the Department of Railways and Canals, who are also acquiring information as to the style of boat required to overcome if possible the ice conditions in the straits in winter.

Mr. EMMERSON. This subject, which is not a new one, has claimed considerable attention at my hands and, early in December, I gave notice of a motion to the effect that in the judgment of the House it was desirable to establish a car service between the mainland and the island and at the same time to widen the gauge of the Prince Edward Island railway. I was unable to reach a discussion of that motion owing to delay in bringing down certain information for which I had moved. That information has since come down, but it was then too late to reach the motion on the paper and so I withdrew it in order that the matter might be discussed on some other occasion.

In 1905 a Bill was passed by this House having for its object the connection of the Prince Edward Island railway with the Intercolonial railway and the establishment of a car-ferry service between Tormentine and Carleton Head. That Bill, however, was killed in the Senate. The fact that a car-ferry service of this kind has not been established is largely attributable to the people of Prince Edward Island themselves. The Bill to which I have referred was strongly opposed by certain members from the island in this House and in the Senate it was killed largely through the influence of Prince Edward Island senators. The reasons are obvious. We must recognize the fact that there are sectional differences and jealousies on the island as in other provinces and Charlottetown and Summerside have vied with each other in an effort to secure every possible advantage in the way of communication with the mainland and because of the influences and prejudices of the eastern and western sections of the island against any means of communication being established in the centre of the island, as between Carleton Head and the mainland at Tormentine, the scheme fell through. I had a strong view with respect to the matter at the time

that the government should acquire the railway which runs from Sackville to Cape Tormentine, known as the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island railway, and should establish a car ferry service such as has been established at other points on this continent, and such as is now in operation on a smaller scale at the Strait of Canso, on the Intercolonial railway.

I think that eventually the government should acquire that road, and that they should establish a car-ferry service and operate it as part of the government system of railways. I believe that is the only solution of the difficulty. For many years the representatives of Prince Edward Island in this parliament have talked of a tunnel, they have brought it before the House time and again, but no one seemed to take them seriously, in fact sometimes it was thought they were not serious themselves; not that the proposition is not feasible from an engineering standpoint, but that the undertaking was too large to be considered seriously at the present time in our history. In June last I was in Prince Edward Island in connection with an election campaign, in a way, and I discussed with the people the matter of a car-ferry service. I strongly advocated it then, and I advocate it now. I think it is perfectly feasible, and that it will be a success if established. It may interfere with the constituency of my hon. friend from Pictou, it may interfere with some interests in my constituency; but what are these interests as compared with the greater interest of improved transportation facilities between Prince Edward Island and the rest of the Dominion?

My hon. friend says there are suspicious circumstances in the haste with which this matter has been taken up. This parliament met in November, but there was no mention of it in the speech from the Throne, although the leader of the government had discussed it in Prince Edward Island in September. There was no mention of it by representatives from the Island after the opening of parliament. It was brought to the notice of parliament on the 7th of December, when I took occasion to give a notice of motion with respect to it. I notice in a return which was laid upon the table of the House, that there was a communication addressed on the 22nd of November to the right hon. the Prime Minister, which was signed by the two representatives from Queens, P.E.I. The matter apparently did not claim much further consideration until the 23rd of December, on the eve of a local election in Prince Edward Island. On the 28th of December the Prime Minister and the Minister of Railways appear to have taken certain steps in the way of sending telegrams and writing letters to Prince Edward Island. The elections were held in the early days of January, I think these telegrams reached Prince Edward Island two days before the polling. Well, of course people are suspicious; sometimes those who are hit are supersensitive with respect to letters and telegrams on occasions of this kind. These letters and telegrams may not have been written with any idea of influencing the provincial elections, it may have been a mere coincidence that they were sent down to the Island at that particular moment. Of course, I do not mean to insinuate that there was any connection between the telegrams and the election, I am only mentioning the facts. It is no doubt unfair to impugn the motives of ministers of the Crown in such matters.

Now some reference has been made to the lack of estimates. I do not think the government at that time did have any estimates with respect to the matter, and I am bound to say that we could hardly expect them to have. I do not think they should be condemned because they did not have such estimates, although it might be a fair matter of comment that they should have made such positive declarations as to what should be done before they had any estimates of the probable cost. I favour the proposition, and I will support it. It is not only in the interest of Prince Edward Island and of the Prince Edward Island railway, but it is in the interest of the Intercolonial and of all Canada. The people of the maritime provinces as a whole are peculiarly interested in it, and the people of Quebec, Ontario and of the distant west are to a large degree interested in the proper solution of this question. In July last I told the people of Prince Edward Island that a tunnel might be feasible. In years to come conditions may prevail in Canada which will make the construction of a tunnel possible. But in the meantime what should be done? Try at least this experiment. I think it will be successful during the major portion of the year, even during the winter months. Between the nearest points, Cape Tormentine and Carleton Head, a distance of between six and seven miles, I am told by those who are familiar with the navigation of the straits, that during the winter months, once during every twenty-four hours in the day-time, there is practically a clear channel between those two points. It is caused by the tide bringing the ice together, and when the tide recedes one portion of the ice goes out on the eastern end of the island, and the other goes to the western end, the ice separates, leaving a channel. I am told this by people who have no object in misrepresenting the circumstances. I have not seen it myself, but the people in that section of New Brunswick who are familiar with the conditions prevailing there say that is the case.

There is a short period in which there is open and continuous communication between these two points. During the greater portion of the year you could have communication between the island and the mainland without extra cost six or seven times during the day. It would be possible to convey trains across. It could have been done last year at these points. It would obviate the three freight charges, it would place the people of Prince Edward Island on a parity with the people of Cape Breton in respect to transportation charges, there would be no break and there would be the continuous mileage haul from the point of embarkation to the point of destination. Under these circumstances I think it is commendable for the government to undertake this. I may say that in the past I have called the attention of the preceding government to this very matter. I have invited their consideration to it, and I invited their consideration to the subject not later than last July. Regardless of which government is in power, regardless of party affiliations, I believe that the representatives in this House whether they be from the east or from the west, should join hands in aiding to give the best possible communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. Perhaps the discussion of this matter is not relative to this particular item, other than that as references are made to winter communication between the island and the mainland, it may be relevant. But this is a subject that might more properly be discussed when the Minister of Railways has his estimates under consideration. It belongs to the government system of railways, and it is a part and parcel of the branch line proposition which has been before this House for many years. The branch line proposition could not be effectively carried out without the establishment of a steam-ferry service at these points—I do not say at these particular points because I am not sectional in regard to the matter. It has been said that a very good route might be established between the western end of Prince Edward Island and Richibucto, or some point in the county of Kent. Let it be determined wherever the best route is to be found, there place your ferry, there establish it in the interest, not of any particular locality, not of any particular province or county, but in the interest of the whole Dominion and bring the people of Prince Edward Island into touch with their fellow countrymen throughout the rest of Canada.

Mr. McKENZIE. I cannot allow this item to carry until I have had an opportunity of bringing to the notice of the minister what I regard as a matter of very great importance to the section of the country from which I come. This particular item gives me a legitimate opportunity of bringing up matters that I regard as important to the harbour of North Sydney and Sydney, and if I allowed it to pass without doing so I might not have the opportunity again. We all take more or less pride in the places from which we come and dwell with delight upon their advantages and beauties. I am sure that any person who has the good fortune of living on the shores of the harbour of Sydney or North Sydney, or, as my hon. friend says, the Bras d'Or lakes, can have nothing but pride in the great beauty and commercial advantages of these harbours. Without saying anything against any other harbour in the world, I do not think that Sydney harbour, particularly the harbour of North Sydney, is second to any. That is a big thing to say, but I think it is true. A harbour in Australia, Halifax harbour, and Sydney harbour are regarded as the three finest harbours in the world with the preference given to North Sydney and Sydney. There are a few things that should be done for the harbour of Sydney and North Sydney. When I tell the minister that there is in the neighbourhood of 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 of tonnage coming into that harbour every summer he will get some idea of the shipping that is frequenting it, and when I tell him that never a dollar in the world has been spent for the betterment of that harbour he will understand that we are not coming too often or asking too much. It is true that a few dollars may have been expended in building wharfs and breakwaters. While upon general harbour improvements millions are being spent in other parts of Canada, there never has been a dollar spent on this magnificent harbour of Sydney and North Sydney. The outgoing of iron and steel, the incoming of iron ore, and the shipping of 6,000,000 or 7,000,000 tons of coal out of this harbour every year will give the minister some idea of its importance. I take this opportunity of bringing to his notice this magnificent harbour and the splendid facilities which it offers for transportation. We hear a great deal about St. John. It seems to me that the Minister must have heard of the harbour of St. John, he has heard of Courtenay Bay, and he has heard of some $7,000,000, or $10,000,000, or $15,000,000 being spent in the woods at Courtenay Bay in order to make a harbour which when completed will be nothing like as magnificent a harbour as that at North Sydney. I am surprised when we are talking about the great points of transportation in this country where elevators are to be built, where millions of dollars are to be expended in the betterment of transporta-

tion for the future millions who are to inhabit this country, that we do not hear very much about the great harbour of Sydney and North Sydney. This little item that is now before this committee gives me an opportunity of presenting to the minister some of the advantages of this point which is the nearest point in Canada to the old country and which is a matter of great importance.

Mr. HAZEN. I would like to call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that this item is for the maintenance of steamers and icebreakers, and it is not for money to be spent on harbours.

Mr. McKENZIE. I am not at all losing sight of that, and we have the ruling of the Chair that when a man is coming to the point he is always permitted to take his own road.

Mr. HAZEN. Do not be too long.

Mr. McKENZIE. I will come to the point clean and straight, and the minister will be surprised that I have managed to get to it so quickly.

I shall read a statement made in this House the other night by the Minister of Trade and Commerce which shows the importance of the traffic carried, on the service between North Sydney and Newfoundland. The minister said:

> There is a continual growth in this trade. Last year there were carried 6,765 first-class passengers 11,178 second-class passengers, 15,538 tons of freight, 1,635 head of stock, with a very large quantity of mail, and if you take the trade for the previous three years, you will find there is a gratifying increase.

The steamer plying on this route usually makes her trips between Port aux Basques and North Sydney without interruption, but in a particularly severe season she meets with difficulty and it would be a great advantage for us to have an icebreaker at that port. I understand the minister has an ice-breaker that he sends on missions—I might say on useful missions—throughout the country. I saw her tracks in Sydney harbour last year, just enough to show us what she could do if she kept at the work. She came to Sydney harbour and without any difficulty made tracks in the ice but she went away and has never come back.

Mr. HAZEN. When was that?

Mr. McKENZIE. Last winter. I do not know what she came there for except it was to give an exhibition of her power, and then she fled and we never have seen her since. If the 'Stanley' were sent there in February and March, I believe she could do excellent service in keeping the channel open for this line of steamers between North Sydney and Newfoundland. Now, the service is three trips a week, but after the first of May there will be a daily boat and with this daily service established, we hope to make connection with the mail boats so that the maritime province mails can be caught up by the 'Bruce' from the steamers coming up the St. Lawrence and landed at North Sydney by which means the million people in the maritime provinces would get their mail much quicker than by the Rimouski route. I believe that at little expense the government could send us an icebreaker which would clear the entrance at North Sydney harbour and this I believe would be beneficial, not only to North Sydney, but to the Intercolonial railway and the country generally.

Mr. CARROLL. I endorse what my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) has said in reference to the necessity for having an icebreaker at certain times of the year in the harbour of North Sydney and Sydney, which after all is the one harbour. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McKenzie) has not exaggerated the importance of this matter. Unfortunately in some years, in January and February the harbour is frozen over, and I am sure it would not take a large expenditure to have an icebreaker there for a couple of months. This year the harbour froze over a good deal earlier than usual. I think it only justice to the county I represent that I should supplement what has been said by the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie. When we are spending millions of dollars in making ports all over the country which are not natural harbours at all, I do not think it is too much to ask the government to assist in this small way the splendid natural harbour of Sydney so as to make it available for shipping at all times during the winter months. I trust that the minister will make inquiry as to the cost of keeping an ice-breaker there during a certain portion of the winter, and I am sure if he puts an ice-breaker there he will do good work not only for the port of Sydney but for the shipping interests of the Dominion generally.

Mr. HAZEN. I fear I will have to make a confession, which I regard as somewhat humiliating: that I never have had the great pleasure of visiting Sydney. But, after the description given of its beauties and potentialities by my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie), I shall not delay that visit longer than I possibly can help. I may say, however, that although I have not visited Sydney I possibly have as good an idea of it as my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) seems to have of Courtney Bay which he speaks of as being situated in the woods. I would invite my hon. friend

(Mr. McKenzie) to drop off at St. John some time, and I would like to take him around to have a look at Courtenay Bay, and then I am sure he will come back next session and be ready to withdraw the disparaging things he said about it.

Mr. McKENZIE. I think it would be hopeless for me to find it without the guidance of my hon. friend the minister.

Mr. HAZEN. There are none so blind as those who will not see, but I am sure that with the beautifully clear air and exhilarating atmosphere of St. John my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) will be able to see further than when his vision is bounded by the four walls of this chamber. I may say that this year we sent the 'Stanley' to Sydney harbour at the request of some shipping interests with a view of opening the channel so that vessels could get out, and that experiment was very successful. Only last week we sent an ice-breaker there again for the purpose of making a channel up to the pier of the Dominion Coal Company, and as a result of our laudable efforts to assist the port of Sydney, the 'Stanley' is now firmly bound in the ice off Sydney harbour, and I am afraid it will be some days before we can get her released. The question of ice-breaking is every year becoming more and more important, and people are beginning to realize that it has the effect of helping shipping and trade. I shall be very glad to give my attention to the representations made by my hon. friends and to accede to them so far as it is possible for the department to do so with the steamers and plant now at its command.

Mr. MACDONALD. In connection with the vote for masters and mates, may I ask if Mr. Adams has resigned?

Mr. HAZEN. Very much to the regret of everybody in the department Mr. Adams feels the work is becoming too onerous for him, and he has applied for superannuation.

Mr. MACDONALD. Has any appointment been made?

Mr. HAZEN. No appointment has been made. His retirement is a matter of regret to every one in the department, where he has had a very long and honourable career.

Mr. McKENZIE. Are there any local examiners for masters and mates?

Mr. HAZEN. Yes, this includes the vote for local examiners.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is there a local examiner in the county of Great Breton?

Mr. HAZEN. Yes, James Sutherland of North Sydney is a local examiner.

Mr. HAZEN.

Rewards saving life, including life-saving stations, $96,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would like to ask my hon. friend if he has considered the question of establishing a life-saving station at Cape Jourmain in Westmorland county?

Mr. HAZEN. That is being considered now by the officials of the department, and reports are being prepared upon it.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Inverness). I would like to have some information in regard to the station at Cheticamp.

Mr. HAZEN. That station is under construction at the present time.

Mr. McKENZIE. It was decided last year to build a life-saving station at Cranberry Head. What position is that in now?

Mr. HAZEN. There is included in the present vote an appropriation of $2,500 for that work. It is situated at the mouth of North Sydney harbour.

Mr. LAW. Is it the intention of the department to establish a life-saving station at Mud Island in Yarmouth county?

Mr. HAZEN. I do not think so; but a life-saving station is being established on the south shore of Nova Scotia not far from Digby. This year, I may say, in consequence of representations made to me by the hon. member for Digby, I ordered the 'Stanley' to proceed to Digby and to remain there, as I was told that on several occasions fishermen had got into trouble, and the 'Stanley' had to be sent for from St. John for life-saving service. Therefore, it was thought advisable to have her stationed at Digby for that purpose. We are establishing a life-saving station, with a lifeboat, at Bay View, east of Digby.

Mr. LAW. I never heard of it. It cannot be south of Briar Island. It must be further up the bay.

Mr. HAZEN. Yes, it is further up the bay.

Mr. LAW. That would be no use for the southern coast of Nova Scotia. Mud Island is situated at the mouth of the Bay of Fundy, where all the boats going up and down the bay have to pass, and there have been many shipwrecks at that point, and I would like to see a life-saving station there.

Mr. HAZEN. There is one at Baker's Cove now. But I will consider what my hon. friend says. The appropriation for the station near Digby was voted in the estimates of the present year, but the money was not spent when I came into office, and I have given instructions to have the work proceeded with at once.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.). Has the department information with regard to the utility of what is known as the rocket apparatus? It costs much less than life-saving stations, and can be moved quickly from place to place.

Mr. HAZEN. It is an auxiliary to life-saving stations.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.). Yes, I have received information from captains familiar with conditions in Great Britain to the effect that more life is saved by the application of that machinery than by the regular lifeboats.

Investigation into wrecks, $18,400.

Mr. MACDONALD. Why is the increase?

Mr. HAZEN. It is due to the appointment of a wreck commissioner in British Columbia and to the fact that the shipping interests on the Great Lakes have ardently demanded that investigations be held into all cases of grounding which appear to be of a serious nature.

Expenses of schools of navigation, $8,000.

Mr. LAW. Where are these schools situated?

Mr. HAZEN. At Halifax, Yarmouth, St. John, North Sydney, Quebec, Montreal, Collingwood, Midland, Vancouver, Victoria and other places if necessary.

Registration of shipping, $1,500.

Mr. McKENZIE. I believe that the officer in the city of Sydney who used to make the measurements for the registration of shipping is dead. Has this fact been brought to the notice of the minister?

Mr. HAZEN. Yes. No appointment has yet been made.

Mr. McKENZIE. I think it would be well to consult the authorities and get an appointment made, because it might be required at any moment.

Inspection of live stock shipments, $5,000.

Mr. McKENZIE. Last year 1,635 head of stock were shipped from the port of North Sydney. I think if the Minister has anything to do with looking after these cattle, then he might see that provision be made for the cattle between the time of their leaving the car and getting on board the vessel. I wish to point out to him that the greatest possible cruelty is practised on these cattle. There is no place in which to put them, and in winter they are left outside exposed to very severe weather. That has been the subject of comment in that part of the country, where the opinion is entertained that accommodation should be provided for these cattle. I want particularly to point out to the minister that there is no officer resident at the port of North Sydney to carry out this inspection and certainly, I think, the officer should be on the spot where the work has to be done.

Mr. HAZEN. The officers of the Marine Department are not supposed to look after these cattle until they are on the ship, when I think their duty is to see that they are given proper accommodation. It would be the duty of the Railway Department to take care of these cattle until they are placed on board ship. But if the conditions are such as is described by my hon. friend, certainly representations should be made to the Railway Department.

Mr. McKENZIE. I hope that my representations will reach the Railway Department, because at present there is no provision made for these cattle although there were 1,625 of them last year, showing that it must be quite a profitable business for the railway and for the vessel as well.

Mr. HAZEN. As the hon. gentleman has brought this matter to the attention of the House when my estimates were under consideration, I will ask my officials to call the attention of the Railway Department to what he has said, undoubtedly this is a very important matter which should be remedied at once.

Mr. McKENZIE. Then I would point out to the minister that the Newfoundland government will not permit any of these cattle to land on the other side, unless they have a certificate from a veterinary officer of some department of the Canadian government.

Mr. HAZEN. That does not come under our control at all.

Mr. McKENZIE. What is this money for then?

Mr. HAZEN. The inspectors when we pay see that the cattle are properly cared for on board ship, that proper stalls are built so that they will have the proper amount of space that is requisite, and be looked after in other ways, during the voyage across the Atlantic. They have nothing to do with the question of health, or with the question of quarantine, but they are simply for the purpose stated.

Mr. McKENZIE. Perhaps the deputy minister will inform the minister to what department this official belongs.

Mr. HAZEN. That would be the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. McKENZIE. It is exceedingly important that the officer who has to examine this number of cattle should always be on the ground. I would like to call the attention of the department to that fact.

Mr. HAZEN. Perhaps it will do when the estimates of the Department of Agriculture are under consideration.

Mr. McKENZIE. I thought it came under the Marine Department.

To continue the subsidy for wrecking plants in Quebec, Maritime Provinces and British Columbia, $30,000.

Mr. CARROLL. What companies, if any, in the province of Nova Scotia have received subsidies?

Mr. HAZEN. Subsidies are paid to three companies: $10,000 to the Davey Company, Quebec; $10,000 to the Dominion Coal Company at Sydney, and $10,000 to the British Salvage Company.

Mr. CARROLL. Has there been an application for a subsidy from the city of Sydney?

Mr. HAZEN. No. Tenders are asked for this important service.

Mr. MACDONALD. Are tenders invited every year?

Mr. HAZEN. No for a period of five years.

Mr. MACDONALD. What about the Quebec tender?

Mr. HAZEN. The Quebec tender, I may say, is expiring this year, and as a matter of fact, Mr. Davey has informed the department that he will not carry it on any longer at that subsidy as he is losing money on it. He has to keep an expensive plant, and there have been so few wrecks that there is no income coming in, and he gave figures to show that actually there has been a loss. As far as I can find out Canada is the only country in the world where the government assist in maintaining these wrecking plants. In other countries this work is done by the shipping interests.

To provide for the maintenance of vessels employed in patrolling the waters in the northern portion of Canada, &c., $59,000.

Mr. MACDONALD. Is it the minister's intention to again send the 'Arctic' into those northern waters?

Mr. HAZEN. This vote will be available for sending the 'Arctic', or some other boat, to patrol the northern waters if it is decided to do so.

Mr. MACDONALD. I suppose tenders will be invited for the supplies?

Mr. HAZEN. I suppose something of that sort should be done.

River St. Lawrence ship channel, $841,000.

Mr. MACDONALD. I would ask that this item, as well as the next one, be allowed to stand because some hon. gentlemen on this side familiar with these matters are not here to-night.

Salaries and allowances to lightkeepers, $450,000.

Mr. McKENZIE. Has the minister dismissed any of these lightkeepers in my own county, North Cape Breton and Victoria?

Mr. HAZEN. I do not think so, I cannot recall them.

Mr. CARROLL. Is there any system of superannuation for these lightkeepers?

Mr. HAZEN. No.

Mr. CARROLL. It might perhaps be well for the department to consider some scheme of superannuation. There are men who are employed in this work for twenty and thirty years, and when they retire are not fit for anything else, having been in the government service for so long a time. I think it would be proper for the department to take this matter of superannuation into consideration.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.). Have any charges been made against lightkeepers in Kings county, Prince Edward Island?

Mr. HAZEN. I could not answer that question offhand, but I would be very glad to get the information for the hon. gentleman. So many charges have been made that it would be quite impossible to carry them all in my memory.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, Prince Edward Island). Has the minister appointed any one to investigate these charges?

Mr. HAZEN. Yes, a gentleman named Norman Campbell, I think.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, Prince Edward Island). Is he a lawyer?

Mr. HAZEN. Yes, a lawyer is appointed to conduct the investigation in every case.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, Prince Edward Island). I understand some charges have been preferred against a man named Luther Jordan, who has charge of Murray harbour light.

Mr. HAZEN. Those were not for partisanship.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, Prince Edward Island). I do not know really.

Mr. HAZEN. The hon. member will understand that these commisisoners are only investigating charges of partisanship. Where there are charges of neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office, or something of that sort, they are investigated by the officials of the department. I think in this case, speaking subject to correc-

tion, the charge was for neglect of duty or something of that kind. In that case there will be an investigation by an officer of the department.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, Prince Edward Island). Is there an age limit in the case of the appointment of lightkeepers?

Mr. HAZEN. There is an age limit, but in very many cases it is impossible to live up to that age limit. As the hon. gentleman knows, most of these smaller lights are situated in country districts, and it is necessary to get somebody who lives in the neighbourhood as keeper. The pay is so small in the case of most of these lights, that a person who lives at a distance cannot attend to the light for the remuneration that is given. In a great many instances it has been the case in the past, and I am afraid it will have to continue to be the case in the future, men are appointed to look after these lights who are bevond the age that is prescribed.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, Prince Edward Island). What is the prescribed age?

Mr. HAZEN. The prescribed age is forty, and in many cases it is impossible to get men as young to do the work.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, Prince Edward Island). I am informed that a man named Clark, who has been lightkeeper at New Georgetown, has been, or is likely to be, removed from office.

Mr. HAZEN. I cannot recall the case at the moment; I would be delighted to give my hon. friend all information at the office.

Mr. MACDONALD. I know of one lighthouse keeper being removed in my county. I understand that the investigator in regard to political charges is Mr. Duchemin, who is poorly qualified to give an independent judgment in any matter involving political partisanship. I have no objection to men being removed who have transgressed the well understood rule about interference in politics, but where a man says he is not guilty he is entitled to a hearing, and should have a fair hearing. I know of Mr. Duchemin going back seven years to find that a man had attended a political meeting in a local election. Then the investigator will not allow the person charged to ask any question of the witness except through him or to be represented by any one at the hearing. I would ask the minister to have this gentleman told the limits within which the investigation is to go. I am complaining of proceedings in other departments than the Marine Department.

Mr. HAZEN. I entirely agree that it there is to be a trial it should be a fair trial, otherwise there is no sense in having it. Some of the gentlemen who have been appointed to hold examinations are absolutely fair I know. Mr. Bergeron, a former member of the House, conducts them with the most absolute fairness.

Mr. MACDONALD. I am quite sure he would.

Mr. HAZEN. Of course in each case an abstract of the evidence comes before me, but I do not regard these reports as final, I consider the report in each case before acting and certainly a person accused should have every opportunity of cross-examining witnesses. If there are any investigations in my department I shall certainly prescribe the lines on which the investigation is to be held.

Mr. McKENZIE. I am told that this man was examining an excellent official at Glace Bay. Here are some of the questions asked him: Do you know Premier Murray? A. Yes. Q. Was Premier Murray in Glace Bay last June? A. Yes. Q. Did you shake hands with Premier Murray—and I think the man had to admit the enormous crime of having shaken hands with genial George Murray at Glace Bay. Another question asked was if it was true that Mrs. McKinnon attended a Liberal dance at Glace Bay?

Mr. HAZEN. I am not in a position to discuss the matter, but I think on investigation you will find that the hon. gentleman's statement is a little overdrawn.

Mr. CARROLL. I understand that the keeper of the fog alarm station at Louisburg has had pressure brought to bear on him and has been obliged to dismiss his former assistant, and that another has been forced on him, who is not qualified to operate the fog horn in the keeper's absence. The assistants are not under the jurisdiction of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, but are under the keepers. They should be under the department directly.

Mr. HAZEN. The system in regard to these stations is that the man appointed in charge of a station is paid a certain sum and he is responsible for his assistants whom he pays out of his salary. I understand there has not been much difficulty under the present system, as the man in charge is liable to dismissal if his assistant makes mistakes, as he is responsible.

Mr. CARROLL. I understand that the gentleman forced on him is not qualified.

Mr. HAZEN. Then he had no right to accept him. No lighthouse keeper who properly does his work need have any one forced on him.

Mr. MACDONALD. Last year several industries in that county along the East river, and the schooner people and owners of steamers going up and down that river, asked me to call the attention of the government to the necessity of some small lights along the river in order that it might be made navigable at night. I did so shortly after the late government went out of power, and the matter was to have been dealt with by the Lighthouse Board. The necessity for these lights is very great. There is a stretch of about seven miles where there are a tremendous lot of big steamers and vessels. The dredging is not yet completed. It would be a great public convenience, and I ask the minister to consider it favourably.

Mr. HAZEN. I understand this matter has been before the Lighthouse Board, but they have not come to a decision. They think they should wait until the dredging is completed before they determine what lights are necessary. The hon. gentleman knows the composition of the board. Since I have been minister I have always acted upon the advice of that board with regard to lights.

Mr. MACDONALD. I think that, pending the completion of the improvements, there is absolute necessity for the lights, and there is nothing in the improvements that would involve any change in their location. I will take the opportunity of addressing the board directly.

Mr. HAZEN. I would suggest that the hon. gentleman have a talk with Colonel Anderson.

Mr. McKENZIE. I wish to bring to the attention of the minister the position of the lighthouse keeper at St. Paul island. The light at this place was established long before confederation by the provincial government of Nova Scotia, when a gentleman named John Campbell was appointed. The same position has been held by his son, Samuel C. Campbell, and later by his grandson. At present Mr. John Campbell is in charge of the island. During the régime of Sir Hibbert Tupper charges were brought against Mr. Campbell of a most trivial character, and the gentleman who then represented the county of Victoria, for some personal reason, threatened to resign his seat unless Mr. Campbell was dismissed. Mr. Campbell was dismissed. When the Laurier government came into power there was some difficulty on the island, and the man who was in charge was found to be incompetent and was removed. Mr. Campbell was put back, and was left there for the rest of his life. His son is there now. I understand there was a rule that when it was found necessary to dismiss an officer by the late government, the man who was dismissed should be put back where he was before without making much inquiry. It would be a great hardship to apply this rule in the present case. Mr. Campbell was improperly dismissed, and was put back in his place when the late government came into power, not for partisan reasons, but because he had been found competent. The third generation of Campbells is now on the island, the position is a sort of an heirloom in the family. I take the opportunity of bringing this case to the notice of the minister so that, if anything is done toward replacing Mr. Campbell, the minister will know the history of the case, and I hope he will not interfere with such an excellent officer as John Campbell is.

Construction of lighthouses and aids to navigation, also for the improvement of the West Coast Trail, British Columbia, $1,000,000.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Inverness). Application was made last year for the construction of a lighthouse in Margaree harbour. Has anything been done?

Mr. HAZEN. The matter was never brought to my attention, and my deputy informs me that nothing has been done.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Inverness). Is it the intention of the department to improve the light conditions at that place?

Mr. HAZEN. The matter has been referred, I suppose, to the Lighthouse Board. There is an application, which has been approved by the Lighthouse Board, to improve the existing lights at Margaree harbour, and we will act on the recommendation.

Amount required to pay pensions at $300 each to certain pilots, $6,300.

Mr. MACDONALD. Some time ago a veteran pilot in the Northumberland Straits named William Cook, who does not happen to be a political friend of mine, appealed to the department for a pension. I believe there was some difficulty in regard to the law dealing with this case. The pilots that are pensioned all come from Quebec. But if it is possible under the law to deal with the case, every merit that entitles a man to consideration for a pension exists in the case of Mr. Cook. I think the papers are before the department.

Mr. HAZEN. There the law under which these pensions are voted applies to the pilots of Quebec only. The case my hon. friend refers to would not come under the statute under which this arrangement is carried into effect. Some gentlemen of Pictou have made representations to the department regarding the case of Mr. Cook, and from

what I can learn from my deputy the difficulty is that there is no provision of the law to meet it. I will, however, look into the matter and see if it is possible that something can be done.

To provide for the purchase or construction of a lighthouse and buoy steamer for river St. Lawrence to replace the 'Shamrock' (Dollard), $80,000.

Mr. HAZEN. This is a revote. One hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars was voted last year, the boat is under construction and it is hoped that the balance over and above $80,000 will be paid out of the vote of the present year. That will leave $80,000 to pay next year and to complete the work.

To provide for the purchase or construction of a lighthouse and buoy steamer to replace the 'Scout,' $110,000.

Mr. HAZEN. The 'Scout,' the steamer that did lighthouse work between Kingston and Montreal on the St. Lawrence, has been condemned by the officials of the department and those who have made the inspection as being unfit for further service.

Mr. GRAHAM. Will this be a larger boat than the 'Scout'?

Mr. HAZEN. Yes, it is proposed to build a larger and more modern boat. The 'Scout' was not an old boat, but she seems to have gone to pieces quickly.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is high time that there was a new boat to replace the 'Scout.' I hope that this work will be put up to tender and that if possible it will be given to one of our own shipbuilders.

Mr. HAZEN. Yes, I fancy that we will only ask for tenders in Canada for it.

To provide for the expenses of delegates to the International Association of Navigation Congress to be held in Philadelphia in 1912, and the transportation and entertainment of the members of the congress while in Canada, including the cost of printing pamphlet, $20,000.

Mr. MACDONALD. Will the minister tell us about that?

Mr. HAZEN. This is the International Congress of Marine Engineers. The last meeting was held at Brussels two years ago, and an invitation was then extended to hold the next meeting in the United States. It is going to be held in Philadelphia and the representatives from Canada who were present two years ago extended an invitation to the delegates after their meeting in the United States to come to Canada so that they might have an opportunity of seeing our waterways and our transportation system. It is felt that as they are coming to Canada as the guests of the Canadian people it would be only proper that we should entertain them while they are here.

Mr. MACDONALD. Who will be the representatives of the department?

Mr. HAZEN. The representatives from our department will be Major Stephens, chairman of the Montreal Harbour Commission, Colonel Anderson, chief engineer of the department and the Deputy Minister reminds me that I am also to be one of the representatives.

Marine hospitals—care of sick seamen in marine hospitals, and repairs to marine hospitals, $70,000.

Mr. CARROLL. Am I right in saying that Dr. Sullivan, port physician at Glace bay, is getting $150 a year for his services?

Mr. HAZEN. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. In the Auditor General's report of last year he is charged with having received something over $400 when, as a matter of fact his salary is $150. He is under considerable odium in that part of the country on account of the statement that he has received $150 or $200 more than he has actually been paid. Reports have been circulated against the doctor, who is a very honest man, and it has been alleged that he has received money in some underhand way, or by methods which are not honest.

Mr. HAZEN. I understand that the Auditor General, through some mistake in his department, charged up to this gentleman $300 for coal that was not for the doctor at all, but was used in the marine hosiptal at Louisburg. It certainly would be most unfair to Dr. Sullivan to make a charge against him such as has been suggested by my hon. friend.

Mr. CARROLL. I just wanted to have the matter cleared up.

Steamboat inspection, $57,000.

Mr. HAZEN. There is a $3,000 increase in this item to provide for an additional inspector at Toronto and for an office to be located at Port Arthur. This has been found necessary because of the increased business that is being carried on.

Mr. McKENZIE. I would ask the minister to permit me to go back for a moment to item 260.

Construction of lighthouses and aids to navigation, including apparatus, submarine signals and providing suitable boats for carrying on construction work; also for the improvement of the west coast trail, British Columbia, $1,000,000.

This refers to the construction of lighthouses and aids to navigation. The navigation of the Bras D'Or lakes is very difficult. There are a great many islands, coves, creeks and peninsulas running out

into the lakes and on dark nights it is a very difficult proposition to navigate these lakes. The minister perhaps has not an intimate knowledge of the extent of these inland waters. They extend about 75 or 100 miles from the mouth of the Big Bras D'Or to the canal.

Going up the other way, towards Baddeck, would be a distance of about thirty miles above Bras d'Or, with various branches in different directions extending about twenty-five miles across in some places. There is a great deal of navigation in this inland sea, particularly in carrying pit-props to the mines in which small schooners engage. When a man builds a little schooner it is sometimes his all and it is unfortunate she should be wrecked through lack of aids to navigation. There are on the records of the department requests asking for a lighthouse to be placed at St. Patrick's channel in the County of Victoria. That has been turned down, I am sorry to say, by this Lighthouse Board, composed no doubt of very capable navigators, but none of whom perhaps ever saw Bras d'Or lakes, and none of whom know of the difficulties of sailing a schooner through this place on a dark night. At little expense there could be put here and there through the lakes small lighthouses to help these poor people and if that were done it would be money well spent. Although it does not appeal to the Lighthouse Board, such as do aids to navigation in the St. Lawrence or along the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, it is just as important to the man who in his small way is trying to make his living by navigating the Bras d'Or lakes. This point at St. Patrick's channel would be lighting a stretch of water between Little Narrows and Baddeck, a distance of twenty-five miles, in which whole distance there is no lighthouse from the time you leave Little Narrows until you get to Baddeck. I refer to what is called Eli Point, St. Patrick's channel, and we do not want a big lighthouse but something that would guide the mariner on his way. This board, I am sorry to say, has turned down my application on several occasions, but still I persist in coming until better light is given to the navigator there. I am encouraged by the affability and capability of the minister to come back to him on this occasion and put the case of the St. Patrick's channel navigators before him. Then, the minister will find a great many petitions on file in his department from Big Harbour on the Bras d'Or where, within the last three or four years several schooners have been piled on the rocks in trying to make the harbour on a dark night. These are the only two places in this tremendous inland sea for which I am asking any assistance, namely, Eli Point, St. Patrick's channel, and Big Harbour. Then, on the coast of Victoria county and North Cape Breton there is Cranberry Head without a lighthouse and it is strange to say that although that is a well-known dangerous point on the coast there never has been a light there. The fog alarm that is now on Low Point used to be on Cranberry Head, and for some reason some years ago that foghorn was taken from Cranberry Head and there is nothing there at all now to help navigation. There is a requisition, if I may call it so, from the Dominion Coal Company and the Nova Scotia Steel Company, both owning large steamers, on file in the department, asking for some navigation aid at Cranberry Head. I hope it will receive the attention of the minister. Ingonish Harbour has a lighthouse now, but within the last few years the Department of Public Works has deepened that harbour, and it is now much more important than it formerly was. I think there is something on record with the department showing that something must be done to place better aids to navigation than exist at the present time at Ingonish Harbour. The same thing is true of Bay St. Lawrence. The navigation generally is under the supervision of the Minister of Marine, and when there are obstructions to navigation in the shape of railway bridges, they must have been put there by the Railway Department with the consent of the Marine Department. I call attention to a bridge right across the Grand Narrows, which is a serious obstruction to navigation. The minister will find that a report was made by the Department of Public Works some years ago which shows that a large number of small ships were broken to pieces and the greatest possible destruction of property resulted by striking against this bridge. We have been for years trying to provide a remedy for that. Thousands of small vessels go from Prince Edward Island and other parts through this bridge every year, and many of them get damaged. The danger to the bridge itself is also serious. If these vessels coming along with the force of tide and wind strike against one of the piers serious damage will certainly result to the bridge. We wanted some kind of a tug put there which for a small fee might guide the vessels through.

Mr. HAZEN. Have any vessels run against the bridges?

Mr. McKENZIE. Oh, yes, several vessels from Prince Edward Island in the spring of the year have come in contact with that bridge, and if the Prince Edward Island members were here they could tell the minister that a great many disasters have occurred there.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.). I am here.

Mr. McKENZIE. I meant members from Prince Edward Island on the other side of the House. My hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) can bear testimony that very often vessels are injured there. I seriously bring it to the notice of the minister, and I hope something will be done both for the sake of the bridge itself and for the vessels navigating there. Although not publicly, I have brought this matter to the attention of the Railway Department a dozen times, and they have this report to which I have referred which substantiates what I say, but still I could not get them to spend any money. As this obstruction to navigation must have been put there with the consent of the Marine Department, I would ask the minister to insist on the Railway Department taking proper precautions to safeguard public and private property there.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, Prince Edward Island). I can support the statement made by the hon. member (Mr. McKenzie) in regard to the danger of navigation at that particular point. I have heard the captains say how very dangerous it is, and I have known of wrecks that have taken place there on account of striking against the bridge. If the department can do anything to remove the obstruction it would be money spent in the right direction.

Mr. HAZEN. It seems to me that the question of the danger of the bridge at Grand Narrows is more especially for the Railway Department, and if the bridge is causing all the danger that it is said it causes then it would be for the Railway Department to do something in the direction outlined by my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) to enable vessels to be taken through the bridge in safety.

If my hon. friend would see the Minister of Railways about the matter, perhaps he would find him less obdurate and hard-hearted than some of his predecessors, and he might be able to make some impression upon him. With regard to the necessity of lights in English Harbour, I have great pleasure in telling my hon. friend that it has been decided to have lights put there for the purpose of making the harbour safer. My hon. friend has referred to a number of other applications which he said he had made in the past for lighthouses, and which were turned down. Perhaps that turning down, in some cases at least, was not intended to be permanent, for I have found since I have been in the Department that the Lighthouse Board has refused applications that have merit for the simple reason that we have hardly organization enough to carry out the works for which parliament has provided the money, in the way of construction of lighthouses and aids to navigation, and the work has not proceeded as rapidly as it is evidently the desire of parliament from the liberality of its appropriation that it should proceed. I would request the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who is here, and who is a member of the Lighthouse Board, to bring these matters to the attention of the board for consideration, and in view of the way the hon. gentleman has expedited the passage of my estimates, I would ask him to request the board to give special consideration to the request of my hon. friend.

Salaries and disbursement of fisheries inspectors, overseers and guardians, $200,000.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, Prince Edward Island). The minister was good enough to say that if I called at the department the deputy minister would show me the papers with regard to charges made against the lighthouse keepers. Will he show me the papers with regard to some charges made against the fishery overseer of King's county, Mr. McCormick?

Mr. HAZEN. My hon. friend spoke to me about that, and I asked the deputy minister to furnish the information. I understand that the papers were sent to-day.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, Prince Edward Island). No matter what the result is, he is a capital officer.

Mr. HAZEN. The charge made is that of wrong-doing in connection with the payment of the fishing bounties. It is not a new thing for officials to be so charged. We are having the charge in this case investigated.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, Prince Edward Island). The payment of the fishing bounties is a very difficult thing to handle. Sometimes the fishermen are not at home when the officer goes to pay the claims.

Mr. MACDONALD. I want to take this opportunity of bringing to the attention of the minister a case which I think is well deserving of his personal attention. In my own county an enthusiastic political friend of his, a medical doctor named Murray, had been in the habit of poaching on the West river in company with some other men Liberals and Conservatives. It was well known that Dr. Murray was a poacher, along with some other men who did not regard it as a heinous offence. Wherever they could get a salmon, they took it, to the injury of the fishing. Dr. Murray was of course no more guilty than the men who participated with him in the amusement. But about the 8th or 9th of October, when this government was safely installed in

power, he went up the river and announced to his fellow poachers that no more Grits were to be allowed to poach on the river, and that he and his friends were going to take all the fish that fall. Later on this new guardian of poachers, in company with some other men were setting nets on the river and he proceeded to telephone into town to Inspector Hockin, that men were poaching on the river, and that he should send out a policeman, which he did, another good Conservative; and he, along with Doctor Murray, took a net from a man who was not fishing, but who was on the road, and who happened to be a Grit, and brought it into town in triumph. As this man complained next day that there was going to be trouble about this thing, Charles E. Tanner, writes to the minister, and develops a new phrase of the matter, that employment was to be furnished to no less than three Conservative lawyers in the county. Mr. Tanner writes:

Inspector Hockin of this place has in hand important cases of salmon poaching on the West River. There has been a lot of poaching, but the law was never enforced against certain people. The catch the other night involves some people who ought to be severely punished. One of them is a special guardian DeWolf McLean. Other important people are named Porters.

It is very much in the interest of the public that the cases be thoroughly prosecuted. The example will have a most wholesome effect; and there is great need of an example. These people have been making a business of poaching.

Mr. Hockin tells me that heretofore the department would not let him retain legal assistance in prosecutions. It may be unnecessary in cases at times to have counsel; but in this instance, at this time, having regard to general conditions and the people involved, it is most desirable that special care should be taken to have the prosecutions conducted to a satisfactory conclusion.

I would therefore ask you to give Mr. Hockin authority to engage a solicitor to act with him. I will be glad to recommend a man to Mr. Hockin. I do not want the work myself.

The information will be laid at once before a stipendiary magistrate.

A man was waiting ready for the job whom Mr. Tanner was ready to recommend. The official in the department communicated with Mr. Hockin, and asked if it was so that counsel was required. Then Mr. Hockin telegraphed:

Four persons summoned, two have confessed, others retained E. M. Macdonald. Circumstances require assistance of counsel.

I was not acting for the others; and at the moment he wrote that letter he must have known that the two men who confessed were men that I advised to plead guilty. Hockin then proceeds to write a letter in which he tells his own story, after the officials of the department have written to him and called him to task for telling Mr. Tanner that the department had always refused to employ counsel.

I may add that it was represented to this department that you had stated that you are not allowed to employ legal assistance. I presume that the information that may have been given you in such connection was, that such was not permitted without the authority of the department having been first procured.

Mr. Tanner and Mr. Hockin were communing together presumably on this line: The Grits, when they were in power, would not allow anybody to retain counsel, but we will get somebody retained. now Mr. Hockin, after getting this letter, tells the story:

On Thursday evening about 9 o'clock, p.m. I received a telephone message from Duncan Murray, M.D., that he was at Loch Broom, about 7 miles from Pictou, and that if I would send a constable there he would show him where a number of nets were set. He said there were a number of persons fishing there and amongst them was a fishery guardian.

I engaged Mr. David Morrison who went to the place and in company with Dr. Murray lay in wait to take the poachers in the act.

Then the conclusion of the letter, which I am not going to read in full. he says:

John McCabe and Scott McCabe have also been summoned——

These men were not defended by me; I was retained by Mr. David Porter. Yet Mr. Hockin says:

David, Sr., and Benjamin Porter have confessed. The others have employed Mr. E. M. Macdonald, M.P., to defend them.

The men for whom I was acting are the men who confessed. I never appeared before the police magistrate in defence of any one connected with the poaching. Mr. Hockin ought to have known that because he knows I was appearing for the Porters. and had no right to assume that I was appearing for anybody else. Now, Mr. Hockin says that John McCabe and Scott McCabe were also summoned. These gentlemen were defended by another man, a political friend of my hon. friend (Mr. Hazen), and a friend of Mr. Tanner's, and to-day I understand that he asks that this gentleman be retained by the department in the case of McLean. He will have been the third lawyer who will have been connected with this case, as I will show you, and is being paid by the department as the result of the interference of Dr. Murray, who was a poacher himself and was not interested in enforcing the law but in getting the exclusive right to poach on the river for the Conservative party.

Mr. HAZEN. There is a saying that it is a good thing to set a thief to catch a thief.

Mr. MACDONALD. Certainly, but when you do that you should not provide him with counsel and go on and spend all kinds of money on his defence afterwards. That is what the government is doing now. Then Mr. Hockin, this innocent gentleman who is entirely non-partisan—writes at the end of the letter:

It is alleged that Dr. Murray himself has been fishing salmon there since October 1st. He also has been summoned and the day of trial has been set for October 31st.

Then comes a letter from Mr. Tanner. Mr. Tanner writes further in regard to this matter:

Dr. Murray's only connection with the matter was pure public spirited action as temporary officer of your department at request of inspector Morrison.

This patriotic individual, Dr. Murray, was being brought into the County court himself for trespass. He was fighting with the Grits up the river, and Mr. Tanner represents in his behalf:

Under the circumstances detailed it would appear to be the fair thing for the department to defend Dr. Murray, and I would ask your favourable consideration of that.

Now, here was the second lawyer. The first lawyer, Mr. Fitzpatrick, was employed to prosecute these men who confessed. He did not require any thing for that, because he took no part in the hearing, but I suppose has received payment. He prosecuted two other men, and let me say that he took very great care not to even cross-examine Dr. Murray at all when it came to the hearing. This gentleman appointed to carry out and vindicate the law and stop poaching, this adviser of the department, never cross-examined Dr. Murray, who was shown to have been on the river night after night. Dr. Murray said that he had occasion to go out there to attend a case of midwifery and took a walk down to the river. That is a new occupation for a medical men to be standing round on the river banks looking at nets and boats floating along. As the result of this representation on the part of Mr. Tanner in regard to this poor unselfish Dr. Murray, Mr. Tanner's partner, Mr. John McKay, was instructed to defend the suit brought in the county court against Dr. Murray at the expense of the department. Then here is the stranger thing in regard to Mr. Hockin, that in a long letter of explanation in defence of his political friend, Dr. Murray, he says:

In order to annoy and put to inconvenience Dr. Murray they have brought this action. I understand that when the nets were seized the persons were some few hundred yards from the river, but had been followed from the river and the only colourable reason for any action is that at the time they were taken they were not in actual use.

Now that is the issue that is being tried in the County Court, and Dr. Murray is being defended by the partner of Mr. Tanner, the local member for the county, and at the expense of the government.

Mr. CARVELL. Was Mr. Tanner prosecutor?

Mr. MACDONALD. No, Mr. Fitzpatrick prosecuted.

Mr. GRAHAM. Both prosecuted and defended.

Mr. MACDONALD. There was a prosecution against Dr. Murray in which the man acting for the department never cross-examined Dr. Murray when he went on the stand, and Mr. Hockin, the inspector, after detailing the story found on page 22 of the return says:

On information from Guardian Livingstone I had brought an action against Dr. Murray, whom the Porters alleged had been fishing himself, but he explained his presence there had been in connection with a midwife case, and having to visit had strolled down to the river.

Mr. GRAHAM. To watch the salmon spawn.

Mr. GRAHAM. To watch the salmon spawn. Mr. Hockin said further:

I think it is in the interest of the fisheries that Dr. Murray should not have to bear the cost of defending this suit, and further that the constable David Morrison should be reimbursed the expense he had been put to to defend himself in the purjury case.

Now the man who defended Dr. Murray in the proceedings in the first instance was a man who bears the same name as myself, but who is a political friend of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hazen), Mr. William Macdonald, and in the case against fishery guardian McLean, who is a Liberal, it was dismissed by the magistrate before whom it had been laid by Mr. Hockin, a man who could not by any possible means be charged with having sympathy with Mr. McLean in any way. After the dismissal of that case, Dr. Murray comes along, through Mr. Tanner and these gentlemen come and get the department to appeal to the county court the case against Guardian McLean. I am told that the department have authorized this to be done and the result is that the man who defended Dr. Murray is now engaged by the department, and is representing them on the appeal of the case from the magistrate to the county court. So that to-day as the result of this interference on the part of Dr. Murray in the way I have stated—as

the result of this doctor's action, the reason of which I have given to the committee on my responsibility as a member of parliament—the department have three pieces of litigation on hand in which they are represented by three Conservative lawyers. And the question is how is it going to contribute to the administration of the law?

Had Mr. Fitzpatrick, who had been retained in the first instance, carried out his business properly in regard to Dr. Murray, he would have been convicted, but when I tell the minister that the man who represented the department when the defendant went on and told the story about the midwife case did not ask him a question in cross-examination in regard to that story, it seems to me the department would have been better instructed if they had advised Mr. Fitzpatrick to go on and appeal the case against Dr. Murray. The result is that the gentleman who started all this furore, for no patriotic reasons or desire to enforce the law, but wishing to be politically officious and offensive, is sued in the county court and is being defended by the department. The department have paid Mr. Fitzpatrick for four cases, including the one in which he apparently did not try to convict Dr. Murray. I ask the minister if that is a proper way to carry out the law. I am not speaking as counsel for the men, because I told those who came to me that they must go and plead guilty. I am anxious to see the law enforced in my county properly, and Mr. Hockin will never enforce it properly if he is starting out on this basis.

Mr. MORPHY. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say he was retained as counsel for the defence?

Mr. MACDONALD. I was retained by two of these men proceeded against at the time Dr. Murray was proceeded against. I took no part in the case other than to instruct them to plead guilty.

Mr. MORPHY. Does the hon. gentleman think it fair to produce in parliament ex parte matter which cannot be contradicted?

Mr. MACDONALD. I have quoted from the records which the minister has given me.

Mr. HAZEN. You have travelled very far outside the records.

Mr. MACDONALD. Not very far. The minister cannot deny that he is employing to-day three Conservative lawyers in that county as the result of a prosecution initiated.

Mr. MORPHY. The hon. gentleman has shown a choleric temper in the presentation of his case.

Mr. MACDONALD.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend does not know me very well when he makes such a statement. I may be emphatic in my statement, but it is justified by this record. The hon. member should learn something about the rules of the House before attempting to lecture anybody.

Mr. MORPHY. I do not think that because a member is an old member he has any authoritative right to lecture young members.

Mr. MACDONALD. I have as much right to lecture my hon. friend as he has to lecture me. The result of this peculiar position, so far as the department is concerned, is that Mr. Tanner's partner is employed in the county court defending in that case. It also appeared that Mr. Fitzpatrick was employed by the department to prosecute certain people including Dr. Murray. I would ask the minister to verify the statement that Mr. Fitzpatrick, in the course of that prosecution, did not cross-examine Dr. Murray.

Mr. HAZEN. The hon. gentleman says so and makes charges against the gentleman in his absence.

Mr. MACDONALD. I am representing to the minister that he did not cross-examine witness.

Mr. HAZEN. That is not evidence that he did not do his duty.

Mr. MACDONALD. I leave it to my hon. friend as a lawyer, that when the doctor stated that he had gone for a stroll by the river that night——

Mr. HAZEN. There was nothing wrong about that.

Mr. MACDONALD. Nothing wrong in October for a doctor to go to the riverside? Would that not be a good subject for cross-examination? It was his duty to cross-examine. Of course I am not blaming the minister, because I know that he cannot be acquainted with all these detailed cases. I say that Mr. Hockin is the man who led the department into this hole, and I would ask the minister to investigate, and see if I have not made out a proper case.

Mr. HAZEN. I think my hon. friend is making a mountain out of a very small mole hill, and has also travelled very far from the record before the House, and made all sorts of ex parte statements in the absence of people who are not here to contradict them. My hon. friend admits that there was wholesale poaching going on in the East river for a long time past. He says that while this Doctor Murray made the observation after the elections that no more Grits would be allowed to poach on the East river. I have no doubt

that Doctor Murray would contradict that if he were here. My hon. friend is evidently repeating idle gossip. It is ridiculous to imagine that a man occupying the position of a leading physician in a community would make such an absurd statement as that no more Liberals would be allowed to poach.

Mr. MACDONALD. I can give the minister a declaration under oath from a man whose word would not be questioned.

Mr. HAZEN. I have no doubt that Doctor Murray's word would be accepted. It is an ex parte statement easily made by a member of parliament here when there is no one to contradict it. I say it is an unfair statement to make about Doctor Murray, who, I understand, is a man of respectability in his community, and a man of standing in his profession, to say that he made a statement of that sort, and that he himself had previously been poaching, and the inference of my hon. friend is that Doctor Murray took this course in order that he might have a better chance of poaching in the future. According to the records in the department we find that Doctor Murray was down there attending a professional case. Having to wait a little while, he took a stroll along the river bank, and finding that poaching was going on he telephoned the fact to Mr. Hockin, and told him that the poachers could be caught, and asked that somebody be sent down there. A constable was sent down, who made certain arrests. Now my hon. friend, not only reflects on Doctor Murray's character, but he reflects on Mr. Hockin.

Mr. MACDONALD. I say he is a political partisan.

Mr. HAZEN. All I can say to my hon. friend is that he will not get one official in the Department of Marine and Fisheries but will say that Mr. Hockin has been a most successful and excellent fishery officer and his record in the department is as high as that of any other official in Canada. That is the departmental record which Mr. Hockin has. He has been a fishery official I think for over a quarter of a century, he has been there under different governments, and his record as fishery officer is an excellent one in the department, so I am informed by the officials whom I find in the department. Now Mr. Hockin very properly reported to the department that men had been arrested charged with poaching, and surely it is a desirable thing that the fishery laws of the country should be enforced, and that poaching should be stopped. Mr. Hockin writes to the department, having been informed that my hon. friend is going to appear as counsel for the defence, and recommends that counsel be employed on the other side. The Department of Justice was asked to name counsel, and they named Mr. Fitzpatrick. Now my hon. friend, having reflected on Dr. Murray and having reflected on Mr. Hockin, now comes down and reflects on the professional conduct of Mr. Fitzpatrick, who is not here to-night to defend himself, either. My hon. friend seems to think that Mr. Fitzpatrick has shown himself to be a party to a conspiracy because he did not cross-examine Dr. Murray. I want to tell him that that fact indicated nothing of the sort. Time and again when I have been acting as counsel I have refrained from cross-examining witnesses where I believed it would do my case more harm than good. One cannot tell whether Mr. Fitzpatrick was acting well or not from the mere fact that he did not cross-examine witnesses. I do not think it is fair for my hon. friend, who is himself a member of the profession to reflect upon the professional conduct of a brother member of the profession merely because he did not judge it prudent to cross-examine a witness, who my hon. friend thinks he should have cross-examined. I have not seen the evidence in the case, therefore, I cannot give an opinion. All I say is that the fact that he did not cross-examine the witness would not, to my mind, be conclusive evidence or any evidence at all, that he had neglected the case. Then a prosecution is commenced against Dr. Murray in the county court. The opinion of the fishery inspector is that it originated in spite, because of Dr. Murray's action in laying the information against these people, and the fishery inspector advises that Dr. Murray should be defended by the department, and the department has acted upon his advice. Is there anything wrong or improper about that? Then we come down to the fact that an appeal is being taken, and counsel of course are necessary to argue that appeal. Now I would ask my hon. friend if he really thinks on reflection there is anything improper or wrong about it, and if he does not think that he is making a mountain out of a mole hill. I would not like to suggest anything improper, but it seems to me that my hon. friend is influenced by his political feeling against Dr. Murray and Mr. Hockin, and possibly against Mr. Fitzpatrick, in the charges he is making. Now it is incredible to me that in a county like the county of Pictou, you will find three men of such leading, standing, and repute——

Mr. MACDONALD. How do you know?

Mr. HAZEN. Because I am so informed. Mr. Fitzpatrick is a respectable member of the bar, and I am informed by the

officers in my department that they have no more faithful and zealous fishery inspector than Mr. Hockin. Now I think my hon. friend, before making charges of this kind against these three gentlemen, who are not here to answer for themselves, should have hesitated, because the charges are of a much more serious character than probably my hon. friend realizes. It seems to me, as my hon. friend states that he does not wish to make any reflection upon my conduct, that he is desirous of getting a slap at men down in his own constituency because of what has taken place in politics and for party reasons only. I ask my hon. friend in all sincerity if he thinks he is justified in making the statement against these gentlemen?

Mr. MACDONALD. I am not one of those who make statements against people that I cannot justify. I want to say that the point of the complaint against Mr. Hockin is this, that he knows the circumstances in regard to poaching in that river. I say that Mr. Murray was poaching in the river, and everybody in that community knew it, and knew that he had poached in other years. I say that, I know the community in which I live, and I know the district. I do not mind my hon. friend's little lecture to me in regard to my action in the matter, but I want to say that when he undertakes to tell me what professional ethics are, I have as high an appreciation of professional ethics as the hon. gentleman. I say that Mr Fitzpatrick, when he accepts a retainer from the Crown to act in a case, becomes subject to criticism. I do not know why the fact that he and I happen to be members of the bar should debar me from criticising his conduct. Mr. McKay, of New Glasgow, was retained to act before the magistrate to proceed against Dr. Murray, but Mr. Fitzpatrick would not allow him to ask any questions or to take any part in the matter at all. If Mr. Fitzpatrick had been willing to allow this gentleman to assist him in the case, no one could find fault, but he would not recognize him. Therefore, I say I have a right to criticise his conduct. My hon. friend need not put before me Mr. Hockin as a paragon of excellence. I know Mr. Hockin since I was a boy, I have nothing to say about his private character. I do say however that he is a strong partisan. Still, we did not dismiss him when we were in power, but the moment Mr. Hockin's friends got back into power a different line of conduct is pursued.

I have brought this matter to the attention of the minister for the purpose of showing, on a statement of facts that is not open to question, that the department today are employing three counsel down there and that the employment of two additional counsel is not in the interest of the suppression of illegal fishing in the county. There has arisen a situation in which there has been hard feeling aroused, difficulties have occurred and political strife has been brought about and in which the hon. gentleman has found counsel at the public expense for men who happen to be Conservatives while other men have to find their own counsel. In the meantime there is very little regard for the enforcement of the law. I do not know how many counsel my hon. friend will provide.

Mr. HAZEN. I might retain the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MACDONALD. I do not know that my hon. friend would retain me, and I do not think I could take a retainer from him under the law. Therefore, I am entirely disinterested in bringing this up. But, I regret that the minister has assumed charge of the cases of men about whom he does not know anything. His eulogy of Mr. Murray is most surprising. How the officials in his department could have told him about his high standing as a physician and all that kind of thing is ludicrous to me and it will be ludicrous to the people in the county to whom I send 'Hansard.' Mr. Hockin is all right in a good many ways, but he made a sudden jump when his friends got into power and when Dr. Murray wanted to hire a lawyer he wrote to the department and suggested that they should undertake that duty, and that the employment of these counsel is uncalled for. I want the minister not to take all he hears about these people as gospel and at least look into the matter of the employment of counsel in this way, because if this goes on it will go on ad infinitum.

Mr. LAW. Would the minister inform me if Mr. Hatfield fishery officer in Yarmouth county, has been dismissed?

Mr. HAZEN. Yes, he has.

Mr. LAW. On whose recommendation was he dismissed?

Mr. HAZEN. On the recommendation of a number of gentlemen in Yarmouth.

Mr. LAW. Has he had any investigation?

Mr. HAZEN. No. The feeling in the department was that, as Mr. Hatfield was 83 years of age, he was too old to properly discharge the duties of the office.

Mr. LAW. Would it not have been fair to Mr. Hatfield, who had performed his duties so well during all these years, to have given him an opportunity of defending himself?

Mr. HAZEN. The man is 83 years of age.

Mr. LAW. There are men who are 80 years of age who are smarter than some men of 40. He belongs to a long-lived race and he has been a most capable officer.

Mr. HAZEN. Our information about this gentleman is that he is not only 83 years of age, but that he is quite crippled with rheumatism and was unable to attend to the duties of the position.

Mr. LAW. Who is his successor?

Mr. HAZEN. Mr. James G. Doutrement.

Mr. LAW. On whose recommendation was Mr. Doutrement appointed?

Mr. HAZEN. He was appointed on the recommendation of a number of gentlemen in Yarmouth county.

Mr. LAW. What qualification has Mr. Doutrement for the position?

Mr. HAZEN. He has only been appointed temporarily, and if he does not fill the position satisfactorily he will not be continued.

Mr. LAW. If I move for the papers in connection with it, I suppose they will give the names of the gentlemen who recommended him?

Mr. HAZEN. Certainly; if the hon. gentleman moves for the papers they will be brought down.

Mr. LAW. I presume Mr. Doutrement was not appointed particularly because he was the Conservative candidate in two elections?

Mr. HAZEN. If that was the case it would give him a claim upon the party in case a vacancy should occur.

Mr. LAW. Without any other qualifications, as I understand?

Mr. HAZEN. The hon. gentleman does not need to understand anything of the sort. We will not appoint a man unless he is qualified, but if he is qualified the fact that he was twice the candidate of his party is nothing against him.

Mr. LAW. It is nothing against him, but I think that in filling a position of that kind it should not be very much in his favour.

Mr. GRAHAM. I would like a statement as to the actual condition of the treaty which is supposed to really exist between Canada and the United States with reference to the fisheries.

Mr. HAZEN. Does my hon. friend refer to the treaty relating to fisheries in waters contiguous to the international boundary?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. HAZEN. I can give him the information with regard to that at any time.

Mr. GRAHAM. There would be some discussion upon it.

Mr. HAZEN. Well, then, we will let the item stand until we come to that.

Mr. GRAHAM. Then, in reference to the first item, I presume it has to do with the dismissal of overseers and inspectors appointed by the late government. I am not going to defend the appointment of those officers or attack the dismissal of any gentleman, but I would like to point out that if it were possible for some understanding to be arrived at between the provinces and the Dominion by which this work and the regulations would be under the jurisdiction of one or the other, it would be greatly to the benefit of everybody. The minister may not be aware of it now, but if he happens to continue as minister, he will find out that political advantage is taken of the conditions as they at present exist. Fishermen on the lakes in Ontario especially will apply for an extension of the fishing season to the Dominion. The Dominion officers will be stiff and say: No, the request cannot be granted, while the provincial officers will go to the fishermen and say: We would be delighted to give you an extension but the Dominion will not allow us to do it. That leads to constant friction. That is one of the reasons why I presume the minister's predecessor found it necessary to have a staff of inspectors. He desired to get information as to whether these applications should be complied with and as to whether the regulations were properly enforced by the provincial governments. If some arrangement could be made by which the province, or the Dominion—I do not care which—would have absolute control of the regulations and their enforcement, it would relieve a very trying and irritating situation, and I have no doubt would be welcomed by both the Dominion and provincial authorities.

Mr. HAZEN. I think everybody who has given any thought to the question at all will agree with what my hon. friend (Mr. Graham) has said about the unsatisfactory condition of things as they at present exist. The authority apparently is divided between the two governments. If some arrangement could be made by which the control of the fisheries could be taken over by one government or the other, it would be very much in the interest of the fisheries, and it would promote the public interest generally.

Every one agrees about this, and it is not a party question by any means. But, in the past, it has been found impossible to work the matter out satisfactorily, and I am not prepared to say that even had I

had the time to consider it carefully and thoroughly I would have been more successful than my predecessors have been. Certain questions with regard to the jurisdiction of the provinces and the Dominion at the fisheries are being submitted to the courts in a stated case, and it may be that the decision given by the Privy Council will clarify the situation.

Mr. GRAHAM. The last one muddled it.

Mr. HAZEN. My hon. friend smiles at my anticipation that the decision of the Privy Council may clarify the situation, and, as he has pointed out, the last decision probably made it more cloudy than before. There were about forty fishery overseers in Ontario and the feeling was that they were not doing any good from the Dominion standpoint, and were duplicating the work done by the Ontario government officials, and so it was thought better to drop them and not appoint anybody in their places. The hon. gentleman suggested that if you had a government in Ottawa of a different political stripe from the government of the provinces there would be more difficulty, but I may say that in my short experience with the government of the province of Quebec which is of a different political stripe from the government in power here, I have had no difficulty whatever. Trouble perhaps may come in the future, but it certainly has not come yet. I think every one will agree that if some arrangement can be made for the administration of the fisheries from the one central authority it would be much in the public interest.

Oyster culture, $10,000.

Mr. MACDONALD. What about this?

Mr. HAZEN. This vote is to keep the public oyster beds in good condition, and is the same amount as last year. I find a memorandum here from Mr. Found:

For more than a year past negotiations have been going on with the governments of the maritime provinces looking to a modus vivendi which will enable the issue by the federal government of satisfactory leases of areas in which to carry on oyster cultivation, pending the settlement of the outstanding question of the fishery reference. New Brunswick and Nova Scotia agreed to the modus vivendi and it is hoped that Prince Edward Island will also agree and that before another year is over a start will be made by private enterprises to cultivate oyster areas now almost barren.

That memorandum was prepared some time ago, and since then we have introduced a Bill dealing with the matter.

To assist in the establishment, maintenance and inspection of cold storage for bait, the conservation and development of the deep sea fisheries, and to provide for better transportation facilities for fresh fish, $50,000.

Mr. HAZEN. We find that the fishermen throughout the country are taking greater advantage every day of the provision under which one-third of the express charges on fresh fish is being paid from the lower provinces to places in Ontario and the west. In view of the rapid increase in this business, I would ask the committee to amend the item by making it $65,000 instead of $50,000. I am told that the intention was to make it $60,000, but by a misprint it was made $50,000 in the estimates. I now propose to have it made $65,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not think you can increase the item in this way without the consent of His Royal Highness.

Mr. HAZEN. Is that the rule?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. HAZEN. I am much obliged to my hon. friend for the suggestion.

Mr. GRAHAM. You can pass the $50,000 in this item and then bring in a supplementary item for the $15,000.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I would ask that this item stand, with the understanding that we may discuss on it any matter which we please appertaining to the fisheries.

Mr. HAZEN. Very well.

Mr. McKENZIE. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) is interested in the question of the reduction works for dogfish, and I would ask that item to stand also.

Mr. GRAHAM. We are anxious to expedite the passage of these items, and I would ask that items 285 and 290 be allowed to stand with the understanding that there will be freedom of discussion.

Mr. HAZEN. That is satisfactory to me. I do not wish to have the discussion restricted especially to any particular item. I think there ought to be free and full discussion.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). A property was purchased last summer at Spry Bay, Halifax County, for the establishment of a lobster hatchery and the building which was on the property was torn down. In what condition is that matter now?

Mr. HAZEN. That matter is still under consideration; nothing has been done with regard to it.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Does not the minister propose to proceed with the lobster hatchery there?

Mr. HAZEN. The matter has not been finally decided, but I think it is very doubtful if anything will be done this season.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Why?

Mr. HAZEN. It is felt that there are other places in which the hatchery would be of more general use to the fisheries.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Have you paid for this property?

Mr. HAZEN. The property was paid for some time in August last.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). There does not seem to be any reason why you should not go on with it. However, I will inquire again about it. In connection with item 289 for the issuing of modus vivendi licenses, is it proposed to increase this license fee?

Mr. HAZEN. No.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). During the last election it was stated by Conservative candidates throughout the maritime provinces generally that the fee was too small altogether, and that it would be increased in the event of the Conservative party coming to power. It was the subject of an attack against the late government that the American fishing vessels should have had such privileges as they obtained under these fishing licenses for such a small amount.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Hazen, House adjourned at 12.30 a.m., Saturday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 18, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 149) respecting water in the Railway Belt and the Peace River block and land.—Mr. Rogers.

Bill (No. 145) to ratify and confirm certain Agreements between the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway Commission and the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Currie.

Bill (No. 146) respecting the Saskatchewan Central Railway Company.—Mr. Martin (Regina).

Bill (No. 147) for the relief of Isabella Helen Horncastle.—Mr. Clark (Red Deer).

Bill (No. 148) to incorporate International Guarantee Company.—Mr. McCraney.

HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS OF MONTREAL.

Hon. J. D. HAZEN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 150) respecting the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. HAZEN. This Bill is for the purpose of correcting a typographical error in the Act of 1904 by changing the word 'southern' to the word 'eastern' in the definition of the limits of the harbour of Montreal.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

BIRD ROCKS LIGHTHOUSE.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I beg to call the attention of the Minister of Marine (Mr. Hazen) to a serious accident which occurred recently at Birds Rock Lighthouse in the Gulf of St. Lawrence when the lightkeeper was drowned. Bird Rocks is a very dangerous spot and many accidents have happened in years past, this being the third lightkeeper, in my recollection, who has met with a violent death there. The body of the lightkeeper has been found and is now on Bird Rocks where his wife and his assistant are living in the lighthouse. The father of the young man who is an old elector of mine has written me to ask the Minister of Marine to send one of the government steamers to bring the body to the Magdalen Islands. The father is an experienced navigator and he says that one of the government steamers, especially the 'Montcalm,' could reach Bird Rocks at this season of the year without any difficulty. It would be a humane act on the part of the Minister if he could comply with the desire of the father of the deceased.

Mr. HAZEN. On Friday evening or on Saturday morning a telegram addressed to me was received at the department from the agent at Quebec, conveying the same request that my hon. friend has now made. I had that telegram handed over to my deputy minister with the direction to reply that if possible one of the government steamers would be sent to Bird Rocks for the purpose of removing the body of this young man to the place of burial. I have no doubt the matter has been attended to. It seems to have been a very sad accident. I was not aware that several other accidents of a similar character had taken place.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There were three in all.

Mr. HAZEN. It seems to me that something ought to be done, if possible, to pre-

vent such fatalities occurring. I think the matter referred to by my hon. friend has already been attended to, but I will communicate at once with the department and let him know.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Some years ago I wanted the Department of Public Works to re-establish a cable station at Bird Rocks to connect with the mainland and the Magdalen islands. It was found that the cable was always broken by the ice in winter. Then I changed my proposal and asked the government to establish a Marconi station at Bird Rocks. I understand there is a Marconi station at Grindstone island, but it has always been the opinion of the lighthouse keeper that it should be at Bird Rocks.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. TURGEON. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to an order of the House issued on the 22nd of January for papers relating to the dismissal of two fishery overseers in the county of Gloucester. Those papers have not yet reached me.

Mr. HAZEN. My attention was not called to the matter before, but I will make immediate inquiry, and if the return has not been brought down, I will see that it is brought down not later than to-morrow.

Mr. LEMIEUX. May I ask the Minister of Railways and Canals to bring down the papers concerning the dismissal of George Bourgoin, employed as statistician on the Lachine canal at Montreal. My motion for these papers in so far down on the order paper that it may be dropped, and I think a verbal request to my hon. friend will cause the papers to be brought down.

Mr. COCHRANE. I shall be very glad to bring them down.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 120) for the relief of Ethel May Stewart.—Mr. Clarke (Red Deer).

Bill (No. 122) for the relief of William Holloway Adams.—Mr. MacNutt.

Bill (No. 101) to incorporate the British Western Loan Company.—Mr. Martin (Regina).

SECOND READNGS.

Bill (No. 125) to incorporate the Western Dominion Railway Company.—Mr. Martin (Regina).

Bill (No. 126) to incorporate the Universal Eyesight Insurance Company.—Mr. McLean (Queens).

Bill (No. 127) to incorporate the Canadian Public Health Association.—Mr. Schaffner.

Bill (No. 128) to incorporate the Montreal Transcontinental Railway Company.—Mr. Coderre.

Bill (No. 129) respecting the Alberta, Peace River and Eastern Railway Company.—Mr. Chabot.

Bill (No. 130) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Currie.

Bill (No. 131) for the relief of Isobell Isaac.—Mr. MacNutt.

Bill (No. 132) respecting Mexican Interurban Electric Traction Company, Limited, and to change its name to Mexican Interurban Electric Railway Company, Limited. —Mr. Macdonell.

Bill (No. 133) respecting the Methodist Church.—Mr. Aikins.

Bill (No. 134) respecting the British Columbia and Dawson Railway Company.—Mr. Goodeve.

Bill (No. 135) respecting the Vancouver, Fraser Valley and Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Stevens.

Bill (No. 136) to incorporate the Prince Edward and Hastings Railway Company. —Mr. Hepburn.

Bill (No. 139) to incorporate the Ottawa and Lake McGregor Railway Company.—Mr. Devlin.

Bill (No. 141) to incorporate the Interprovincial Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Lesperance.

Bill (No. 142) for the relief of Alvena Bell Leaitch.—Mr. Macdonald.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterick.)

STE. ANNE DE BELLEVUE—DELIVERY OF LETTERS.

Mr. BOYER:

1. Did the Postmaster General receive, on February 2 last, a complaint from the firm of Daoust & Co., of Ste. Anne de Bellevue, informing him that two letters had been sent to them open, and that those letters, instead of being delivered in the evening had only been delivered the next morning?

2. If so, has the government special reasons for not replying to the complaint?

3. Is the government going to inquire into the state of the matter revealed, and will it provide a remedy?

4. Is the postmaster in this locality obliged to deliver postal matter on the same evening that he receives them, or is it allowable for him to deliver letters, &c., only on the next morning?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. The complaint in question does not appear to have been received at the Post Office Department.

2 & 3.—Answered by No. 1.

4.—This would depend upon the hour at which the mails reach Ste. Anne de Bellevue post office in the evening.

CANADIAN AGENCIES—APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. CARVELL:

What are the names and salaries of the officials appointed since October 1, 1911, at the following Canadian agencies: Liverpool, Glasgow, Paris, Commissioner's Office, and Boston, Mass.?

Mr. FOSTER. So far as the Department of Trade and Commerce is concerned, none have been appointed. Probably the question had better be allowed to stand to have an answer from the Minister of the Interior.

CENSUS OF SASKATCHEWAN.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina):

1. Has the census of the province of Saskatchewan been fully completed?
2. Has any detailed official information of the census of Saskatchewan been sent to any one in that province? If so, to whom was it sent?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. Yes.
2. The special report, issued February 29, was sent to every person who made a request for it.

MR. R. S. FAULKNER, OF STELLARTON, CONTRACTOR.

Mr. DAVIDSON:

1. In respect of what public works was R. S. Faulkner, of Stellarton, Pictou County, N.S., the contractor?
2. What was the contract price or total expenditure in each case?
3. In respect of each work, at what date did the work begin, at what date was the work completed, and when there was a contract, at what date was it stipulated that the work should be completed?
4. In respect to such work, how much per day was R. S. Faulkner paid, for how many days was he paid, and what was the total amount paid to him?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Construction of station building and freight shed at Granton, N.S. Contractors R. S. Faulkner and Jas. F. Falconer.
2. $1,130.
3. Work started April 25, 1905. Work was completed on June 16, 1905. Stipulated time for completion March 15, 1905, but the time was extended to June 30, 1905, by order in council.
4. Was not paid for by the day.

C. N. Q. RAILWAY—ROAD ON L'ILE BOURDON.

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. Has the Railway Commission refused to intervene and compel the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company to make and maintain on l'Ile Bourdon, between the bridges of Bout de l'Ile and Charlemagne, a road fit for carriages and macadamized as required?
2. Is the honourable Minister of Railways and Canals of the opinion that by virtue of the bargain concluded between his department and the said company, the latter is bound to make the works in question?
3. If so, has the department given notice to the said company of an order to carry out these works and comply with the wishes of the public in the matter, or will measures be soon taken to compel the company to fulfill such obligations?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. The matter referred to came before the Board of Railway Commissioners on February 22 last, and the application was refused on the ground that the Board had no jurisdiction to entertain the same.
2. In August, 1910, the Department of Justice advised that the construction of the highway across l'Ile Bourdon, between the bridges of Bout de l'Ile and Charlemagne was not contemplated by either contracting parties when the subsidy agreements were executed, therefore the company is not legally liable to build the high way referred to. There appears to be no grounds for adoption of any other opinion than that given by the Department of Justice.
3. Answered by No. 2.

C.P.R. IRRIGATION—SUPPLY OF WATER.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Has the government received a communication from the United Farmers of Alberta in regard to the supply of water for the Canadian Pacific Railway Irrigation tract east of Calgary?
2. Has the government issued the following guarantee with reference to the delivery of water to the Canadian Pacific Railway Irrigation system east of Calgary: 'That the Canadian government stands behind the settler, and sees to it that he gets an efficient supply of water for live-stock raising and irrigation'?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Yes.
2. No.

CANADA-FRANCE STEAMSHIP SERVICE.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

Has the contract for a steamship service between Canada and France been renewed with the Allan company? If so, for what term of years?

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). The contract for a steamship service between Canada and France has been renewed with the Allan Company, for a term of five years.

ALLEGED USE OF GOVERNMENT STEAMERS FOR POLITICAL PURPOSES.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. Has the Minister of Marine and Fisheries been informed that the government steamers

'William Joliffe' and 'Falcon,' connected with the fisheries protection service on the coast of British Columbia, are being used, as alleged, by the Conservative candidates in the north of British Columbia, for political purposes?

2. If so, has he taken any action in the matter?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. General statements have been made that these government steamers are being used by Conservative candidates in British Columbia for political purposes.

2. The complainants have been informed that no one was authorized to use the departmental steamers for electioneering purposes. The agent of the Marine and Fisheries Department at Victoria, B.C., was advised to the same effect.

The general instructions to the captains and other government employees distinctly lay down that no part is to be taken in politics.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all correspondence in the possession of the Postmaster General respecting the change of name of Broderick post office, in the province of Saskatchewan, to St. Aldwyn.—Mr. McCraney.

For a copy of all correspondence, negotiations, proposals in writing, and other papers and documents in the possession of the government of any department thereof, relating to reciprocity in trade with the United States, bearing date between January 1, 1890, and December 31, 1891.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a copy of all papers, telegrams, letters and order in council, respecting the purchase of a piece of ground from Mr. Pierre Bourgeois, for the construction of a public building at Napierville.—Mr. Lanctot.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, complaints and other documents relating to charges against Jas. W. Matheson, I.C.R. trackman at Meadowville, Pictou County, N.S., of the evidence taken and other proceedings of the investigation held on said charges, the reports thereon and of all representations in regard to the case from the Brotherhood of Trackmen.—Mr. Macdonald.

For a copy of all charges against A. M. Hatfield, fishery overseer for the county of Yarmouth, N.S., and of all letters, telegrams, and any other communications between the Minister of Marine and Fisheries or any officer of his department, and any other person, having reference to the same, in relation to the appointment of Mr. Hatfield's successor. —Mr. Law.

For a copy of all reports made by the inspector of agents for placing immigrants, both domestic servants and farm labourers, in Ontario and Quebec, during the years 1910 and 1911.—Mr. Sutherland.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT—POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. PELLETIER moved:

That the order for the third reading of Bill (No. 106,) an Act to amend the Civil Service Act be discharged and the Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole.

He said: When this Bill was in committee the other day we amended clause 4 by inserting the word 'preliminary.' The law clerk of the House has pointed out that in doing so we struck out the word 'qualifying' before examination, which was not the intention of the committee.

Motion agreed to, and House went again into committee on the Bill.

On section 4, qualifications of third-class clerks.

Mr. PELLETIER. I beg to move that the words 'preliminary or qualifying' be inserted before the word 'examination.'

Mr. BENNETT (Calgary). I certainly think that the provision of the section should be so extended as to provide for the case of graduates within the British Empire. As it now stands it merely allows advancement to those who are graduates of the Royal Military College or of any university in Canada. There are a large number of valuable civil servants that I know of in Canada who are graduates of English universities, some of Cambridge, some of Oxford, and from other leading universities of the world, and I think the privilege should be extended so as to cover the case of graduates in the Royal Military College or of any university in the British Empire. I cannot see why it should be otherwise.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Is there reciprocity in that?

Mr. BENNETT (Calgary). No, there is something better than reciprocity; there is something that concerns true imperialism.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). What is it?

Mr. BENNETT (Calgary). Let those who are graduates of the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, who are already in the civil service, and who desire promotion, obtain that promotion by extending this privilege to them.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). What I meant by reciprocity was whether the same privilege will be extended to graduates of Canadian universities in the English civil service.

Mr. BENNETT (Calgary). Practically it has been so. Members of our professions go over to England and all they have to do is to go through a very formal examination.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Does not my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett, Calgary) think that if our people have to go through a formal examination in England in law or in medicine the same thing should take place in Canada? I am not against giving the

privilege to any graduate from Great Britain, or any other part of the British Empire, but even in this country the same rule exactly exists as between the different provinces. There are no reciprocity degrees. Some few years ago a Bill was passed with this object of bringing about reciprocity in this respect, but the principle involved in Dr. Roddick's Bill was not acceded to by some of the provinces. My hon. friend, I am afraid, is opening up a much wider issue than he thinks. We all stand for the British Empire, but our home is Canada and we want to give first chance to our own people in Canada. In England Donald MacMaster, K.C., one of the ablest lawyers in this country, had to undergo an examination.

Mr. BENNETT (Calgary). Purely formal.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Well, let the same formal examination be prescribed for those who come from England, South Africa, Australia or New Zealand. This is a very serious matter. If we extend this privilege to the graduates of any university in the empire the same privilege must be extended to our own people in any part of the empire.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). I take exactly the view of this question that has been expressed by my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux). The first duty of this parliament, as I conceive, is towards Canada, and I think that in a matter of this kind we should not be called upon to give rights to Britain which Britain would not give to us. My hon. friend (Mr. Bennett, Calgary) is proposing, if I am not mistaken, what my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) would call a jack-handled preference. It is to reconcile myself with the hon. member for Brantford in this matter——

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). You are thinking of jack-rabbits.

Mr. BORDEN. I think he calls it a 'jug-handled' preference.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). Well, I am not particular about the term; it means the same thing. I think the position of the hon. member for Rouville is sound with regard to this question.

Mr. PELLETIER. The question raised by my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. Bennett) is one which deserves consideration, and it ought to be looked into, but I think my hon. friend will admit with me that we should not go into this matter on this section of the Civil Service Act. This Bill refers to the third class employees of the Post Office Department. The wording of the clause is that which is adopted by all the other departments If we were to adopt the principle which my hon. friend advocates, and advocates so well, we should make the change not only with reference to the third class employees of one department, but with reference to the employees of all the other departments. I think this will appeal to my hon. friend. For the moment, we are only passing a clause which says that no third class clerk shall be eligible for promotion for a higher class until he passes the qualifying examination, or unless he is a graduate of the Royal Military College, or of a university in Canada. Even if we were satisfied it is quite possible that he is right on the question—I would not like to make that provision in a clause which deals specially with one class in one department. Consequently, I would ask my hon. friend to allow this amendment to pass as it is. The question whether this ought or ought not to be put into the Civil Service Act is one well worthy of consideration, but we will have to consider it in connection with all the departments and not only in connection with one department.

Mr. LEMIEUX. This is a question which might well come before the next imperial conference, and I might say to my hon. friend (Mr Bennett, Calgary) that, sooner or later, he may have to exercise his faculties in the British House of Commons. There will be a good chance for him to advocate these imperial schemes which, for my part, I consider the nobler kind. He might at the same time, when he is in the British House of Commons, ask the British authorities of free trade doctrine to remove the cattle embargo and to amend the naturalization laws.

Mr. BENNETT (Calgary). Both the hon. members for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) and Red Deer (Mr. Clark) entirely misapprehend the point I make. The hon. member for Red Deer speaks of our first duty being to Canada, but allow me to remind him that the class of people who would be affected by this proposed change are those who are Canadians, because they are living in Canada and are British subjects by reason of their birth. My understanding is that when one comes and takes up his residence here and finds employment he is a Canadian. I would, therefore, ask the hon. member for Red Deer what he means when he refers to these gentlemen as not being Canadians. Perhaps he might be able, in his usual voluble style, to explain. This clause deals with those who are in the employ of the government of Canada already, and it merely provides for their promotion. To enter that employment they have to pass an examination. In the western provinces any person who desires to study law is allowed the status of a student if a graduate of

the Royal Military College, or any university in the United Kingdom or Canada. We in the western provinces provide that any one may become an articled student at law without examination if he is a graduate of a university in the United Kingdom or of a Canadian university. This young man referred to in this section 3 is already in the employment of the government; the time comes for his promotion and he may be promoted by reason of passing an examination or by reason of his academic attainments, these attainments having been acquired before he became a citizen of Canada.

I submit that any one who has passed the examination and obtained the degree of B.A. in any of the universities of the United Kingdom may just as well be spared that examination as one who is a Canadian and obtains his education in the Royal Military College or in a university in Canada. They are both Canadians, but by an accident of circumstances one got his education in the United Kingdom and the other in Canada; one came to Canada in his youth or was born in Canada and obtained his education here; the other came after he obtained his education in the United Kingdom, and they should be on the same footing because they are both Canadians. The position taken by the hon. member from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), and by the hon. member from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) was beside the question and had to deal with a case not now before the committee. As the Minister of Marine has suggested, a man born in Canada might have obtained his degree in Oxford or Cambridge, and I know of one particular case where under the Rhodes scholarship system a young man in western Canada so obtained his degree.

Mr. LEMIEUX. A young man who goes to Oxford as a Rhodes scholar must, before doing so, obtain his degree in Canada?

Mr. BENNETT (Calgary). That is not so. I know of two men personnally who did not obtain Canadian degrees. They got the Rhodes scholarship, one in the junior year and the other in the sophomore year.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I know three Rhodes scholars who went from Quebec and each had previously obtained his university degree.

Mr. BENNETT (Calgary). I know the rules very well and they do not have to obtain a degree here before getting the scholarship.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). As a matter of fact most of them do have their degrees before getting the Rhodes scholarship.

Mr. BENNETT (Calgary). Quite so, but it is not essential.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). My hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) referred to me as having in my usual voluble style referred to someone as not being a Canadian. A compliment from my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) on volubility of style, I rate extremely high, but my hon. friend seems not only to be voluble in his style of speech but defective in his style of hearing, because I never used the words he attributed to me. I never referred to any one not being a Canadian, as he will find when he reduces his volubility to reading in 'Hansard' what I actually said.

Mr. PELLETIER. I would ask my hon. friend from Red Deer not to forget my Bill.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). There is no fear of any one in this House forgetting either the hon. Minister or his Bill. To come to the Bill, as I was doing, I do not think my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) has touched the argument in this case. If I proceeded actually on his style of argument, I should think that a man who learned his economics in England should be allowed to introduce English goods free of duty because he was born in Canada. It is not the man we are dealing with in this case; it is the degree, it is the qualification. The question is as between a Canadian and an English qualification; the man is not in the question at all. I did not mention him; my hon. friend thought I did, but I did not say anything about the man.

Mr. BENNETT (Calgary). Did not the hon. gentleman say the first duty of this parliament was to legislate for Canadians?

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). I said the first duty of this parliament was to Canada. There is a very great difference between a Canadian and Canada. There may be some Canadians who would not make the distinction, but there is a great distinction between any given minority of Canadians and 'Canada'. I repeat that the first duty of this parliament is to Canada, and I don't think my hon. friend will disagree with me in that.

Mr. BENNETT (Calgary). We agree.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). The question is as between degrees and I think we are on safe ground in dealing out to a British degree exactly the consideration which Britain gives to a Canadian degree.

Amendment agreed to.

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

QUEBEC BOUNDARIES EXTENSION.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to extend the limits of the province of Quebec so that the boundaries thereof shall include, in addition to the present territory of the said province, the territory bounded and described as follows:—Commencing at the point at the mouth of East Main river where it empties into James bay, the said point being the western termination of the northern boundary of the province of Quebec as established by virtue of chapter 3 of the statutes of 1898, intituled: 'An Act respecting the Northwestern, Northern and Northeastern Boundaries of the Province of Quebec,' thence northerly and easterly along the shores of Hudson bay and Hudson strait; thence southerly, easterly and northerly along the shore of Ungava bay and the shore of the said strait; thence easterly along the shore of the said strait to the boundary of the territory under the jurisdiction of Newfoundland; thence southeasterly along the westerly boundary of the said last mentioned territory to the middle of Bay du Rigolet or Hamilton inlet; thence westerly along the northern boundary of the province of Quebec as established by the said Act to the place of commencement.

Mr. BORDEN. I have an amendment to offer, and I might mention it now. This resolution is founded on the description contained in the resolution of 1908. It has been prepared by the technical officers: the Dominion Geographer and the Dominion Astronomer, and it is, I believe, in proper form with one exception. That is to say: my right hon. friend will find in the 11th line the words 'under the jurisdiction of Newfoundland.' There is a question about 'de facto' and 'de jure' jurisdiction at present. My right hon. friend will remember that for some time past there has been an endeavour to have a decision given by the judicial committee of the Privy Council upon a stated case which has not been heard yet, nor I think agreed to. In the meantime, I think it would be advisable to strike out the words 'under the jurisdiction of Newfoundland' and substitute for them 'over which the Island of Newfoundland has lawful jurisdiction.' I think it would be desirable to distinguish between the 'de facto' jurisdiction and the 'de jure' authority.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That would improve the Bill but perhaps it would be better to say: 'May have lawful jurisdiction.'

Mr. BORDEN. Perhaps that is a little vague.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It may be too vague for a statute.

Mr. BORDEN. The word 'lawful' would preserve all our rights.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The question will probably soon be decided by the Privy Council. It is true that some years ago a test case was prepared by the Department of Justice for submission to that court, and I do not know for what reason it was not submitted; but I am informed by the Attorney General of Quebec, Sir Lomer Gouin, that proceedings have been taken against some of the poachers who for some years have had so-called authority from Newfoundland to cut timber in the district which is supposed to pertain to the province of Quebec and in some parts of Ungava. When this resolution is passed and Ungava is ceded to Quebec, I am quite sure that the provincial authorities will see that the jurisdiction of both governments is clearly established by the Privy Council. May I ask the right hon. the Prime Minister if he has communicated with the government of Quebec as regards the exact territory which it is proposed to add to the province of Quebec? I understand that the Prime Minister of Quebec has been quite willing to accept the territory of Ungava, but he claims that not only the mainland but also the islands bordering on Ungava, should be given to Quebec; and I would like to know from the right hon. gentleman if the islands will be included in the territory to be ceded to that province.

Mr. BORDEN. No, they will not. There was a question in regard to the islands in relation to the three provinces to which territory was added—Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec. We determined not to include the islands for the present. One reason was the difficulty of giving a description of the islands adjacent to those territories which would be sufficiently definite. Then, the islands may be necessary for Dominion purposes in connection with navigation and defence.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Will my right hon. friend kindly inform the House what is the population of Ungava—Indians, Esquimaux and white men—if he has the information at hand?

Mr. BORDEN. I have not the information before me at this moment, but I will give it to my hon. friend on the second reading of the Bill.

Resolution reported, read the first and the second time and agreed to.

Mr. BORDEN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 151) to extend the boundaries of the province of Quebec.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ONTARIO BOUNDARIES EXTENSION.

The following resolution was considered in committee, reported, read the first and second time and agreed to:

Resolved, that it is expedient to extend the limits of the province of Ontario so that the boundaries thereof shall include, in addition to the present territory of the said province, the territory bounded and described as follows:—Commencing at the most northerly point of the westerly boundary of the province of Ontario as determined by the Canada (Ontario) Boundary Act, 1889, chapter 28 of the statutes of 1889 of the United Kingdom (the said westerly boundary being the easterly boundary of the province of Manitoba); thence continuing due north along the same meridian to the intersection thereof with the centre of the road allowance on the twelfth base line of the system of Dominion land surveys; thence northeasterly in a right line to the most eastern point of Island lake, as shown in approximate latitude 53° 30′ and longitude 93° 40′ on the railway map of the Dominion of Canada, published, on the scale of thirty-five miles to one inch, in the year one thousand nine hundred and eight, by the authority of the Minister of the Interior; thence northeasterly in a right line to the point where the eighty-ninth meridian of west longitude intersects the southern shore of Hudson bay; thence easterly and southerly following the shore of the said bay to the point where the northerly boundary of the province of Ontario, as established under the said Act, intersects the shore of James bay; thence westward along the said boundary, as established by the said Act, to the place of commencement.—Mr. Borden.

Mr. BORDEN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 152) to extend the boundaries of the province of Ontario.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. HAZEN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 140) to amend the Fisheries Act.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Will the minister be kind enough to explain this Bill?

Mr. HAZEN. The measure was explained upon its being introduced on Thursday. My hon. friend (Mr. Sinclair) was, I think absent on that occasion, but it will only take a few moments to again explain the Bill. Owing to the uncertainty as to the question of fishery rights in tidal waters, following the Privy Council decision of 1898, the Department of Marine and Fisheries discontinued the granting of new leases of areas on which to carry on oyster culture and cultivation, and while some of the provinces at first arranged to take up the matter, as it was felt that leases of a satisfactory nature could not be given by the provinces without the consent of the Dominion, it was dropped and things were drifting on in this way up to two years ago when the Inspector of Fisheries took up the question of a modus vivendi with the maritime provinces, under which this department would issue leases pending the settlement of the outstanding question of fishery rights, and without prejudice to the claims of the provinces in any way. Nova Scotia and New Brunswick agreed to this modus vivendi, although up to the present time the government of the latter province has not signed it, and of late I think there has been a disposition on its part not to do so; but Prince Edward Island, after first expressing anxiety to enter into such an arrangement, finally declined to do so, and the premier of the province, Mr. Matheson, who has been in Ottawa for some weeks past, states that the local government is not prepared to enter into any arrangement which would hand over rights which it considers it possesses; but on the other hand is anxious to itself issue lease on the policy that it is in a position to place the industry on a flourishing basis. The question has been taken up with the Department of Justice, and the deputy minister of that department advises the desirability of amending the Fisheries Act, to enable a suitable agreement to be entered into with the province, and states that such an agreement would not in any way prejudice or affect the questions now pending, looking to a decision regarding fishery rights. The matter is important, because as my hon. friend knows the oyster industry in the lower provinces has been falling off year after year. If the hon. gentleman will look at the report of the oyster fisheries on the Atlantic coast prepared by Mr. Wm. A. Found, the Inspector of Fisheries, and published in 1910, he will find a table at page 23 which shows the following state of affairs so far as the oyster industry is concerned: The oyster fishery some years ago was one of very great importance. We find, for instance, that in the year 1890 54,926 barrels of oysters were produced in the three lower provinces. The year before that, the quantity was 61,549 barrels. From that time down to the present there has been a continuous falling off in the production year by year until in 1910-11, the last year for which I have statistics, there were only 27,005 barrels of oysters produced in those provinces, of which 14,045 barrels were produced in New Brunswick, 11,264 barrels in Prince Edward Island, and only 1,696 barrels in Nova Scotia. This discloses a very alarming state of affairs, and it is perfectly clear that unless something is done the oyster fishery will become an industry entirely of the past. There is every opportunity in the maritime provinces for a very large production of oysters. The natural producing beds are situated about as follows: In New Brunswick 5,000 acres, in Prince Edward Island 4,300

acres, and in Nova Scotia 1,250 acres. The area that might be made to produce oysters has been variously estimated at from 1,000,000 to 3,000,000 acres. Hon. gentlemen know that oyster culture is now carried on on the Atlantic coast of the United States to such a large extent that it yields approximately $15,000,000 per annum, though oysters sell for from one quarter to one-third the price they do at the Canadian beds. Under artificial culture, oyster beds would yield about 250 bushels per acre per annum, and even as high as 500 bushels per acre might be obtained. Unless oyster culture is taken up in an intelligent way the Canadian oyster fishery must soon be practically wiped out. The regulations have become more and more restrictive, until at the present time fishing is not allowed to begin until October 1 so that it usually lasts about four weeks each season, and as the number of oysters is being year by year reduced, the quantity of spat is being proportionately minimized, so that the beds will have less and less chance of being seeded. When oyster culture is taken up the regulations will have to be so arranged as to enable it to be carried on to the best advantage. The department, without the consent of the provinces, was unable to do anything because in view of the condition of the fishery laws at the present time, parties could not accept leases from us unless those leases had been approved of by the provinces concerned. Under these circumstances it has been thought better to pass this law empowering the government of Canada to grant permission to the provinces to make leases of these oyster areas, under rules and regulations and under terms and conditions to be determined upon by the Department of Marine and Fisheries and the different provincial governments. If that is done it is believed that these oyster areas, which are not now yielding, can be leased in blocks of from five to ten acres, as the case may be. The result will be that the person who leases areas will replant the beds, and we hope there may be an increased production in this industry which is such a desirable one to perpetuate and develop. The Bill simply authorizes the Governor in Council, under terms and conditions that may be agreed upon, to empower the provinces to grant leases of these oyster beds.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I am very much obliged to the minister for the very interesting account he has given us of the purposes of the Bill. My own view is that it will be much better to leave the management of the oyster industry in the hands of the Dominion government, and that is the view held by the people of Nova Scotia generally. The other provinces are more interested in this fishery, as they have larger areas capable of cultivating than have the people of Nova Scotia. In Nova Scotia we have no Minister of Fisheries, and no officers to look after these matters; but there is no doubt at all in my mind that so far as the maritime provinces are concerned it would be much better for the industry and for everybody else concerned, if the Dominion government should continue to take charge of the oyster industry. I presume from what the minister has said that it will not be compulsory on the part of any government to accept the management of the oyster industry from the Dominion unless they wish to do so. It will still be open, I presume, for the province of Nova Scotia to leave the conduct of the oyster industry in the hands of the federal government, as has been the case in the past, should the province wish to do so. I trust if that should be done, the minister will take an interest in this important question, and carry out such a policy as will have the effect of conserving the oyster industry.

Mr. HAZEN. I am very glad to hear the hon. gentleman's views because they entirely concur with my own. I think without doubt it is more in the interest of the oyster industry that it should be managed by the Department of Marine and Fisheries at Ottawa. This Bill is simply introduced to meet a difficulty which faces us in the case of Prince Edward Island, and I fear also in the case of New Brunswick. Nova Scotia has, however, consented to our carrying on the management of the industry in that province, and we are prepared to have the oyster areas delimited and lease them to certain people under the regulations to be established. But there is no intention of throwing any burden in connection with this matter on the provincial governments. To my mind the other governments are making a mistake which will involve them in a certain amount of expenditure in the way of stocking and delimiting the beds, and in other respects. However, that is a matter for the provinces themselves to decide. If Nova Scotia is still willing to agree to the modus vivendi, we are prepared to go ahead and do our share.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). In the county I have the honour to represent there is some business done in the cultivation of oysters and this industry is of considerable importance to a couple of the districts there. On that account I am emboldened to say, I think it would be a mistake to transfer the cultivation of the oyster to the provincial government. As my hon. friend

from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) pointed out, they have not the machinery down there for the cultivation of the oyster, and I fear if the whole thing is transferred to the province, the result may be ultimately the entire neglect of this industry. As it is, there has been a serious falling off. I think that the department here should devote a little more attention to the matter of oyster cultivation. The beds in my county, to which I refer, are in Tracadie harbour. I have asked the department to have some cultivation done there; and I take this opportunity of calling the attention of the minister to this place. It was proposed, I think, last year, that Mr. Kemp should go down and do some work there, as he did fifteen years ago, but owing to the fact that he was engaged in Prince Edward Island, it was impossible for him to go. I had good reason to expect, however, that this matter would receive attention at an early date and I hope that the assurances given will be borne in mind by the present minister.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.). I understood that under this proposed arrangement, the Dominion government would still retain the management and regulation of the fisheries and the local government would have the power to grant leases and receive the rents from those leases.

Mr. HAZEN. As in practically all fisheries, we make the regulations.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.). And the local government has the rents——

Mr. HAZEN. Well, the effect would be that we would allow the local government subject to conditions which may be agreed upon, to grant the leases and to get the benefit of what revenues there may be. I do not expect that there will be a large revenue. The license fee is merely nominal, a dollar or two an acre. These licenses would be controlled by the commissioner. But I think that there is no question that under the law, the power to regulate in relation to close seasons and so on, is vested in the Dominion government. Even where it has been decided, as in the case of the rivers, where the provinces are the riparian proprietors, that they have the rights to lease those rivers to anglers and to collect the fees, yet the regulations regarding the close season and all that sort of thing are made here at Ottawa.

Mr HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.). And enforced by the officers of this government?

Mr. HAZEN. Yes.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I assume that the minister intends to make appropriations for the promotion of the oyster business. I understand that in Nova Scotia, assuming that these beds are left under the control of the federal government, something will be done. But if in Prince Edward Island they do not agree to leave the beds under control of the federal government, will the minister spend money to assist the oyster propagation there?

Mr. HAZEN. Under the Bill, we will not spend money anywhere in oyster propagation. The proposition is, that worn-out bottoms, capable of producing oysters, but now sterile, will be leased to private individuals and these private individuals will practically farm below the sea as the farmers do in the land. They will lease these areas, plant them, and reap the profits.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Inverness). Will the local government have the right to determine the length of time?

Mr. HAZEN. Under the Bill everything is subject to terms and conditions that may be agreed upon between the two provinces, and that will be a matter of agreement having regard to conditions that are desirable.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read a second time, and the House went into committee thereon.

Mr. JAMESON. If the provinces avail themselves of the benefit of this measure, will that mean that the Dominion government will abandon the work it has been carrying on recently, in connection with oyster culture? An officer of the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Hazen) department has been doing work in the different parts of the maritime provinces in this connection. For the last few years, I believe he has been operating in Prince Edward Island. Some years ago, this expert of the department, Mr. Kemp, was in the neighbourhood of my own riding, and planted some oysters in the Annapolis river at Goat Island. I have not been able to get a report on that experiment to learn whether it turned out satisfactorily or whether it was a failure. Is it proposed to abandon work of this character? Or is this work to go on and are we to have reports of the progress made?

Mr. HAZEN. We must be able to get reports in the department. If the hon. gentleman will let me know what report he desires, I will expedite the furnishing of it. Mr. Kemp is now in Ottawa, I believe. There must be reports on file, I assume, though, as my attention has not been called to the matter, I cannot say that I have seen those reports.

Mr. JAMESON. No, there is no report.

Mr. HAZEN. Then I should think it would be desirable that my hon. friend

should call for a report, and I will be glad to have it furnished. Even though this work is being carried on by arrangement with the provinces, as undoubtedly it will be in Prince Edward Island, and maybe in other provinces, I think that from the national standpoint, and having in view the importance of this matter, it is only right and proper that the department should continue, as far as it can, to assist in the development of the industry by placing the services of its expert in oyster culture at the disposal of any province to assist that province by advice and consultation. If the government here are to carry on the work then, in addition to the leasing of these areas, it might be well for us also to carry on experimental work to furnish object lessons to those leasing areas from the government as to the best methods of oyster culture. I do not see why we should cease our work here even although under this Bill we enable the provinces to extend their work.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

AID TO AGRICULTURE.

Bill (No. 100) for the aid and encouragement of agriculture—Mr. Burrell—read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

On section 2—annual grant to encourage agriculture,

Mr. PUGSLEY. It seems to me that this clause is fairly subject to criticism in that it proposes to leave to the Governor in Council very wide discretion as to the granting of subsidies. A subsidy may be granted to one province which is not in proportion to its population or needs. Subsidies granted to provinces ought to be based upon some principle, as nearly as possible on the principle to be found in the British North America Act. If this Bill passes, it will give the Governor in Council absolute discretion, without consulting parliament, to do what the Governor in Council pleases with the money which may be voted for this purpose. I do not know whether it is intended that when the estimates are brought down a separate amount should be voted for each province or a lump sum for the whole Dominion to be used at the pleasure of the Minister of Agriculture. Perhaps my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture might enlighten the committee as to what is intended in that respect.

Mr. BURRELL. There is absolutely no desire on the part of the government to divide the money in any way except what is absolutely fair and equitable. I stated in introducing the Bill that the money would be granted according to the population of the various provinces, and I think there would be no objection to bringing down the supplementary estimates divided as they would be according to the populations of the various provinces.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Well, why should that not be provided in the Bill?

Mr. BURRELL. I do not see why.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a wrong principle. If the Minister of Public Works were to come down with a Bill providing that moneys appropriated to public works might be divided in the discretion of the Governor in Council we would all be shocked. It is true we have the statement of my hon. friend, and I have no doubt that the intimation he has given will be carried out in good faith, but parliament is passing a law which presumably is to remain permanently upon the statute-book, and I think we ought to recognize the principle upon which subsidies are to be given namely, in proportion to the population of the different provinces.

Mr. HAZEN. I have no doubt that the practical working out of this will result in the amount voted by parliament being apportioned practically in proportion to the population of the different provinces, but I do not think parliament should lay down a hard and fast rule that that should be the case. There may be years when one province will need for agricultural purposes more than another. Regard must be had to the conditions in the different provinces. It would be better to leave it as it is, allowing some small measure of discretion with the Governor in Council that he may have regard to the different conditions. My hon. friend will see that there should be some elasticity and a certain amount of discretion although the probable result will be that the provinces will all get their fair share.

Mr. GRAHAM. Of course that could all be done under a special Act. When the estimates are brought down and passed they become a statute of the Dominion of Canada, and you can give aid to any province for any purposes for anything within the constitution. This is a general principle laid down providing for an amount of money to be expended annually and there should be some basis as to how the money will be divided. To put it on a sordid ground, it is possible that in one province, where a provincial election may be taking place, the government might intimate, as certain gentlemen did in a riding recently, that if the people want a lot of money expended in that province, they had better put in a certain party. In a riding recently they were told that if they wanted a lot of money spent on agriculture it would be

well for them to vote for a certain candidate. That is what was said by a very prominent member of this House.

Mr. HAZEN. I have heard that statement frequently in the last fifteen years.

Mr. HENDERSON. Very frequently.

Mr. GRAHAM. The hon. gentleman seems to want to hang on to it. With that experience, there should be some standard established when a general principle is being laid down. Special circumstances can be met, by special legislation, and special estimates, as they arise. But, this is for the distribution of an amount to be voted annually and the government are asking us to place in their hands the sayso of where this money will go without any regard to the population of the different provinces.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It may not go to a province at all; it may go beyond a province.

Mr. GRAHAM. This Act, unfortunately, says it shall be confined to the provinces. If we are going to hand this over to a department of the government we shall lay down the general principle upon which the division shall be made. I say this all the more strongly coming from the province of Ontario which has the largest population, and I think ought to have some consideration, particularly when the government had such a large support from that province.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The statement of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen), which is quite at variance with the statement of my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell), shows the necessity for having some provision in this Bill. The Minister of Agriculture made the statement, as if it were the settled policy of the government, that whatever money as voted should be distributed among the different provinces in proportion to population. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, having an eye perhaps to the condition of affairs suggested by my hon. friend on my right (Mr. Graham), says: Oh, it will not do to declare that it shall be distributed according to population because we must have some discretion; there must be a certain leeway left to us; we must be allowed to pick out the different provinces, and to say how much money shall be given to each; circumstances may arise which might make it desirable for the Governor in Council to give larger proportion to one province than to another. That shows that the government has not settled upon its policy. The Minister of Agriculture, with the very best intentions might be outvoted by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries when the matter comes before council. It is proposed to increase the subsidies to the different provinces. That is the basis of the provision, and nothing else. Section 2 says:

> The Governor in Council may grant . . . to any province, for the encouragement of agriculture, a subsidy not exceeding such sum as may in such year be voted by parliament for that purpose.

The Fathers of Confederation, having had in mind what would be the necessity of the different provinces, what they would require for education, roads, bridges, and other provincial purposes, felt that, in order to guard against dissatisfaction in the future, in order to guard against difficulties as between the different provinces and in order to prevent the spectacle of the provinces being obliged to come to the federal treasury——

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). If my hon. friend is going to dwell on the Fathers of Confederation, probably we had better take lunch first.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I rather think so too.

At one o'clock House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Before the recess, when the Minister of Trade and Commerce seemed to think that the principles of the Fathers of Confederation should be subordinated to his desire to get an early luncheon, I was proceeding to speak of the agreement of confederation, with regard to the subsidies, and I showed, I think, that it was considered in the highest degree desirable that the provinces should know exactly what subsidies they were going to receive, and that the allowance to the provinces should be made upon a fixed and definite basis, so that the people of any one province would not feel that they were in any way subject to control by or dependent upon the generosity of the federal government. The idea was to make them in every possible respect independent of the federal authorities. That was the same plan which was adopted as the result of the interprovincial conference in 1906. The governments of the different provinces met together at the request of the federal government and increases were made to all the provinces, but they were made upon a fixed and definite principle. It is now proposed to do by this Bill, what the government asked parliament to do in reference to the Highways Act, that is: to vote subsidies to the different provinces, but

to leave it in the discretion of the Governor in Council as to how those moneys would be apportioned. We know very well that one of the most important subjects with which the governments of the provinces have to deal is the subject of agriculture. All the provinces give aid for the encouragement of agriculture, and by this Bill it is proposed to add to the subsidies of the provinces sums to be devoted to this special object. I submit that in the interests of all the provinces, in the interests of the whole people of Canada, this Bill should provide that these additional subsidies should be granted upon a fixed and definite principle. The Minister of Agriculture admitted that was right and he said it was intended to apportion these amounts according to population. But that the government has not any definite policy upon the subject, is evident from the remarks of the Minister of Marine, who apparently took distinct issue with the Minister of Agriculture and said that there might be circumstances which would render it desirable not to grant the aid according to population, but to leave it to the discretion of the Governor in Council. In the absence of any definite statement from the Prime Minister, that shows the government has no definite policy upon this subject. I submit that the principle in this Bill is most objectionable. It was bad enough to do this sort of thing in respect to the highways, and the only excuse the Prime Minister gave for that was that the Bill had been drawn in a hurry and they had not had time to work out the details. Let me ask the Minister of Agriculture if that is the excuse in this case. Has there been no opportunity to work out the details of this measure, so that it is necessary to come to Parliament with this skeleton of a Bill and ask Parliament, with respect to these moneys for the promotion of agriculture, to give to the Governor in Council an absolutely free hand to deal with these grants just as they please? I can hardly imagine a case arising where there would be any difficulty if the Bill provided that these subsidies be given to the different provinces according to the population of each. All the provinces of Canada are agricultural provinces; they are equally interested in the matter of agriculture, they are all spending large sums of money for the encouragement of agriculture. Therefore, I cannot imagine that any possible difficulty will arise if the government should amend this Bill so as to provide that these subsidies should be given just as are subsidies provided by the British North America Act, on the basis of the population of each province. This Bill purposes yielding to the Governor in Council that power over the expenditure of money which parliament has always been jealous of retaining. In the estimates there are almost thousands of items in respect to which parliament is asked to give its approval or disapproval for all kinds of public works which are specified in detail, but in this case, it is proposed simply to pass the Bill in blanket form, giving to the Governor in Council, which means the Minister of Agriculture, the right to be generous to one province and niggardly to another, and to depart from the principles laid down in the British North America Act.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I would certainly not oppose any grant being made to any of the provinces provided it is specifically mentioned how these grants are to be apportioned. As the Bill is drawn and presented to us, I see nothing to indicate how the policy set forth in it will be given effect to. In Quebec we have several agricultural schools, one of which is the great institution known as the Macdonald college at Ste. Anne de Bellevue. That college fortunately does not require much help because through the generosity of its founder, Sir William Macdonald, it is quite up to date and well equipped. In fact, I do do not think there is to be found on this continent or even in Europe any agricultural college which can be compared to the Macdonald college. In Quebec, we have also agricultural schools at Oka, at Ste. Anne's, Kamouraska, and L'Assomption and no doubt these colleges would require from the government very substantial help. Does the government intend, under this legislation, to give aid to such provincial agricultural schools? We also have in practically each of the counties of Quebec an agricultural society which is assisted by the government by sending lecturers and publishing a paper which is freely distributed to the members of the society. Will these societies get assistance? We are told in vague terms that the government intends to help agriculture in the various provinces, but let me ask if that help will be given according to the population of each province? I would be obliged to the Minister of Agriculture if he would give more information to the House on those subjects. I am certainly not opposed to grants for agriculture being made by this government. I have always held that the provinces did not receive at the time of confederation their fair share of the public moneys, and in that sense I am a provincialist. I believe that in the present instance an interprovincial conference should be summoned and probably some means could be devised for an equitable distribution of this money, so that it may not be left at the mercy of one minister. Of course, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Burrell) is a friend of agriculture, and no doubt he does not primarily intend it, but he will probably be encouraged at

election times to discriminate as between one province which favours the government and another province which does not. My hon. friend is full of good intentions, I know; but let us make it clear in this legislation that there shall be no discrimination but that all the provinces shall be treated alike, and that the grants shall be really in the interest of the farmers and not in the interest of one political party.

Mr. BURRELL. There seems to be some rather strange misconception in regard to this Bill. I am almost led to think that the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) and the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) were not in the House when I asked leave to introduce the Bill, for I took particular pains to state accurately and clearly what was the purport of the measure and what were the lines on which the government were going to proceed. I know that my hon. friend from St. John has a very fertile and expansive mind, and he has probably put into his remarks some statements in regard to which he was not very serious. He said that it was to be left to the Governor in Council to apportion the money among the different provinces. What the Bill refers to the Governor in Council is not the allotment of the money, but to devise the ways in which the respective amounts shall be expended, so as to ensure their being expended on agriculture and in such a way as not to induce the provinces to knock off their own agricultural grants, but rather to stimulate them along those lines. This is done because we had not time to formulate an exact policy under which we could spend this money ourselves, and in order to implement the promise of the leader of the government to give some aid to agriculture this year. I am perfectly in sympathy with what the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) says in regard to the work done by Macdonald College and other educational institutions, and I believe the money which this parliament may vote for agriculture would be well expended if devoted to the objects aimed at by these institutions. I might point out that in the province of Ontario, of about half a million dollars per year which the provincial government spends on agriculture, nearly 30 per cent is spent on agricultural education; and in Nova Scotia nearly 40 per cent of the money spent by the provincial government on agriculture is spent on agricultural education. The Dominion government would be amply justified in helping the provinces along these lines. But to relieve the mind of my hon. friend from St. John, I may say that when the votes are brought down, they will be divided among the different provinces according to population, so that each province will know exactly what proportion will be allotted to it. Perhaps I may be allowed to quote the closing lines of the remarks I made in introducing the Bill, and which will make this quite clear:

> The principle upon which grants will be apportioned will be that of division based on population, the census of 1911 governing. The government has given a good deal of consideration to this phase of the matter, and has arrived at the conclusion that the population basis is one which is open to the fewest objections. . . I may add that there is no desire in this matter to favour this or that of the various provincial governments. We recognize that in every province a government has been placed there by the people, and I am voicing the sentiments of the Prime Minister and his colleagues in saying that the sole purport of this measure is to do what the title declares it is designed for, viz.: to aid and encourage agriculture.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Would that include aid to annual exhibitions?

Mr. BURRELL. It would be done in any way, upon agreement between the provincial governments and the Minister of Agriculture, so long as it will assist in agricultural development. These details must be left to this government, which is giving a grant which is rather unusual. The hon. member for St. John intimated that there was some difference of opinion in the government on this matter. I do not think so. What the Minister of Marine said was that owing to natural conditions of an extraordinary character, it might be advisable in one year to spend more in one province than in another. We can all understand that; but this year at any rate we do not propose to take that into consideration. There is going to be a straight division according to population.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What about next year?

Mr. BURRELL. In introducing this Bill I pointed out that it was more or less of a temporary measure. The idea of the government was to work out this year a thorough knowledge of agricultural conditions in the whole country. The British North America Act has slightly confused the jurisdiction as between the provinces and the Dominion as to agriculture. We would prefer to do this work ourselves, but we want to work out the scheme this year on lines that will be fair and that will be approved by the provinces.

Mr. LEMIEUX. When an amount will be put in the estimates in accordance with this Bill, will that amount invariably apply to all the provinces, or will the government be in a position one year to exclude three or four provinces, and in another year to exclude others, or will

any amount put in the estimates be applied to all the provinces?

Mr. BORDEN. Not one dollar can be spent under this Bill until it has been voted by parliament, and parliament has to be satisfied.

Mr. KNOWLES. Can the expenditure be withheld without the consent of the province? Suppose a certain amount is voted to a province and the province and the Dominion government do not agree, could it be withheld at the dictation of this government?

Mr. BORDEN. If the province could not satisfy the government that the amount would be expended on agriculture, it would not be proper for the government to hand it over.

Mr. KNOWLES. Apart from that there would be no conflict?

Mr. BORDEN. No.

Mr. CARVELL. Would it not be very much better to have the distribution provided for in the Bill? Of course, we will all take the word of the present Minister of Agriculture, that if he is Minister of Agriculture next year, he will divide the money among the provinces according to population; but there might be a condition of things under which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would feel that it would not be in the interest of the Dominion to expend this money according to population. That is what we on this side of the House fear. Therefore, I think it would be better for the minister to frame an amendment providing that the total amount to be divided under this Act must be divided among the provinces pro rata, allowing this government to exercise some control as to the manner in which it should be expended under proper arrangements with the provincial governments.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not at all object to the provisions of section 3, which provides for the making of an agreement between the federal and the provincial governments. I think that is very proper, but it does seem to me that my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture has not shown any reason for not putting in the Bill a provision that the moneys shall be divided according to the population of the different provinces. My hon. friend (Mr. Burrell) says that this year the government are experimenting in order to ascertain whether it is desirable to expend the moneys themselves instead of through the provincial government, but I would remind the hon. gentleman that if that decision should be come to, they will have to apply to parliament to amend this Bill because the measure provides for subsidies to the provinces. Therefore, before the Dominion government could take charge of the expenditure to be made under this Bill, the Bill would have to be amended.

Mr. BORDEN. Why?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Because section 2 provides:

> The Governor in Council may, in any year, and upon such terms and subject to such conditions as are prescribed by order in council, grant to any province, for the encouragement of agriculture, a subsidy not exceeding such sum as may in such year be voted by parliament for that purpose.

Now, I take it, Mr. Chairman, that means the granting of a money subsidy to the governments of the different provinces. It would not be making a grant to a province if the government themselves expended the money by giving aid to exhibitions or giving aid to agricultural colleges; that would not be in accordance with the terms of this Bill. The Bill provides and provides only, for a subsidy to different provinces. The expression subsidy to a province is well understood. We had it first in the British North America Act, and we have had it in all the Acts in amendment to the British North America Act, which have been passed since that time. I am going to suggest an amendment which I think my hon. friend (Mr. Burrell) would have inserted in the Bill if he had had time to think the matter over before introducing the measure. I will move that the following be added as a subsection to section 2:

> All moneys voted in any year, if expended under this Act shall be apportioned among, and paid to, the governments of the different provinces of the Dominion according to the respective population of the said provinces as established by the last census for the time being.

Now that carries out what my hon. friend says he would do if he had control over the matter as Minister of Agriculture, but he should put it clearly upon the statute-book that that shall be done. It would be a declaration by this parliament that where an arrangement is made for voting moneys in the way of subsidies, these payments shall be founded upon the principle of population so far as the different provinces are concerned, and it prevents an Act going on the statue-book which is indefinate in its character, and which would be a declaration by parliament that it was willing to vote moneys in the way of subsidies, leaving it to the government to do as they pleased with the money as between the different provinces.

Mr. BENNETT (Calgary). It is perfectly apparent that if the scheme outlined by the hon. member for St. John were carried

into effect it would be perfectly useless. For instance, take the two provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan: It must be apparent that at times we might have an excellent crop in one province and not in the other. It therefore, becomes necessary to provide seed grain in consequence of hail falling in certain localities. The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) knows perfectly well that in some sections of the province of Alberta during the present year the crop was entirely destroyed by reason of hail, while in other sections there was no destruction at all. In the province of Saskatchewan no loss was experienced. It therefore, becomes essential that in the distribution of this money there should be no fixed principle, but rather regard should be paid to the demands from the several provinces by reason of their necessities. That should be the governing consideration, I submit to this committee, in determining how the money should be divided. For example I think the province of Saskatchewan this year, having regard to seed grain requires little or no money at all; but I happen to know that in the province of Alberta large sums of money will be required to meet the demands of the settlers not only by reason of hail, but owing to the early frost, a condition which has not arisen in the other provinces. If you divide the money according to population then the necessities of at least one of the provinces may not be properly met. There is this point further. As the interests of the provinces are presented to the Governor in Council, the government of Canada should practically determine how that money should be apportioned and divided.

Mr. GRAHAM. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken evidently did not hear the remarks of the Minister of Agriculture, who stated most positively that although not mentioned in this Bill, the estimate brought in would provide that the money should be divided, under this measure, between the provinces according to population. What the amendment proposes to do is to embody in the present Bill the suggestion and the promise of the Minister of Agriculture. The amendment simply proposes to place in the Statute what the Minister of Agriculture says is the policy of the government. My hon. friend (Mr. Bennett, Calgary) says that he objects to it being divided on any fixed principle. But that is what we on this side are contending for. We think it would be wise to do that. It does not at all affect, and would not and could not affect, the Act referring to the distribution of seed grain, or any other distribution to meet any misfortune that might occur. When special cases arise, this parliament has unlimited power to deal with such cases by special legislation, and it always has done so. Should any requirements appear or be needed in any province, this parliament has always been, I think, fairly generous in meeting the emergency and providing money in the estimates to so satisfy such a demand. But this Act is to provide practically a subsidy to each province, and that subsidy is to be expended along certain lines, and it has no connection whatever with any special conditions that may arise. The Minister of Agriculture has taken the ground, and taken it wisely, that when this money comes to be distributed under this Bill, which is nothing less than a subsidy, it will be divided according to population among the various provinces; and when estimates are brought down for the money to be expended under this Bill, those estimates will be provided among the various provinces according to the population. Now all we are asking is this: That there be embalmed in the statute a clause which shall carry out the promise of the minister to the House this afternoon.

Mr. BORDEN. My hon friends on the other side are threshing out exactly the same question that was debated at very great length in connection with the Highways Act. There is not the slightest objection to setting forth the proposed division of the appropriation in a statute, but we are not going to put the division in this Bill because there is no necessity for it. The division will appear in the Supply Act in both cases, and there is no need whatever for putting it in this Act as well, so far as I can understand. Up to the present time no good reason has been shown to me why we should do that. If we were providing in this Bill a certain sum of money which need not therefore be voted by parliament, everything that has been said on the other side would be absolutely logical and absolutely reasonable, and we would accept it at once. But we have already assured the House, and it remains to be seen whether our assurance will be borne out, that the moneys provided for assistance to highways, and the moneys provided for assistance to agriculture, will be brought into the estimates in the way my hon. friend (Mr. Burrell) has mentioned this afternoon, and will therefore appear in the Statute, and that Statute will be just as binding as if the same provision were made in this Bill. It seems to me therefore that there is no good reason why the division should appear in both places.

Mr. CARVELL. It is all very well when my right hon. friend gives us the assurance that the division will take place in the supplementary estimates this year, but we have no guarantee that it will take

place the next year or the year after. If that be the intention what good reason can be urged against putting it in the present Bill, and then we will know what will occur not only next year but some other year when another gentleman perhaps may be leading the government. We do not know what conditions may obtain in the future, and we would like to have this safeguard inserted in the Bill so that we may know what is going to happen. It has been said by the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Bennett) that in the west this is going to be distributed in providing seed grain. For my part I can well conceive what might happen if my hon. friends were able to go to any particular province in Canada and say: 'We will give you so many bushels of seed grain this year.' My right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) says, 'We do not intend to do that.' But we on this side would like to have the amendment of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) inserted in the statute so that we may know what will be done in future.

Mr. BORDEN. My hon. friend seems to forget that every year parliament has the matter in its own hands. A vote must be brought down, and parliament will have a perfect right, before the appropriation is made, to point out any injustice to any particular province. And that appropriation must be embodied in the Supply Bill. It seems to me there cannot possibly be any danger such as my hon. friend has alluded to. He speaks of the great advantage—I do not know if he speaks from experience—

Mr. CARVELL. No, I never distributed seed-grain.

Mr. BORDEN. My hon. friend seems to have very impressive ideas with regard to this measure. The proposal in this Bill, as in the Highways Bill, is to utilize such provincial machinery as can effectively be utilized in connection with the subject. I need hardly remind my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley), that if this parliament saw fit to make a general appropriation for aid to agriculture, it would not be necessary to have any such Bill as this at all. He knows that under section 95 of the British North America Act, the laws of this Dominion relating to agriculture override any provincial laws that are inconsistent with them. This parliament has the primary right, the dominant right, to legislate in respect of agriculture; so that if we saw fit to depart from the proposal which we are making now—which I think is a very good proposal—of co-operation with the provinces we should not need any legislation at all. But it has seemed to us that co-operation with the provinces and the utilization of provincial machinery is a good principle. At all events, we are disposed to try it, and to try it on terms that will be absolutely fair and just to every province of Canada. It is perfectly obvious that we must have assurance that the money in each province will be expended judiciously, economically, and acceptably, and for the purposes for which parliament has voted it. That is the only qualification we make with regard to the matter. So far as the distribution is concerned it will be on the fairest basis we can propose, the basis suggested by my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), the basis of population, the basis of existing subsidies.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If everything contemplated in this Bill can be done by an appropriation Bill, what is the object of this measure? The object is that intimated by my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden), to provide a system of co-operation with the provinces. So far, we all agree with him. The object is a good one, and we do not oppose it—quite the contrary. But if the object is to lay a foundation for co-operation between the Dominion and the provinces, it seems to me obvious—and I submit it to my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden)—that we should have a complete law which the provinces will know and understand, and which will not be changed by an appropriation Act to be voted year by year. To this end the method of appropriation among the different provinces should be laid down. I confess that I view with some alarm the statement of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell), when he said that this year it was intended that the money should be apportioned among the different provinces. But he was not looking to the future.

Mr. BURRELL. The right hon. gentleman must have misunderstood me.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am very glad of that. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Burrell) then please tell me what he said? I understood him to take the view expressed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) that it might be necessary to give to one locality more than to another. On the Highways Bill we heard the same thing from my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox)—that he hoped the policy would not be pursued of making an even distribution among the provinces, because one province might require more than another. That is exactly the kind of thing we object to, and I understand that this is the sentiment of the House, and that everybody is satisfied that this money should be distributed on the basis of population, which, I think, is

the fairest basis. If that be so, then why not have it stated in the Bill. Then, happen what may afterwards, the distribution of the money voted by parliament for the purpose of aiding agriculture would be given in a proportion that is known and understood. I would not insist so much on this amendment but for the statement made by two prominent members of the majority, the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen), that there may be occasion when it would be advisable to give more money to one province than to another. This makes it absolutely indispensable that this should be in the Bill.

Mr. BENNETT (Calgary). May I remind the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) when he speaks of distributing this money according to population, that to distribute it on the basis of a decennial census would not be fair to the west, inasmuch as in the new provinces we have a census every five years.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The amendment does not say 'the last decennial census,' but the 'last census.'

Mr. BENNETT (Calgary). But, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) knows that you have to read the law by the special provisions in regard to Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. The population of one province may increase by 100,000, while another may increase only 10,000. Manitoba, probably, will not increase as rapidly as the other western provinces. The government will have the information before them by reason of the immigration returns. They should be free to distribute the money according to the necessities of the case, the climatic and other conditions that may arise from year to year.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There may be something in what is stated by my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett, Calgary). Everybody is aware that the population of the western provinces increases more rapidly than that of the eastern provinces. But that does not take from the principle that the money ought to be distributed according to population, and if according to population, it should be according to population as shown by the census.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (Simcoe). I had not intended to speak on this subject, although it is one in which I am very much interested. But the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) happened to mention my attitude in regard to a former Bill, the one relating to the highways. I realize that I am in a hopeless minority, as it might be expressed, at this time. I am entirely in harmony with the government's attitude that there is no reason whatever for incorporating this proposed amendment in the Bill; I am opposed to that amendment at all events. I am exceedingly glad that the government has decided to aid agriculture. As I said the other day in reference to the Highway Bill, it is a step in the right direction.

I think I will stand alone in the position I take in regard to the system of distribution. The government's policy is that, they shall distribute this money absolutely upon the basis of population. The attiude of the opposition leader is also that it should be distributed upon the basis of population. The only difference between them is whether that principle should be incorporated in the Bill now. I do not want it incorporated in the present Bill, because I do not think it would be right to incorporate it, but since the matter has been mentioned, I would rather like to place on record, my view upon this question as to the system of distribution. My view is that neither the money under the Road Act nor those under this Act, should be distributed upon the basis of population, and I hope, as I said the other day, that the government, having taken this step in advance, will yet come to realize that, whatever party may be in power, the true basis of distribution is the needs of the localities, and not population or conformity to provincial boundaries. I believe that the less sectionalism we have, the better. I believe that we should throw aside all parish politics, and parish legislation, that we should leave to the county councils the duty of providing for the needs of counties, and to the provinces, the duty of providing for the special needs of the provinces; that when we come into this House, whether it is in the selection of cabinet ministers, or as far as may be in the selection of senators, and as far as may be in everything, that we should realize that it is not a question of county or locality or province, but it is a question of the whole of Canada, and that we are legislating for the whole of Canada. I can see that cases will arise and must arise, when it would be more in the interest of Canada as a whole, more for the general advantage of Canada, that we should distribute this money upon the basis of the needs of localities altogether aside from the question of provincial boundaries.

It has been suggested that this may be used for political purposes. I am not afraid of that, I would not be deterred from my course even if the right hon. the leader of the opposition were in power (which God prevent for a long series of years, at all events) because I think the true principle is, that this government have been chosen

by the people, upon them has been cast the duty of legislating and providing for the needs of Canada; and they have the right to take upon themselves the duty of determining, and it is their duty to determine from time to time what shall be the basis of the distribution of this money. My answer would be, if I had the power to make the answer: Do not trouble yourselves gentlemen, we are in power, and we are asked by the people to administer this fund, we will take the responsibility and to the people we will be responsible. I would not be afraid of criticism in that position. My view is, that certain portions of Canada are especially adapted for agriculture. Certain other portions of Canada are not so manifestly adapted for agriculture and the government of this country takes a large view of the whole situation, not provincially, but they say: Here is a locality that particularly needs the distribution of a certain amount of money; we are charged with the responsibility of distributing the funds of the people of Canada and whether the criticism is favourable or unfavourable, we will decide that this particular locality, whether it be in Quebec or in Manitoba, shall have this assistance out of this public fund. That position would be subject to criticism. Hon. gentlemen opposite, would perhaps think it was not honestly done, because they have not been accustomed to that sort of thing to any great extent; but wrapt in the consciousness of honesty, knowing I was doing what I absolutely believed to be right, I would disregard the criticism of the opposition and I feel confident that the time will come when we will have sufficiently enlarged ideas in Canada, as to the necessity of obliterating provincial lines to distribute public funds as regards railways and this fund, on the basis of the greatest need of the population and having regard to the general advantage of Canada.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. And suppressing the provinces also.

Mr. LENNOX. Not suppressing the provinces to any degree, but endeavouring that every province shall devote its energies to that particular line of industry best adapted to develop the greatest good for the greatest number of the whole Dominion of Canada and where a section of Canada is especially adapted to mining or fishing or agriculture, we shall bend our energies to develop it along the lines of least resistance, and so seek to promote the general welfare of all without regard to provincial boundaries or local boundaries of any kind.

Mr. OLIVER. It is a good while since there has been heard in any deliberative and representative body in the King's dominions the declaration of the principle so clearly put forward by my hon. friend of the right divine of kings to govern wrong. I think my hon. friend is in a smaller minority even than he supposes in holding that view. But there is this to be said: If it is desirable that special attention should be given to special circumstances in special cases and special localities, there is not any necessity for this Act or of the Highway Act to enable that to be done. If the government hold the view of my hon. friend that there is a certain locality in some certain part of this Dominion wherein agriculture requires assistance on the principle that he lays down, on the principle of responsible government it is for the government of the day to put a sum in the estimates and say why that sum is placed there, and take the responsibility for its expenditure; they do not need this Act to enable them to do that. Why do they have this Act at all? It is to declare a principle. Then if it is to declare a principle, we ask that it declare the principle of the equal right of each province of the Dominion to share in the subsidies of the Dominion.

There is nothing abnormal about the intent of the government; in view of the very large revenue of the country to-day, there is nothing wrong or strange about the government saying: We are to-day receiving into the treasury sums larger than we were in receipt of when confederation was formed; these sums are contributed by the people of all the different provinces, and the proportion of these sums contributed by the citizens of the Dominion at large available for Dominion purposes, is larger than and out of proportion to that available for provincial purposes. It is right and reasonable that under those circumstances the government of the Dominion should submit to parliament a measure for handing back to the provinces some share of this large surplus revenue. That is a perfectly legitimate proposition, and it would embody a perfectly definite and accepted principle.

But it seems to me that, if that is a sound principle and if we should legislate on the subject at all we should embody that principle in our legislation. If we do not believe in it, we do not want to put it into legislation, but if we do believe in it, then I submit that it should be embodied in the legislation. I ask, why should we assume that the various provincial governments are not competent to handle the money that comes into their treasury, whether it comes by way of subsidy, by taxation levied by themselves, or contributed by this Dominion Surely the provincial governments are able to handle their own business, just as the Dominion is able to handle its own business. Why should there be any particular, serious provision in a Bill

to say that this money should be handled in the different provinces on conditions to be fixed by the Dominion government? Why should not the money be handed over to the provinces to be disbursed on the responsibility of the provinces? Why are not the government and legislature of the province just as responsible to the people of the province as this parliament and this government are to the people of the whole Dominion? It would almost seem as though the idea of this legislation was that the provincial legislatures and governments were in some sense inferior, or less intelligent, or less responsible, than this government is. That is an assumption that is entirely unwarranted. The provincial legislature represent the people of the province just as the members of this parliament represent the people of the Dominion and the government of each of the provinces represent the people of the province just as this government represent the people of the Dominion. Then why should there be any hesitation, considering that it is right to hand back to the provincial governments for expenditure by them, money taken out of the Dominion revenue which is not provided for in the Confederation Act? Why should there be any hesitation about doing it and saying that we are doing it for that reason and that purpose? Why should this government want to exercise some sort of directive control over the proper functions of government in the various provinces? Why should we assume that they do not know how to build their own roads or aid agriculture within their own limits? Such an assumption is entirely uncalled for. So, I say that if we do intend to follow the principle that we are handing back to the various provinces money that in equity, though not in law, is theirs, let us put it in the Act and say that that is the principle in accordance with the amendment of my hon. friend from St. John. As long as the government refuse to do that, as long as the Bill contains the words and phrases appearing in it as it comes to the House, I must say that the government are asking too much in asking the people to consider that the fixed policy of the government is such as the premier has undertaken to state here to-day. The very fact that there are supporters of his own who hold diametrically opposite views to those he has expressed is a reason for urging that the principle, if there is a principle, should be embodied in the Act.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell) has admitted again and again in the course of his remarks that it is the intention to distribute this money according to population. What objection can there be to inserting that in the Act? Is it not more satisfactory to all concerned that that should be embodied in the Act itself? The right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) has said that there is no occasion for it. Yet, at the risk of being regarded as provincial by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), and at the risk of talking parish politics, I venture to say that there are people who are not quite as confident of justice being done in the distribution of this money by the present government, or perhaps by succeeding governments, as the hon. member for South Simcoe appears to be. I can understand that the maritime provinces, without any possibility of their territory being enlarged and without any possibility of their population growing proportionately with that of the other provinces, will necessarily become relatively an insignificant part of Canada; that is that their influence will be relatively insignificant. Whilst we have the Premier and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as the commanding influences in the Cabinet, we have every confidence that justice will be done each year, but they are not to be there always and we know not the day nor the hour when perhaps one, or both, of them will disappear from his present position. We feel that it would be only right and fair that the principle should be set forth in the Bill itself, that each and every province, the smaller as well as the larger, those that are not influential as well as those who have influence, should have an assurance of its fair share of this money. The people of the various provinces are entitled to their relative share of this distribution. There is a surplus of nearly $40,000,000, the treasury is full to overflowing, the different provinces have contributed to this money, and it is only right that each and every one of them should receive its share. We had the budget brought down a short time ago. There was no relief to the farmers of the country in the way of giving them a reduction of taxation. It is a very laudable thing that the government should spend a portion of this large sum in the improvement of roads and encouragement of agriculture. What are they going to do with the surplus taxation taken from the pockets of the people? They do not propose to reduce the customs tariff; the interests will not let them. So no thanks to them if they increase the subsidies to the provinces for the promotion of agriculture and the improvement of roads. If the government lessened the burdens of the people by a reduction in the customs tariff it would be very acceptable to the farmers of the country, but, inasmuch as they will not do that, it is only right that the farmers should be guaranteed their proportionate share of this money by having a section in the Act giving to each

province its share in proportion to its population and not leaving it dependant on the sweet will of the government. I think the amendment is a reasonable one.

Amendment (Mr. Pugsley) negatived on division.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall section 2 be agreed to?

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.). Perhaps this might be a suitable time to get some information from the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell). I wish to ask him whether it is the intention to increase the acreage at the experimental station at Charlottetown, P. E. I. Perhaps I might ask the question by reading a letter.

Mr. BURRELL. I think it will be as well to bring that upon the estimates. My hon. friend will have an opportunity when the estimates are brought up and perhaps he will defer the matter until then.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Could not the hon. gentleman give the practical object of the legislation and tell us how he intends to encourage agriculture? These are broad terms. Could he specify a little more than he did before?

Mr. BORDEN. It has been made very plain so far. If the government had had in mind some of the considerations that seem to have influenced hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House it could have brought in a large appropriation in general terms and spent it anywhere throughout the country that it saw fit. But it did not think that the wisest or best course, so it proposes to use this Bill as a means of arriving at an arrangement with the provincial governments by which there can be co-operation between the provincial and federal governments. The government proposes to distribute the money, which it will ask parliament to vote for this purpose, in accordance with the population of the various provinces. Hon. gentlemen on the other side ask us upon what principle? The principle is a very plain one; each of the provinces of Canada has or is supposed to have an agricultural department under which money is expended in the interest of the people of the province for aid to agriculture and for agricultural education. We are endeavouring, by means of this statute, to provide that the money voted by this parliament and to be distributed under this Bill shall be expended by the provincial government under such regulations and under such conditions as will ensure to the government and parliament of Canada that it is expended for the purpose for which it is intended. We propose to try that principle here and if that does not succeed we may try some other principle another year. We may try the principle which hon. gentlemen on the other side seem to be fighting for—although I must confess that I cannot understand why they are fighting for it—of giving up the principle of co-operation, and of bringing down instead a grant in aid of agriculture expending it ourselves in the various provinces. We have not thought that was the best course, but there is so much objection to our proposal and so much argument in favour of this other course that perhaps we might take that into consideration. I would suppose that the principle which we have adopted and by which we would call the provincial governments into co-operation, would have commended itself to every man in this House without distinction of party. Instead of that, the proposal of the government made in an eminently fair spirit and to be embodied, so far as the division is concerned, in a plain statute, seems to be viewed with suspicion and distrust. I must confess I cannot understand why. The principle is the encouragement of agriculture by the utilization of provincial machinery and by co-operation with the provincial governments. It seems to me that this is a very easily understood principle; it is a principle I believe from which good results may be expected, but I am bound to say that the other suggestion which seems to be urged so strongly by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House is worthy of being taken into consideration.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think my right hon. friend is extremely unfair to members on this side of the House. I did not hear a single member on this side speak against this government co-operating with the provincial governments in encouraging agriculture. My hon. friend must have got angry at some of his own followers because they were not disposed to accept the suggestion of the Minister of Agriculture, that these moneys should be divided on the basis of population. My right hon. friend surely did not hear us on this side correctly. All of us who spoke were in favour of co-operation with the provincial governments, but what we said was: that if it is proposed, as the Minister of Agriculture admits it is the correct thing to do—to apportion these moneys among the different provinces on the basis of population, that parliament in this statute should now lay down the principle on which this money is to be divided. That is all we were arguing for. And surely we have the more reason to argue for that when we find the Minister of Marine rising in his place and saying that he was opposed to binding the government to distribute these moneys according to population, because, he said, there might be cases in which in one province or another it would

be necessary to appropriate a larger amount than would be justified on the basis of population. In view of that statement it is hard to believe that this policy was settled upon, as my right hon. friend says it was, by the government before the Bill was brought down. If the policy was settled upon, how is it possible that an influential member of the government could say it is true that so far as we reasonably can we will apportion these moneys on the basis of population, but we want elasticity so that from time to time we may depart from that principle in cases where in the judgment of the Governor in Council it would be necessary to do so. There is no ground whatever for the statement of the Prime Minister that we have opposed liberal encouragement to agriculture or that we have opposed the federal government granting aid to the different provinces and acting in co-operation with the governments of these provinces.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I move that item 248, for a grant of $100,000 to the National Battlefields Commission, be struck out, as I intend to have the vote brought down in the supplementary estimates, with appropriate wording to meet the requirements of the statute.

Mr. EMMERSON. I trust that the Finance Minister, in making his amendment, will make it so comprehensive that it will include the battlefields of the Dominion other than those of Quebec. There are the old forts of Beau Sejour and Gaspereaux in New Brunswick, and Fort Lawrence in the county of Cumberland in Nova Scotia, and a number of others, and I hope he will take into consideration the preservation of all these old battlefields and forts, which certainly have been too long neglected.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). At present I am dealing only with this Battlefields Commission with respect to Quebec. The other matters to which my hon. friend has referred will have our consideration, but it is not possible for us to deal with them this year. I do not say that it will be possible for us to deal with them at any particular time in the future, but the matter to which my hon. friend has called attention, is, I am sure, one in which we are all interested.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not suppose it is the intention of the government to change the present personnel of the commission?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I have no information to give my hon. friend as to that.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. EMMERSON. The Finance Minister says that nothing can be done this year, and he cannot give any assurance when anything can be done, as to these old forts and historic battlefields. I want to impress upon him this fact, that unless something is done soon, the day will have gone when anything can be done. Fort Cumberland or Fort Beau Sejour are fast crumblig, and unless something is done speedily, they will simply be a memory. At Fort Lawrence and at Fort Gaspereaux on Baie Verte similar conditions prevail. If anything is to be done to wrest these places from the process of decay, it must be done speedily. I think the attention of this government has been called to this matter. I know that the attention of the former government was called to it, and it was put off, as is too often the case with all governments. If the government would make some announcement with respect to taking early action in this matter, I think the country would hear it with pleasure and gratification.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say that the late government had this matter under consideration, and a proposition was made to enlarge the scope of the National Battlefields Commission. There did not seem to be any reason why that should not be done. The gentlemen who are serving the country very acceptably on this commission do not get any compensation for their services, and it seems to me that it will be pre-eminently the work of the commission to take charge of the matters outlined by the hon. member for Westmorland. Several months ago I brought this matter before the House, and the hon. Minister of Militia referred to it as a matter of great importance on which the government would take early action. He expressed unbounded enthusiasm at the idea, and I would have thought that the Minister of Finance would have been prepared to have enlarged the scope of this commission. A few words put in the Bill would be all that would be necessary.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I think that the commission should be consulted with regard to such a matter. Individually, I am in entire sympathy with the preservation of our battlefields and all historic points in Canada. I have had in mind the possibility of enlarging the scope of the commission, but as the expenditure for this year is comparatively large, it is probably as much as the government may feel called upon to make this year. The question of enlarging the scope of the commission is a matter which will have to be left for future consideration, as there is not a great deal of time left this session.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I may say that the proposition meets with my very

hearty endorsation, but inasmuch as we have a Battlefields Commission, I presume it would be more appropriate that such an item should be placed at the disposal of that commission. Whatever items may be set apart for dealing with our Canadian battlefields belong, I should imagine, to that commission.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Let us get the item first.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The item, of course, will have to be considered. The matter has not yet been discussed in council, but as soon as it is in shape my hon. friend will have full information in connection with it. Whatever has been said in regard to the matter has been most sympathetically received by my colleagues, to whom I have spoken.

Mr. EMMERSON. Sympathy is cheap, it is money we want.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Sympathy is a good thing to start with.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). There are certain persons who like to indulge in promises without performing them, I need not say that it is not our intention to proceed along those lines.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say to my hon. friend the reason we were greatly discouraged when he was absent from the chamber was that the Minister of Finance, with that care for the treasury which of course, it is proper he should have, rather led us to believe that nothing would be done this year.

Mr. BEATTIE. While this matter is before the House I would like to draw attention to two very celebrated forts at Niagara, Fort George, and Fort Missauga. These forts are opposite the United States frontier where the American forts are kept in good condition. It will be a disgrace to Canada if the forts on the Canadian side are not kept in an equally good state of repair, more especially as it will not require a very large expenditure for that purpose.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I will take the liberty of bringing the matter to the attention of the Battlefields Commission.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Let me call the attention of the Minister of Militia to the old fortification at Chambly, not very far from my own county of Rouville. This is one of the finest pieces of old military architecture to be found in the country. The fortifications have been well preserved up to a few years ago when the government of Canada spent a few thousand dollars to repair the fortifications, and to restore the names of the great soldiers and captains who fought there under the French Régime, but lately I have noticed that the old fort was crumbling and giving signs of decay. I do not think that all the fortifications, all the old landmarks, should be placed under the control of the Quebec Battlefields Commission, because that body has one object in view. I believe the time has come when we should take into serious consideration the conditions of all the old military landmarks of the country. I would mention also the old fortifications at L'Isle-aux-Noix which were beautifully built by the English officers about a century ago, and are very historic. These fortifications are also crumbling, and I specially draw the attention of the Minister of Militia to the fact. We should not rest satisfied with mere words on this matter, because, as the English proverb has it, 'fine words butter no parsnips.' Let the minister act heroically in this matter and see that a sum is placed in the estimates, and that a systematic policy dealing with the preservation of the historic military landmarks of the country, is adopted, for the perpetuation of the memories of the heroes of the past, and for the education of the young men of this country. Some years ago a monument was erected at Chateaugay to commemorate the valorous deeds of Canadians there, and a similar monument was put up at Niagara, but we should not forget that in other sections of the country there are landmarks which also call for consideration and attention.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria, Ontario). The hon. gentleman would not expect the present government, which has only been in office for a few months, to attempt to perform what he and his colleagues failed to do in 15 years of Liberal administration. He will surely give us breathing space at the beginning of our term of office and allow us time to demonstrate our intentions, if not our promises, in this matter.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). All that has been said confirms me in the view that this matter should be dealt with in a comprehensive manner, either by the Quebec Battlefields Commission or some other commission. The whole question should be taken up and so dealt with, instead of dealing with it piecemeal and in hugger-mugger fashion. I am quite sure the proposal will have the sympathy of every man on this side of the House if treated comprehensively. Because this is not a party question, it is a question in which we would all heartily support the government in dealing with it in a proper and comprehensive manner. So far as I am concerned, speaking for myself, I am heartily in sympathy with what has been said. It is only as to the method employed that

there may perhaps be any divergence of opinion. I am entirely in accord with the idea that legislation should be passed authorizing some commission to take up the whole question, so that it may be dealt with in a thorough and comprehensive way.

Mr. McKENZIE. The discussion that has taken place this afternoon may be regarded as a basis for further inquiry upon this subject, and I do not wish the Minister of Militia and his colleagues to lose sight of the old fortifications at Louisburg. I was waiting for some other hon. gentleman to mention this grand old fortress, but as nothing has been said, I deem it proper now to bring the fortifications of Louisburg to the notice of the government. The old casements and other parts of those fortifications are just as much intact to-day as they were during the French régime at Louisburg, and we should take care that they are preserved as well as can be. An interesting point that I might mention is, that a former captain in the English army Capt. Kennedy, who spent some years of his life at Louisburg and died there, made provision in his will towards the upkeep of the fortification at Louisburg in co-operation with government assistance, so that the conditions as they existed at the time of the siege might be, as far as possible, maintained. I simply mention this matter so that when the government are dealing with this question, Louisburg shall not be forgotten.

Naval Service, including purchase and maintenance of ships, the maintenance and up-keep of dockyards at Esquimalt and and Halifax, and the establishment and maintenance of training school, $1,660,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Will the minister please explain this item?

Mr. HAZEN. This item is prepared on the basis of maintaining the present ships and establishments in full working order without undertaking any new work other than is necessary for the efficient maintenance of those ships and establishments. It is estimated this amount will be sufficient for the purpose. The vote is made up as follows:—

Pay, &c., of officers and men for 'Niobe,' 'Rainbow,' and College—	$583,080
Stores, including guns for the above	533,900
Repairs to ships and vessels (mainly 'Niobe')	200.000
Repairs to dockyard machinery at Halifax and Esquimalt	13,000
Miscellaneous, dockyard services at Halifax and Esquimalt	44,444
Miscellaneous, other services	118,600
Repairs and maintenance of buildings	36,300
Provision of additional gear for the College	$ 5,500
Purchase of new machinery for the dockyards at Halifax and Esquimalt	19,200
New buildings and other works	41,276
Construction of lighters, water-tank and other service boats	64,5000
Total	$1,660,000

If hon. gentlemen want any further information regarding these different items I have that information under my hand, and will be very glad to give it to them. I may say pending the declaration of what the policy of this government will be touching the naval service—which as my hon. friends know the Prime Minister announced in the debate on the address would not be determined until after full opportunity was had of considering the whole question and of first consulting with the Admiralty authorities in the matter—it has been thought better that the estimates this year should be based on the idea of maintaining the existing ships and the existing establishments, including the Naval College at Halifax, on a proper basis, without adding new ships or adding to the equipment we have at the present time more than is necessary for the purpose of maintaining it in proper condition. It is on that basis entirely that the estimates are made up this year.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I notice that my hon. friends who represent the interests of the province of Quebec in the government have all vanished. They disappeared at the announcement that we might discuss the Naval service this afternoon. I am sorry for that; I should like to have seen them here. But let me be very frank with my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) and tell him, notwithstanding the absence of his colleagues from Quebec, that each and every one of the Quebec ministers, in their respective constituencies, and at large public meetings in my province during the last election contest, and before that contest, solemnly promised the people that if a government should be formed under the leadership of the right hon. member from Halifax, (Mr. Borden) then, as soon as parliament should be convened, every sign, every vestige of a Naval service would disappear from the blue-book, that the naval policy of the Laurier government would be wiped out and that we should never hear any thing about it again. Let me tell my hon. friend also, as I have already stated in his presence elsewhere, that he has no idea of the fight, of the struggle, which took place in our province during the last general election on this naval question. We were told by the Minister of Public works (Mr. Monk) by the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) and by the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Nantel) that our policy was

suicidal, that we were selling our birthright to Great Britain, and that the time had come for Canada to assert herself and to do away with all this imperialism and this whole naval expenditure. We on our part, resisted those appeals, appeals of the worst kind, that were made in our province against the naval policy; we stood to our guns like men; and we educated public opinion in the province of Quebec to such an extent that on the 21st of September last we returned a majority of members of that province, pledged to a naval policy. Of course, the members returned in favour of the late government were pledged, I am glad to say to the Liberal policy. I say our campaign was a campaign of education and it was carried on against the declaration on the other side that if we were defeated every vestige of the navy would disappear from the blue-books and that there would be no expenditure whatever on such a service.

Now, I am surprised to see such a large amount of money in the estimates for the maintainance of that naval policy. People are being told every day, in our province, not only in the newspapers but at public meetings, that the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) intends to wipe out the navy from his programme. On the other hand we read in another section of the press, and learn of speeches on other platforms, that after consultation with the admiralty, a new policy will be evolved which will mean something while the old policy meant nothing.

Now, I want an authoritative statement from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hazen) who is at the head of the Naval Department. We on this side of the House are not opposed to a Canadian navy; far from it. And in my own province I would be ready to take up the cudgels again to-morrow and fight the same battle that we fought before the 21st of September last. Public education has been effected in that regard in spite of the Quebec ministers of the government and their followers in the House. I want the hon. gentleman to speak plainly on this question and to say to the country whether we are to have a navy—yes, or no. Whether we are to have a contribution—yes, or no. Then we can debate whether that contribution should be given or not. The naval policy should be above politics. Canada is pledged to do something. But there are certain members who represent especially the interests of the province of Quebec, who are pledged against it; and so are their followers in this House. Now, let us be frank about it. Why shilly-shally? why speak one way for one province, and another way for another province? Our words will reach the heart of the empire, and Great Britain will know whether Canada will do something for the maintenance of Britain's supremacy on the seas or not. My hon. friend (Mr. Hazen) will consult the admiralty. I know his fine Imperial spirit. I may disagree with him on the lines of the policy he may pursue. But is it not time to know distinctly whether Canada will do something or not. I believe that the country has declared in favour of certain aid to be given to Great Britain to maintain her naval supremacy. I say it would be unbecoming on the part of the Canadian people through their representatives to say that a certain policy was pursued by the late government, but we are going to wipe it out from the statute-book and do nothing. That is what is being said in the province of Quebec to-day; that is what is being repeated from platform after platform and in every newspaper of a certain stripe in that province. During the last election and since the last election they have equivocated as to what they will do and they are equivocating amongst the partisans of the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) in Quebec to-day whether they will do something or nothing. The time has come to speak firmly and plainly. If it is the province of Quebec the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hazen) is afraid of, let him not be afraid. In Quebec he will find a majority of His Majesty's loyal subjects ready to stand for a Canadian navy that will do its share for the maintenance of the supremacy of Britain on the seas. Those opposed to that principle are but a minority, and a very insignificant minority at that.

Mr. PELLETIER. Returning to the House after an absence of a few minutes, I am told that my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) has used the same means as were used on a former occasion to say that I was out of the House when this question was discussed. I am never out of the House when my duty calls me here. And I am not afraid to discuss this question with the hon. gentleman now or at any other time.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What are you going to do?

Mr. PELLETIER. I will tell the hon. gentleman if he will wait a minute. In this House I give my mind and say what I think. But I wish to make clear the point I mentioned first, so that certain newspapers in Montreal to-morrow may have no reason to say that I ran out of the House because I was afraid of what might fall upon me coming from the important member from Rouville. I am going to tell my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) that he is not stating the facts as they are when he speaks as he has just spoken. I shall ask him to tell me at what public meeting since the elections the stand indicated by him a moment ago was taken.

Mr. LEMIEUX. When my hon. friend was returned by acclamation he made a speech at Lorette in the province of Quebec at which he announced that at last the people would be free from that naval policy that the Borden government has decided not to have any naval question to bother them and that something better than the repeal of the Bill would take place.

Mr. PELLETIER. I said then and I say now that I am opposed to the scheme of the late government, that it is a bad thing. I said then as I say now that when the leader of the present government on the debate on the address took up this question he made declarations which were perfectly satisfactory to us and which were satisfactory in the province of Quebec. Those are the facts which we stated in Quebec.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Not much facts in that.

Mr. PELLETIER. I am not going to be responsible for people in some quarters——

Mr. LEMIEUX. In your own paper?

Mr. PELLETIER. The hon. member for Rouville will not find it in my own paper. I have no paper.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Does my hon. friend state he has no paper?

Mr. PELLETIER. I do.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I must tell my hon. friend that I took the precaution of getting from the court-house in Quebec a declaration of the ownership of 'L'Evenement,' of Quebec, and I find the name of my hon. friend the Postmaster General quite prominent amongst the directors and joint owners of 'L'Evenement.'.

Mr. PELLETIER. My hon. friend is dealing with ancient history. I was at one time one of the directors of the paper, but I inform my hon. friend that I am not now.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Since when?

Mr. PELLETIER. I do not remember the dates but I can get them for my hon. friend. I thought it was more becoming for a member of this government not to have any interest in any of the newspapers of this country which might be called upon to publish advertisements for this government and I gave away, transferred all my interests in that paper and I think it was the right thing to do. But my hon. friend will not find in that paper anything like what he has said this afternoon and I defy him to find anything of the kind.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Get me the paper.

Mr. PELLETIER. I am not going to look for something that is not there. If he wants it he will have to hunt it up himself.

Mr. PELLETIER.

We from the province of Quebec have been misrepresented on this question, not only to-day but from the very day the debate in this House began. We have been told that we went around the province of Quebec and declared that we were against any policy at all.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Hear, hear.

Mr. PELLETIER. That is not the stand we have taken. The right hon. the leader of the opposition said one day in this House that we had taken the stand that the children of Canadians were going to be disembowelled.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Hear, hear.

Mr. PELLETIER. And that was tantamount to cowardice. I may tell my right hon. friend now, that I am against any policy, naval or other, which will put the Canadians of this country who are going to fight for this country in a position to be disembowelled without fighting. I have taken the stand that the policy of the late government was to send Canadians on such ships, that if they should meet the enemy they would not be within range to fight and that these ships would be sunk before having a chance to fight.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Is my hon. friend aware that at the present moment there are four battleships of the same type as was proposed by the late government, being built in Great Britain, and that they will be launched during the present season, and added to the navy of Great Britain?

Mr. PELLETIER. Those are the things which we said to the province of Quebec. I do not regret it, I am of that opinion now, but we in the province of Quebec, have been told by the hon. member during the debate on the address that there was an anti-British party in the province of Quebec.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PELLETIER. I want to tell him that there is no such thing in the province of Quebec, that the people of our province are British subjects and loyal British subjects—although I am afraid that if this cry goes forth that there is an anti-British party in Quebec, there may be one in some quarters—but the cry to-day is absolutely erroneous, not to say a lie.

We have taken a certain stand on this question. We were absolutely opposed to the naval policy propounded by the late government. What did we find when we came into power with reference to the ten or eleven ships which were to be built on the lines of the policy of my hon. friends opposite? We found that the very men who were in charge of that service, had made reports in which

they stated that when the last of these ships would leave the navy yard, they would be obsolete and of no use. Are you surprised that we were opposed to such a policy as that? We were not naval experts but we thought we were telling Quebec what was right in taking that stand, and arriving here, we found that Admiral Kingsmill and Commander Roper were of the same opinion as ourselves. I think that was pretty good justification. Now we are face to face with this question. The government have not had time to go into it, but we have never declared that there would be no policy at all; we adhere, one and all, to the declarations made here by the Prime Minister and those declarations are to the effect that something will be done, that a new policy will be put before this country. With those declarations my right hon. friend has no right to say what he has said. When this policy has been carefully studied, it will be put before parliament, and the country. Those are the declarations made, and it may be that my hon. friends opposite, who had such hopes of seeing this government go to pieces on certain rocks, and who have been disappointed so far, still hope that something might come up to wreck this government. The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) says that now is the time to speak, that he must know now where this government stands. We are just going to take our time. The government declared that this question should be looked into, and carefully studied, and if the hon. member for Rouville is so impatient about a policy I can only say that the policy which will be put before this country by this government, will be a much better one than the one which he himself, as a member of the late government, put before the country and which was disapproved.

In the last general election, if it had not been for the appeals which were made to the people of my province that the Prime Minister for the time being was a French Canadian and a Catholic, there would not have been a majority in that province of Quebec to approve of the policy which gave us a 'Rainbow' and a 'Niobe.'

Mr. CARVELL. My hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) says that the party which he represents in Quebec is not afraid to fight, but that when they fight they want to be in a position to fight and not to fight upon vessels that are so small and so imperfectly equipped that they will not be within the firing line. Does my hon. friend mean to say—and I hope he will give me an answer to this question—that he and his party will take a vote to provide for efficient vessels that will be in the fight, and that his French friends in Quebec will not be massacred, but will stand up and fight like men?

Mr. PELLETIER. I can tell my hon. friend that when French-Canadians were called upon in the past they did their duty nobly to their country. That is what they did when they fought at Chateauguay.

Mr. CARVELL. But my hon. friend is not answering the question. Answer the question.

Mr. PELLETIER. I will answer the question in my own way.

Mr. CARVELL. Ah!

Mr. PELLETIER. The hon. gentleman would like me to tell the committee what is going to be the policy of this government when the government has not had time to consider its policy.

Mr. CARVELL. I cannot make you answer.

Mr. PELLETIER. The hon. gentleman will not make me answer questions which have not been considered by this government. This question has not been considered by the government. My hon. friend may try as much as he likes to make party capital out of it, but this government has taken the stand that there is no policy which it has looked into, but that this matter will be taken up later, at which time a plan governed by the necessities of the question will be considered.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend the Postmaster General has taken refuge on the ground that he was opposed to the Laurier policy. That is the way he put it to-day before the House. He knows as well as I do—and if he denies it I will not bandy words with him—that the position which his party took in the last election, and ever since the Naval Bill was introduced in 1910, was that Canada owed absolutely nothing to England and that there was no need for any policy at all.

Mr. PELLETIER. When I heard words to that effect uttered in the province of Quebec I said that for all the years I had lived I had thought it was wrong to say that we owed nothing to England. My hon. friend will never find anything of that kind on my lips.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I said a moment ago that I would not bandy words with my hon. friend. I never heard him speak, but I read some speeches upon this point, and I maintain that the policy which was followed by his friends in Quebec during the last campaign and previously, ever since the month of June, 1910, when the Naval Bill was introduced, was that Canada owed nothing to England, that they were against any naval policy and that, if they were not to be disembowelled upon the seas of China and Japan, it was not because they were not to be put upon

imperial ships, but because they were not to be put upon any ships at all. We heard in this very House the declaration that this policy would mean conscription, and the hon. gentleman knows as well as I do that his friends stated during the campaign that the children of the people would be taken by force and put upon the decks of these ships to fight for England. My hon. friend can take any position he likes upon the present occasion as to what he did or did not say—I would not contradict him even if I knew to the contrary, but I leave it to those who heard him and who heard his friends. I hope that his words of to-day will be reported in the province of Quebec just as he has spoken them, for nothing will be better for the peace of the country than that for once we have it from the mouth of himself and his associates that Canada owes something to England. The hon. gentleman says that he was opposed to the Laurier policy. Everybody heard him say that. He and his friends declared themselves as being opposed to that policy and they said that the first thing which would be done would be to repeal it. One of the first things which was done by one of the followers of the present government was to put a question to the leader of the government whether or not the naval law would be repealed during the present session. That was the course advocated by the party in office, or the wing of the party coming from the province of Quebec; they threatened that as soon as the late government had been defeated that policy would be repealed. Well, it is not yet repealed. It is, in part in force. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, or the Minister of Naval Service (Mr. Hazen) asks for an appropriation of $1,660,000, for what?—to carry on the naval policy of the Laurier government. That is very far from what was expected by the people of Quebec who voted in favour of the members of the government from that province. They never expected that they would be called upon to vote one dollar for the maintenance and support of the naval policy introduced by the Laurier government. They did not suppose that they would be called upon to vote any such money as that, and if anybody in this House had stated to the electors of the county of Quebec or of Champlain county that they would be called upon to vote over a million dollars to carry out the naval law which was then on the statute-book I am satisfied there would have been a different vote in the province of Quebec. But, it was because these promises were made that hon. gentlemen opposite had the measure of success which they achieved in that province. Now, it is indicated in these estimates that parliament will appropriate $1,660,000. What for? The naval law asks for the creation of a Naval Department. The Naval Department is maintained. The naval law asks for the creation of a naval college. The naval college is maintained. The only thing that is dropped off is the building of warships for which we had invited tenders. In the course of time I do not know what will be done by the government after they have conferred with Great Britain. But, I know what will be the answer of Great Britain. Whatever answer they will have in the future, at the present time they are providing the money for carrying out the naval law. What is it that they provide for? They provide for a naval college with a naval staff; they provide for all the frills and feathers of the naval service, but they do not provide for building ships. We shall have no tin-pot navy! But we shall have a gold lace navy; we shall have an admiral, commodore and captains, but we shall have no sailors. That is what is provided for by these estimates. I find no fault with the estimates and we are ready to vote the money. What will the answer of the British government be when my hon. friend goes over to the other side in order to get that answer? We have it already and we have had it since 1909? At the conference that took place in 1909, which was called by the British government and at which all the dominions were represented, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa, the first thing the British government asked for was a contribution. We were not in favour of a contribution. Whether or not the present government are in favour of a contribution remains to be seen; we will have to wait for that.

The next thing that was asked for was a fleet unit on the Pacific, and for reasons intimated more than once during last parliament, we did not think it advisable to have a unit on the Pacific only; we thought we must have a service both on the Pacific and the Atlantic—a moderate service to begin because we had to commence in a moderate way—but at all events it was accepted. I shall not anticipate what may be the policy of the present government on the navy but after their return from England we will have an opportunity of judging of it. I have simply to repeat that the naval law is maintained by this government, and that whatever my hon. friend say to the contrary I am glad for my part that he is forced to go back on the language he used last election and to retain the naval policy of the late government.

Mr. PELLETIER. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) says he had no occasion to hear what I had to say in the

last election, but if that is so it is his own fault. When the leader of the opposition was going around the province of Quebec he singled out the county I represent to speak in at the last minute, when he knew he could not be answered, and so he called a big meeting in my county on the afternoon of the day before the voting. I then sent a telegram to the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) asking him to allow me to appear with my friends at that meeting and I would give him a chance of hearing what I had to say. That request the right hon. gentleman refused. Therefore, if the right hon. gentleman had no opportunity to hear me on that occasion, he had nobody to blame but himself for it. I suppose the right hon. the leader of the opposition remembers that incident; at all events I do. I shall not qualify his action in refusing me a hearing but I may say that it is the first time I ever heard of the leader of a great party going, on the eve of an election, into a county, when he could not be answered, and refusing the candidate on the other side an opportunity to speak. If the right hon. gentleman is much surprised to-day in finding a vote for the navy in the estimates, I may tell him that I am not, and I may tell him further that that vote is absolutely logical and consistent with the policy of the Conservative party. When we came into power we found certain conditions existing; we found that a naval college had been built at Halifax and that two ships had been purchased. Does the right hon. gentleman mean to say that we should have set fire to that college and sunk those two ships? It is true that one of them had met with a bad accident on a certain trip down in Yarmouth, but, nevertheless, we found her there with the other ship, both belonging to Canada. As we had no opportunity to put a naval policy before the country, was it not reasonable and sensible to do as we have done and to say that we would not build these other ten ships which were proposed by the late government, sending back the cheques which had been put in with the tenders and declaring to the country that the ships would not be built? We had under the circumstances to continue what the late government had put into operation. It would have been ridiculous, even for those so called bad Nationalists in Quebec, without one moment of consideration, to close the naval college and give the ships to some other country. That would not be reasonable. I may say that when this government has looked into the question, the policy which shall be brought forward and which shall have the support of all the people of this country, French-Canadian and English-Canadian alike, will be a policy that every one will regard in a broad-minded spirit as this government shall regard it. I am not taking here at the present moment any stand different from that which I have taken in the province of Quebec. I know that some people have said: we owe nothing to the empire. I am not of that opinion. I believe that we owe to the British Empire the protection of the liberties which we enjoy in this country and which are dear to us. We French Canadians think as much of the Union Jack as do the people of any other race or creed in this country, and nobody will ever find a word from me even suggesting anything to the contrary. And, Sir, that is the opinion of the French Canadian people of the province of Quebec to-day, and it has been the opinion of the French Canadians of Quebec for years and years. You will not find to-day in any part of the province of Quebec any support for a proposal for annexation to the country south of us; we are British subjects; we are glad that we are British subjects. And, even although some men may say: we owe nothing to the British Empire; yet if the French Canadians had a chance to-day to go back to the French flag they would stay with the British flag under which they have enjoyed their liberties. That is the sentiment of the province of Quebec, and although that sentiment may be distorted for political and party ends, I say that the province of Quebec is as loyal to the empire as any other province.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Pelletier) has one language for this House and another language for his electors, and for the people of the district of Quebec when he addresses them on public questions. I state here most positively that during the election campaign the Postmaster General was one of the worst sinners on the question of the navy to be found in the province of Quebec First of all he did not run as a straight Conservative candidate.

Mr. PELLETIER. I did.

Mr. LEMIEUX. You did?

Mr. PELLETIER. Yes, I did.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Well, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pelletier) has more brass than the 'Niobe' ever used up in her construction.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I withdraw the remark if it is offensive.

Mr. PELLETIER. It is not offensive, coming from you.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend (Mr. Pelletier) has the audacity to state that he

did not run as a Nationalist during the last campaign. Has he the audacity to say so now in this House?

Mr. PELLETIER. Shall I answer now?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. PELLETIER. I will tell the hon. gentleman——

Mr. LEMIEUX. Give the answer, yes or no, because on that point I will read what the hon. gentleman says in his own newspaper.

Mr. PELLETIER. If the hon. member takes his seat I will give the answer.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend (Mr. Pelletier) is not going to give a straight answer. I will give the answer, as the hon. gentleman insists he did not run as a Nationalist last election. My hon. friend is one of the proprietors of 'L'Evenement' of Quebec. True, he has told us that he is no longer one of the proprietors of that newspaper, and I accept his word, but he was one of the proprietors during a part of the session, as I have ascertained from the records of the Quebec Court House. But, when he was a co-proprietor of 'L'Evenement,' speaking after the elections in the county of Montmagny, represented by young Armand Lavergne, who was his master during the last election, who was his guide spiritual and temporal during the last election, speaking in the county of Montmagny, in the presence of Mr. Lavergne, to celebrate the victory of my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. L'Esperance), here is what my hon. friend (Mr. Pelletier) stated, and I quote from 'L'Evenement' of Tuesday, the 3rd of October, 1911, when he was fresh from his triumph with forty majority in Quebec county.

Mr. PELLETIER. It is better than being beaten in Gaspé.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I did not catch what my hon. friend said.

Mr. PELLETIER. I said that forty majority was better than being beaten in Gaspé.

Mr. LEMIEUX. But I was defeated as a straight Liberal, and my hon. friend (Mr. Pelletier) has been defeated under all colours and all shades for the last twenty years.

But let me quote what the hon. gentleman says; and I am glad you are in the chair, Mr. Chairman, because you were yourself a witness to what took place:

> Mr. Pelletier assured the electors that the French Canadian Conservative members from the province of Quebec would be less the representatives of their counties than the representatives of their race. He proclaimed himself a Nationalist and proud to be a Nationalist. The day will come when there will be no more Nationalist groups, but when the Nationalist spirit shall have invaded the whole country.

Was not my hon. friend a Nationalist on the 21st of September last, and before that? A few weeks before the election, he proclaimed boldly, in the presence of his master, Mr. Lavergne, that he was a Nationalist, and that he hoped to bring the whole Conservative fold under the magic wand of the Nationalist party in the province of Quebec. And now my hon. friend says that no racial appeals were made by the Nationalist party. He will not deny, I am sure, that Mr. Bourassa is the leading spirit of the Nationalist party in the province of Quebec. My hon. friend took his instructions from Mr. Bourassa, and from Mr. Lavergne. He would never have been a candidate in the county of Quebec if he had not sworn allegiance to Nationalist principles. Mr. Bourassa publishes the gospel of the Nationalist party in the province of Quebec, 'Le Devoir.' Now let us see what kind of literature was used by my hon. friend and by every other Nationalist candidate against the naval policy of the Laurier government:

> Mr. Laurier did not stop at the violation of the Canadian constitution; from his own admission, by taking, without authorization, the money of the Canadian people to arm the Canadian troops and to have Canada participate in this infamous war (South African war); his cynicism carried him to the point of proclaiming—in the full light of parliament—that this war was the most just that England had ever carried on. No responsible statesman, not even Mr. Chamberlain, had ever dared to go so far. Yes, the Nestor of the Imperial Conference, the Canadian Washington, found it right and good that 50,000 men should be massacred, millions of farms to be burnt and ravaged, peaceful homes to be pillaged, women to be outraged, and little children to be shut up in pestilential camps, where they died like flies. English and Afrikander soldiers who fell on the veldt for the glory of Chamberlain, women who died from shame or misery for the glorification of Laurier, children whose entrails have dried up in the concentration camps for the honour of the empire.

This was not published at the time the contingents were sent to South Africa. It was published during the last campaign by my hon. friend's party leader, whom he followed very modestly and very humbly. Did it arouse the racial feeling of the French-Canadians? With all the incendiary speeches delivered by the hon. gentleman, with all the incendiary speeches delivered by the Minister of Inland Revenue, and with all the incendiary speeches delivered by the Minister of Public Works, I am

proud to say that the province of Quebec gave a majority in favour of the naval policy of the Laurier government; and I say to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that if he comes back from London with a similar policy, he will have, and the government of this country will have, the support of the whole province of Quebec notwithstanding the appeals made by the firebrand whom I see in my presence just now.

Mr. PELLETIER. Never mind big words. The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) has thought fit, since the beginning of this session, to throw mud at a great many people.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Mr. Chairman, I rise—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I should have risen a little earlier, to call the hon. member to order for using the word 'firebrand.'

Mr. PELLETIER. The hon. member for Rouville is very thin-skinned.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am in good humour.

Mr. PELLETIER. It does not seem so. The hon. member is in the habit of attacking the honour and the reputation of the most honest men of his province.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Whom?

Mr. PELLETIER. The hon. member used to be very courteous. I do not know whether or not it is the cold shades of opposition that have angered him, but he has acquired the new habit of calling people names and of assailing the reputation of such men as Mr. Ducharme, one of the most respectable men in Montreal.

Mr. LEMIEUX. A notorious boodler.

Mr. PELLETIER. I can only say I am surprised. I wish the hon. member for Rouville would repeat outside of the House what he says in this House against Mr. Ducharme, so that he might be called upon to answer. From his seat in the House, protected by the privilege of a member of the House of Commons, he is able to say a great many things which he would not dare to say outside of the House. I invite him now to repeat these words against Mr. Ducharme outside of the precincts of this House.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Come back to the navy.

Mr. PELLETIER. The hon. member for Rouville went outside of the navy and I have followed him. Now, I have no advice to give to the hon. member, but if the ordinary rules of debate are to be followed in this House, I think he will have to change the course he has adopted lately of calling people names.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Arch-traitor—did I say that?

Mr. PELLETIER. You said Mr. Ducharme was a boodler.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I still say so.

Mr. PELLETIER. Say so outside of the House like a man.

Mr. LEMIEUX. And you appointed him commissioner.

Mr. PELLETIER. If you said so, you could not prove it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I know him too well.

Mr. PELLETIER. The hon. member has quoted from speeches made by certain gentlemen in the province of Quebec.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The Postmaster General.

Mr. PELLETIER. No, the last quotation which he has made is not from me, and I would not be very much surprised if he had quoted from the 'Toronto Globe.'

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, I quoted a translation from 'Le Devoir.' Do you deny it?

Mr. PELLETIER. Let me proceed.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux), has no right to interrupt.

Mr. PELLETIER. The Toronto 'Globe' has the habit of publishing reports of public speeches delivered in the province of Quebec which are absolutely erroneous, and of such a character as to deceive the public. I am not responsible for what the Toronto 'Globe' says, and I do not want to be responsible for the statements appearing in that journal. I have stated my position before this House, and I am prepared to compare my stand with the stand which the hon. member for Rouville took in a letter published in 1903, in which he said that he was absolutely opposed to helping England in her wars and sending anybody from Canada to fight her battles. There sitting opposite me is the hon. gentleman who called certain people arch traitors——

Mr. LEMIEUX. I meant your friends.

Mr. PELLETIER—because they would not adopt the hon. gentleman's policy. A potion of the letter to which I refer was read in the House the other day by the Prime Minister, and I am going to have copies of that letter distributed to all our friends in the House, so that when the ocassion presents itself they may show to the people of Canada what kind of a loyal British subject the hon. member for Rouville has become. Unfortunately I do not happen to have that letter under my hand at the present moment, but the

hon. member for Rouville admitted that he wrote it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. PELLETIER. Does the hon. gentleman still believe in the sentiments to be found in that letter?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, I can subscribe to each word contained in that letter. I asked the Prime Minister at that time to read the whole letter, but he only read an extract.

Mr. PELLETIER. The Prime Minister read enough to make the House understand that the hon. gentleman was opposed to going to war to protect England's interests.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Have you got a copy of the letter there?

Mr. PELLETIER. I could get it in five minutes, it is in my office.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Get it as soon as possible, and read it.

Mr. PELLETIER. If some hon. gentleman will hold the floor I will go to my office now and get the letter, and have it placed on 'Hansard.'

Mr. PUGSLEY. I want to take advantage of the interval during the Postmaster General's absence, to say a few words upon the excuse which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave during the debate on the address, for the government not proceeding to let the contract for the building of the ten war vessels for Canada, after tenders for their construction had been invited by the late government. I see that my hon. friend the Postmaster General has returned, and perhaps he would like an opportunity of concluding his remarks.

Mr. PELLETIER. I would be greatly obliged to my hon. friend if he would accord me that privilege.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then I will yield the floor to the hon. gentleman, and take the opportunity of speaking later.

Mr. PELLETIER. This letter, of which I have a great many copies, bears the signature 'Rodolphe Lemieux.'

Mr. LEMIEUX. I never change my name to Zandring.

Mr. PELLETIER. When the hon. gentleman is cornered——

Mr. LEMIEUX. Not by any means.

Mr. PELLETIER. When he does not not know what to say, when he is confronted with a letter which contains his condemnation——

Mr. LEMIEUX. Read it please.

Mr. PELLETIER. Then the hon. gentleman uses the words which are insulting, words which I despise. Let me read this letter, and then every hon. gentleman will understand why the hon. member is calling a fellow member names. The letter is addressed to Mr. Henri Bourassa, member for Labelle:

House of Commons,
4th August, 1903.

My dear Colleague,——

Mr. LEMIEUX. Send me over a copy of the letter, if you please.

Mr. PELLETIER. I will give one to the hon. gentleman and another to his leader. The House will see by and by where that leader comes in.

My dear Colleague,—

I would have liked very much to have been present at the meeting on Sunday evening in order to protest with you against the untimely resolution adopted within the last few days by the Congress of Chambers of Commerce. Reasons of a purely personal nature have prevented me from being present.

Permit me, however, to express my surprise that the Chambers of Commerce of Canada, and of the province of Quebec in particular, have thought fit to support the resolution which affirms an absolutely wrong principle, that is the obligation of the colonies to participate in the defence of the empire.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Hear, hear. Go on.

Mr. PELLETIER. I am going on.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If the hon. member for Rouville continues to interrupt I shall be obliged to declare him out of order.

Mr. PELLETIER. The purport of the letter is so far so good, or so far so bad.

Mr. LEMIEUX. So far so good.

Mr. PELLETIER, (reading):

Useless to tell you that the Canadians should not be bound by such a declaration.

And you will remember that the declaration is——

Mr. LEMIEUX. Read the letter please.

Mr. LENNOX. I rise to suggest that the hon. member for Rouville should remain silent in order that we on this side may hear the hon. gentleman who is addressing the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not like to call the hon. gentleman to order, but let me say that it is not proper for any one to interrupt an hon. member while he is speaking.

Mr. LENNOX. I suggest that the hon. gentleman who has the floor should be allowed to make such comments as he sees

fit, and that the hon. member for Rouville be restrained from indulging in interruptions.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. PELLETIER. We must make some allowance for the fact that the hon. member for Rouville is in a bad predicament at present. On that account we must forgive him something.

Mr. LENNOX. Yes, I suppose he cannot help interrupting.

Mr. PELLETIER. Now we will continue the reading of the letter.

Useless to tell you that Canadians should not be bound by such a declaration. By virtue of what treaty would they like to add to the rights and duties respectively of the empire and of the colonies? What mandate have the delegates of our chambers of commerce received to bind the future of the country in this way? The Canadian parliament alone has the right to assume such a responsibility.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Hear, hear.

Mr. PELLETIER. Do not be too rash, I have not yet finished.

The Canadian parliament only has the right to assume such a responsibility, and I do not hesitate to say that the Drummond resolution does not express the wishes of the calm and reflective opinion of the Canadian people.

If I am wrong in the translation, I speak subject to correction. It is not easy to translate as you read, and I am doing my best.

On the contrary, it is the manly attitude taken last year during the International Conference by the Prime Minister of Canada which answers public sentiment. You will remember with what enthusiasm the speech of the Prime Minister was received on the 12th of May, 1902 in the House of Commons. Certain people having exaggerated notions have been anxious for a long time that our country should plunge into the wars of the empire. Sir Wilfrid Laurier has made a declaration which has been published broadcast which is part of the Drummond resolution and which must, so far as Canada is concerned put an end for ever to militarism. Here are the words used by the Prime Minister:

Now, we come down to the head. This is a quotation from the right hon. leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier):

It is absolutely useless, at the point where we are now and in this parliament of Canada, to deceive ourselves as to what we may have in view in respect of this matter of the defence of the empire. If the intention is only to discuss what part Canada will take in its own defence and in what measure we must be ready to safeguard the integrity of the country in which we were born, which has received our faith and in which are our homes and all our affections, we certainly shall always be disposed to discuss such a matter as that. But I do not believe that it is at all necessary to ask us to approach a question of this kind——

That is the defence of the empire.

—because during the same session in which we are now the government has given its word to this House that it would be ready at all times to do its duty to that end, and it has received for that the unanimous approval of both parties. But the politics of the present day, both in England and in Canada, and perhaps in this House, comprise a certain school which would like very much to plunge Canada into the vortex of militarism which is now the bane of old Europe. I am not in favour of such policy.

Now, we have from the pen of the hon. member——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Is that the whole of it.

Here, you have, my dear colleagues, the sentiments of all true Canadians and it is to be regretted that the delegates of the Chambers of Commerce have taken their inspiration from some other source. Believe me to be,

Yours very truly,
RODOLPHE LEMIEUX.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear

Mr. PELLETIER. My hon. friends opposite are glad. Of course, whatever their leader says they applaud.

Mr. PROULX. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman a question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. PROULX. If the hon gentleman will permit me, I would like to ask him——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has no right to interrupt the speaker except with his permission.

Mr. PELLETIER. Let me finish what I am saying and then the hon. member (Mr. Proulx) can put all the questions he likes. But we have in his letter the affirmation by the hon. member from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) that he is absolutely opposed to the principle of participating in the defence of the empire. It is there in so many words. He says that he bases his opinion upon that of his leader, and his leader says that whilst he is ready to do everything for the defence of Canada he is against doing anything for the defence of the empire. This letter will go on 'Hansard' and this country will know now that these hon. gentlemen who rise in their seats and tell us that we are arch-traitors because some people have said this or that in some parts of the province of Quebec have gone even further, as the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) himself has done, or as the right hon. leader of the opposition

(Sir. Wilfrid Laurier) went when he made that speech. They have put themselves on record before this country as being opposed to doing anything for the defence of the empire and they have no right to tell this House of Commons what the hon. member for Rouville has been telling the House this afternoon. Now, Sir, I have perhaps taken more time than I ought to have taken, but I thought perhaps this question should be sifted so that we should know where we stand. With these few words, I bow to hon. gentlemen on the other side.

Mr. KNOWLES. Let me ask the hon. gentleman a question. Did not Sir Charles Tupper say that this country did not want to be drawn into the wars of the old country?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I must thank my hon. friend (Mr. Pelletier) from the bottom of my heart for his kindly discovery of that letter of the 4th of August, 1902, and for translating it, and translating it well, so that it will be on 'Hansard' and the people will know where I stand on this question. Let me call attention to the fact that the hon. gentleman is not a pathfinder in this matter. For in the earlier stages of this session a young gentleman, a member of the Nationalist party in this House referred to the fearful letter published broadcast in the province of Quebec last election and asked me if it were true that I expressed in it different sentiments from those that I expressed in the House. Then I explained under what circumstances that letter was published. In the year 1903, my hon. friend will remember there was a congress of the Chambers of Commerce of the Empire, held in Montreal and presided over by Lord Brassey. I attended the meetings because I took an interest in the world's progress. Some important resolutions were placed before them and adopted dealing with trade, naturalization and other questions such as naturally came before such a gathering. There was one resolution placed before them in favour of a direct contribution by Canada to the British exchequer for the maintenance of the British navy. Immediately after the passage of that resolution and before the Congress the Chambers of Commerce dissolved, a public meeting was held in Montreal at the now famous Monument National. It was called by Mr. Bourassa, then member for Labelle, who invited me to be present at the meeting.

He said specifically in his letter of invitation that he wanted to protest against the resolution which had been adopted by the Chambers of Commerce and he included in his letter a copy of that resolution. The resolution had been moved by Mr. Drummond, a friend of mine who is well known to belong to a school of thought as regards our duty as British citizens towards the mother country, which differs materially from another school of thought no less British I could not attend the meeting, but I wrote this letter and I would subscribe to every line, to every word of it this very day if I was called upon to pronounce upon a similar issue. My hon. friend the Postmaster General was not in the House during the discussion on the Navy Bill in 1909 and especially in 1910, when the gist of this very letter was discussed before the House. The right hon. gentleman who leads the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was taken to task by the then leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) because, forsooth, we had included in the Naval Bill a clause by which the help to be given by Canada in time of emergency should be given only when the representatives of the people should have so declared. We were taken to task, we were quite vehemently reproached for the inclusion of that clause in the Naval Bill. A debate took place here and the very sentiments embodied in this letter were expressed not by one member or by ten, but by a majority of the members of the Canadian parliament in the session of 1910. When the question came before the Congress of Chambers of Commerce, the same principle was at stake, the principle of direct contribution as against the principle of voluntary aid to the mother country. You, Sir, are well aware of the fact that not only in Canada among His Majesty's loyal subjects but in the very heart of the realm there are men opossed to militarism, there are men who to-day are members of the British government who are opposed to that vortex of militarism so aptly described by the then Prime Minister, now leader of the opposition. Lord Haldane, the Minister of War, the other day went from England to Berlin in order to confer with the German authorities and the papers say that his visit was in order to put a stop if possible to that policy of intense armaments which seems to be the bane of all European countries. I have never been against helping the mother country and when the day comes to maintain British supremacy over the seas, I say that not a true Canadian will hesitate one second in doing the needful for the mother country; but there are people in this parliament, in this country, in the motherland, amongst the ministers of His Majesty in London, who are opposed to militarism, and I say it was such militarism to which I objected in that letter.

You, Mr. Chairman, know better than anybody else what a fight we had to encounter in the province of Quebec. The Postmaster General, the Minister of Pub-

lic Works, the Minister of Inland Revenue, the members who formed the Nationalist party in Quebec, abused the right hon. gentleman, decried his followers in the province of Quebec, because, forsooth, they were going to sell our birthright because they were going to spend the people's money to help the mother country and said these gentlemen, this means conscription, this means that your children will be torn from your homes and carried away across the seas, and there be disembowelled. And they added: For what cause? We know that in Drummond and Arthabaska and in every constituency in Quebec the same vicious appeals were made by the Postmaster General and his compeers of Quebec. But I say again, and I am pleased to say it before my friends of the Tory party, let them draft a Bill on a sane imperial basis, let them decide that Canada shall help the mother country even to a larger degree than we ourselves expected to help her, let them bring a Bill acceptable and consistent with Canadian dignity, and they will have the cordial support not only of their friends, but of the Liberal party in general and especially of the French Canadians in the province of Quebec.

The vicious appeals made by the firebrands during the last campaign have helped not a little the British cause in Canada. Our people have opened their eyes. They were taught by a noisy fraction in our province that we owed no duty to the mother country, that Laurier when he was Prime Minister had sacrificed the interests of Canada by sending the contingents to South Africa. They were told all those stories but they have learned through this campaign of education their duties as British citizens, and I repeat they have elected a majority of supporters not only of the right hon. gentlemen who leads the opposition but of the British cause whenever the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, putting aside the vicious arguments used in the last campaign by some of his colleagues' and followers, will frame a Canadinan policy for the supremacy of Great Britain in the world. I hope that this letter will be distributed not only to members of this House but to every elector of my hon. friend in the county of Quebec who have been so much led astray during the last campaign.

Mr. PELLETIER. My hon. friend need not worry; it was distributed in the county of Quebec and that was one of the reasons why I was elected.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The letter which the late Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) has placed on 'Hansard' is dated 1903, and I could quite conceive that any member would be justified in changing his opinion since that date. I understand the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) to say that he has not changed his opinion and stands by every word of it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I stand by my guns like a fighter.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The principle of that letter is that there is no duty devolving upon Canada to take part in the defence of the empire.

Mr. PELLETIER. It is in plain language.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The House can judge of it. The gist of that letter is that there is no duty devolving upon Canada as a portion of the empire to take any part in the defence of the empire.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Nothing of the kind.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Well then, what is the effect of it?

Mr. LEMIEUX. You will read it in 'Hansard' to-morrow.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I ask my hon. friend what the pith and gist of it is.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is opposed to militarism and a direct contribution to the British exchequer. That is the gist of the letter.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I leave it to the hon. members of this House to judge as to the gist of that letter and as to the purpose of the hon. gentleman in speaking in Quebec or in speaking to Mr. Henri Bourassa in the endeavour to prove to him that he was not in favour of taking any part in the defence of the empire.

Mr. LEMIEUX. You are all wrong.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I am in the judgment of the House as to that. When my hon. friend voted in favour of the naval policy of the late government was he carrying into execution the principle which he laid down there?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Exactly so.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Then I would like to ask my hon. friend this: If you are going to leave it to the last minute for this parliament to say, as a portion of the British Empire, whether or not Canada shall take part in Great Britain's wars, after war has been declared, in what single respect do you differ from any foreign nation which, after war has been declared against Great Britain, makes up its mind and says whether it shall be a friend to Great Britain or an enemy? You are in a less loyal, less patriotic position and have less faith in Great Britain than the little kingdom of Japan which sat down ten years ago and said to the representatives of Great Britain: I have sufficient confi-

dence in your integrity, in the justice of your war, I have sufficient confidence in you as a nation, to say that, if within the next ten years you become involved in war, I will come to your assistance and conduct the war in common with you. When the hon. member for Rouville says that this country is bound in no way to take part in the wars of Great Britain, he is less loyal and less patriotic than the ally of Great Britain who sits down and agrees that for a certain time she will participate in the wars of Great Britain. You are a portion of the empire or you are not. If you are a portion of the empire, the minute war is declared you are subject to the international law the same as any other portion of the empire and the same as Great Britain herself. We will suppose that war has been declared and Canada decides that she will not join in Great Britain's war because, in her opinion, the war is not a just one. What position are you put in? Mv hon. friends says that he is a fighter, but he is in the position of the man who decides not to fight but is open to be attached by Britain's enemy under international law. He is not able to take any position in the defence of the empire. So long as you are a portion of the empire there has to be some connection between the motherland and Canada. there has to be some automatic arrangement by which, when war is declared by Great Britain, she is the absolute, superior power that controls the colonies; otherwise you place yourself absolutely in the position of a foreign nation.

Mr. CARVELL. Why do you not get your navy ready then?

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When I gave way to allow the Postmaster General to resume a very interesting discussion into which he had entered, and which was interrupted by his retiring in order to obtain a letter written by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), I was proceeding to speak of the fact that the Minister of Marine had given as a reason why the government had decided not to accept the tenders which had been received for the building of ten war vessels, that he had indisputable evidence that it would be a waste of money to construct the vessels as proposed, and my hon. friend gave the impression, whether intentional or not, that these vessels were not of a type which would very long remain under approval of the British admiralty. I would like to read the remarks that my hon. friend (Mr. Hazen) made in giving the reasons for not awarding the contract. Although it may be out of order to do so, yet the matter is of such great importance that probably no objection will be made. In the discussion upon the address in reply to the speech from the Throne, the Minister of Marine is reported in 'Hansard' at pages 179 and 180 as follows:

Now, Sir, my hon, and respected friend the leader of the opposition said that the old government had a well defined policy on that subject. The policy may have been well defined, but I submit to this House that it was not well considered, because the policy which they embarked upon and laid before this House was one which, if it had been carried to a conclusion, would have resulted in the expenditure of an enormous amount of money with little or no advantage to Canada or to the empire. Let me say that, there is evidence that the hon. gentlemen themselves must have come to a conclusion of that kind. We find that in the month of February last, tenders were asked for the construction of four cruisers of the 'Bristol' type and six torpedo destroyers. Those tenders were received on the 1st day of May, 1911, five months before the government went out of office; yet during the whole of that time, apparently, the government did nothing with regard to those tenders. Now, Sir, why was it, if the government were convinced of the wisdom of their naval policy, that they did not, on receipt of those tenders, award the contract for the construction of those cruisers and destroyers? Why did they wait for five months, until they went out of power, without having taken a single step in that direction? There were nine tenders. There was the tender of Cammel, Laird & Company, which was the lowest, for $11,280,000. There was the tender of Swan, Hunter & William Richardson for $12,174,000. There were other tenders, ranging from the lowest already mentioned up to $13,055,804. Those tenders did not include the armour plating, the armament, and certain supplies that go with warships of this sort, and which would have considerably augmented the cost.

Now why did the late government, after embarking on that policy, after receiving those tenders on the 1st day of May, allow them to remain in abeyance without taking a single step towards making a contract for the building of those ships? Was it because the hon. gentlemen discovered afterwards that if they had done so they would have simply been throwing away about $15,000,000 of the people's money? Because the fact is, and I have evidence that cannot be contradicted, and which I am prepared to give this House at any time if my statement is challenged, I have evidence that those vessels, under that contract, and under the conditions, would not have been completed for six years from the time the contract was awarded, and by the end of six years those vessels would have been obsolete, entirely unfit for the purposes for which they were designed. I cannot help concluding, therefore, that the late government, after issuing a call for those tenders, discovered the actual facts which I have just stated. Therefore,

they did not award the contract for the construction of those ships, but they allowed the matter to stand. When the present government came into power and when I, as Minister of the Naval Service, began to look into the question and found the facts I have just narrated to this House, I would have been entirely failing in my duty as a Minister of the Crown, if I had advised my colleagues in the Council and the Governor General to sign a contract for the construction of those ships which, by the time they were completed, would have been obsolete and valueless for the purpose for which they were intended.

Now, the Minister of Marine in these remarks throws out an intimation that probably the reason the late government did not award the contract for these vessels was because they discovered there had been a mistake and that the expenditure of the money for the purpose would not have been wise. Let me say to my hon. friend (Mr. Hazen) that he is absolutely and entirely mistaken in that assumption. There were two reasons why the late government did not award the contract. One was, that there was some considerable difficulty in determining as to the firm to whom the contract should be awarded. The lowest tenderers were The Cammell-Laird Company. They are a very reputable ship building firm. They have a very large ship building plant at Birkenhead, near Liverpool, and there is no question whatever but that if the contract had been given to them they would have completed it to the entire satisfaction of the government. But one difficulty —and it is the only difficulty I am aware of with regard to the Cammell-Laird Company—was that they coupled with it, a condition of their making an arrangement with one of the tenderers, Norton Griffiths & Company, for the construction of harbour works, including a drydock, in Courtenay bay, St. John. The late Minister of Marine had considerable doubt as to whether that could be regarded as an unconditional tender, and that was a matter which required the careful consideration he was giving it. But what was of perhaps even more importance than that was that all the tenderers either had shipyards in Great Britain, or were associated with builders having shipyards in Great Britain, it was considered desirable to take a memorandum of the tenders to England and to confer with the British Admiralty with regard to them, as well as with regard to the different firms who had tendered. Just as soon as it was convenient to do so, the Hon. Mr. Brodeur went to England and conferred with the admiralty. My hon. friend knows what happened after his return to this country. He knows that very shortly after his return it was decided to dissolve parliament and in consequence of that the government did not deal with the matter. After the elections, in consequence of the very great importance of the contract, and of the magnitude of the sum which was involved, it was thought only right to leave the question of awarding the contract to our successors. That is the whole story. Whether rightly or wrongly the late government decided that it would be in the interests of the people of Canada that the ships which were to form the nucleus of the Canadian navy should be constructed in Canada. The late government felt it would be desirable to encourage the building of ships in Canada that it would give employment to Canadian labour, and as it was necessary to make a beginning at some time, that it would be better to make a beginning in the way in which we proposed it should be made and to enter upon the construction of these war vessels in our own country. So much for that. Now, in consequence of that statement which was made by the Minister of Marine, there was put to him a question later on in the session by myself, which will be found at page 1239 of 'Hansard', as follows:

Mr. PUGSLEY:

Having reference to the statement of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, quoted in Hansard of the present session, page 179, as follows:—

The fact is, and I have evidence that cannot be contradicted and which I am prepared to give this House at any time if my statement is challenged, I have evidence that those vessels, under that contract, (referring to the tenders for the construction of cruisers and torpedo destroyers), and under the conditions, would not have been completed for six years from the time the contract was awarded, and by the end of the six years those vessels would have been obsolete, entirely unfit for the purposes for which they were designed.

What is the evidence to which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries referred, and will he give the House such evidence in detail?

To that the Minister, Mr. Hazen, answered:—

In the conditions embodied by the late government in their call for tenders for the construction of vessels for the naval service it was stipulated that the time allotted for the construction of the vessels would be six years.

In a memorandum from Admiral Kingsmill, dated October 9, 1911, it is stated that 'owing to the rapidity with which designs change it is anticipated that if it takes six years to complete the programme the ships will be out of date before they are completed.'

Then my hon. friend was requested, I think on a motion made by my hon. friend from Rouville, to lay the memorandum on the table of the House, and that was done. I have before me the memorandum of Ad-

miral Kingsmill, which does not at all bear out the statement of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. To this Admiral Kingsmill attaches the following memorandum:

With the advent of a minister who is not conversant with naval matters, nor with the requirements of the naval service, it appears desirable to supply information on these points; I therefore forward herewith a few remarks which will tend to enlighten him with regard to immediate requirements with a view to discussion at an early date on the points raised.

This is dated the 9th of October, 1911. Then follows his memorandum, the first clauses of which relate to ship construction. This is what Admiral Kingsmill says:

The programme of new construction adopted by the late government consists of: four cruisers of the improved Bristol type; six improved river-class destroyers. Whilst this progamme does not appear an ambitious one, yet it meets present requirements from the fact that ships of this kind do not require very large complements, and we are in a position to train sufficient men to form part of their crews, and will not require the loan of such large numbers of officers and men from the imperial government as would be necessary if large armoured cruisers were included in the programme. The admiralty find, difficulty in keeping their ships fully manned, and are thus not in a position to spare large numbers for the Dominions navies.

This statement is an absolute and complete justification of the action of the late government in calling for tenders for this description of war vessel. Admiral Kingsmill entirely approves of the programme of building four cruisers of the improved 'Bristol' type, and six improved 'river-class' destroyers. As having a bearing upon this, I would like to read from a report in the 'Montreal Star' of this evening of a speech made by the Rt. Hon. Winston Churchill, First Lord of the Admiralty, in the House of Commons in England, in introducing the naval estimates:

Referring to the building programme, which includes four large armoured ships, eight light armoured cruisers, twenty destroyers and a number of submarines, Mr. Churchill said that $3,500,000 was to be expended on the construction of submarines this year, and as regards the light armoured cruisers the admiralty had decided to return to a smaller type of vessels as being more useful than the recently built vessels of the Chatham class of 5,400 tons. These eight armoured cruisers will be the smallest, cheapest and fastest vessels protected with vertical armour ever projected for the British Navy. They will be strong enough and fast enough to overhaul and cut down any destroyer.

We have here the very strongest approval by Admiral Kingsmill of the programme undertaken by the late government. The remainder of his memorandum relates to the place where it would be best to have these vessels constructed—whether it would be better to build them all in Canada or to have some of them built in Canada and some in the shipyards of the mother country. This is what he says on that point:

Tenders were called for and have been received by the government for the construction of these vessels in Canada; whilst it may be desirable to encourage a firm or firms to establish shipyards in Canada, the interests and efficiency of the naval service would be better served if some portion of the ships, one or two of the cruisers, and two destroyers were constructed in England, orders being placed without delay. We should thus be able to obtain delivery of one destroyer within a year and one cruiser and a second destroyer within eighteen months; by that time a sufficient number of men will have been trained to form a nucleus of the crews, and training will be more efficiently and expeditiously carried out with the advent of modern ships. In the meantime a shipyard can be established in Canada and the remainder of the ships constructed in this yard; the whole of the programme would thus be completed in four years instead of in six as at present arranged. Owing to the rapidity with which designs change it is anticipated that, if it takes six years to complete the programme, the ships will be out of date before they are completed. Even in the short period which has elapsed since the present designs were adopted, the typical destroyers have increased in displacement and the machinery arrangement has been re-designed, which may make it desirable to negotiate with the firm who undertakes the work for an improved destroyer.

The committee will see that Admiral Kingsmill draws a distinction between the advantage of having these ships constructed in four years, and having them constructed in six years, as was proposed in the programme of the late government. But he has overlooked this important fact, that while the contracting firm had six years in which to build all the ships, that did not mean that they would delay for six years the building of any one vessel. They were to begin the work within a time specified, and would be obliged, in order to complete the contract within six years, to build two war vessels in every eighteen months, and hand them over complete to the Canadian government. That is what the specifications called for. Has my hon. friend the tenders and specifications here?

Mr. HAZEN. I have not the specifications.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is what would be provided for by the Naval Department. Then Admiral Kingsmill suggests that probably the department should have the right to make the changes in accordance with changes which might be suggested by the

British admiralty. I venture to say that would be in the contract, as it is in all contracts, that the minister should have the right to make alterations which might be recommended by the engineers of the department, and that the contractor would be obliged to make those alterations, and in case of decreased expenditure, he would make a reduction, while in case of increased expenditure, he would be allowed an increase in cost. The memorandum of Admiral Kingsmill does not at all bear out the statement that was made by my hon. friend. What does my hon. friend propose to do about the building of the Canadian navy? Does the hon. minister contend, does Admiral Kingsmill contend or do the officers of his department contend that these vessels were not of the very best type existing in the British navy at the time those officers gave their approval to the government for their construction? There is no question that was the case. If the vessels of a different type had been designed, the same remark would apply. If a country entered on a naval programme which would run over six years or ten or fifteen or twenty years, it might well be that before the whole programme was completed, the vessels of earlier construction would be out of date.

But that is a difficulty which always presents itself to any nation which undertakes the building of a navy. If my hon. friend is right then the United States could never, with any degree of wisdom, have started to construct a navy. Nor could Japan, nor any country in the world, because when they start they start with a programme which will extend in most cases over a great many years, and of course after the lapse of a number of years the vessels which are constructed in the first place would become obsolete. But surely this remark would not apply to a contract such as the late government proposed to give which would allow the contractors to take six years for the building af all these vessels, yet would have required them to construct at least two of the vessels during every 18 months in order to complete the contract within the prescribed period. Now this is a matter of very great importance to the people of Canada, and it seems to me that the committee has a right to know if, when my hon. friend gave that reason for not awarding these contracts, the government concurred with Admiral Kingsmill that two or three of these ships should be built in England. Surely my hon. friend and his colleagues did not take the important step of delaying the commencement of a Canadian navy without either agreeing or disagreeing with Admiral Kingsmill. If they agreed with Admiral Kingsmill then they should have at once placed an order for the construction, as he says, of one or two of the cruisers and two destroyers in England without delay, and the contract for the remainder of the vessels should have been awarded to a firm for construction in Canada, so that that firm could proceed with the building of its shipyard and get to work on the construction of the additional ships. But the government has done nothing. Notwithstanding there was a unanimous opinion expressed by this House as long ago as 1909, that it was desirable to proceed with the least possible delay to provide a Canadian navy which would be available for the defence of Canada, and which would also be available to assist in the defence of the empire in time of peril, the government simply withdrew from the matter, returned the deposits, and decided not to go on with the contracts, and so far as we have been informed the government have not decided whether they will adopt the view of Admiral Kingsmill: that is to have two or three of these ships built in England and proceed in Canada with the construction of the remaining vessels which would form part of the navy. If the contract had been let to the lowest tenderers Cammell, Liard & Company, early last October when the government came into power and when they had authority to deal with the matter, and if they had also acted upon the tenders which were received for the construction of a dry dock at the harbour of St. John, instead of delaying for many months before taking action, by this time the construction of a dry dock and a ship yard would have been under way, it would not be many months before the keel of the first vessel would have been laid in Canada, and it would not have been many years before all the ten vessels would have been constructed and available for the defence of the country and for the defence of the empire. But nothing is being done, and my hon. friend (Mr. Hazen) proposes to go home to England to consult the admiralty. What does he intend to recommend to the admiralty? He has stopped all action upon these tenders, he has not acted upon the advice of Admiral Kingsmill and given an order for two or three vessels in England, he has taken no steps whatever. Nevertheless he is going home to consult the British authorities. Well, we know what their opinion is. We know perfectly well that what they would prefer would be a money contribution. They would prefer that Canada should contribute a good many million dollars every year, place it at the disposal of the admiralty and let them build, man and control the ships. Does my hon. friend prefer to act upon the advice which the British admiralty may give him, if it is in that direction? The next thing the admiralty would prefer, and it is all on re-

cord, is that Canada should build a fleet unit to be placed entirely in Pacific waters. Is this government prepared to act on that suggestion, or has it any opinion upon the subject at all? It seems to me they ought to know whether, in their opinion, the proposition would be acceptable to the people of Canada or not. I think it would not be, but that it would be wholly unacceptable to the people of this country. Then there is the third suggestion, and this is the last which the British government made, their views upon the matter being well known: That we undertake to do the next best thing which could be done for the benefit of Canada and for the benefit of the empire; and my hon. friends may dally months and months and even years, and they may make trips to London in order to consult the British admiralty as often as they like, and they will find I think those are the views which will be presented to them by the British government. It seems to me it is idle for my hon. friend to say that they want to get he opinion of the British admiralty when, as I have said, we have it already clearly expressed in terms with regard to which there can be no doubt whatever. I felt, Mr. Chairman it was my duty to bring this matter before the committee, because whatever others may have thought, I certainly understood my hon. friend to convey the impression that none of these ships were to be completed for six years, and that perhaps by reason of the type of vessels they would become obsolete. But if you read carefully Admiral Kingsmill's memorandum his remarks would apply as much to any class of vessels the construction of which might be undertaken, as it would to these vessels which were proposed as part of the programme of the late government. He admits that they are the best type which can be designed for the purpose for which Canada required them. He admits that it would be better to build vessels of this class at the outset, than to build vessels of different design; and the only respect in which he differs from the late government is that he thinks these vessels ought to be constructed in four years instead of in six years, and that in order to do so it would be better to place an order for one or two cruisers and two destroyers in England, and then proceed with the establishment of a ship-yard in Canada and award the contract for the construction here of the additional vessels.

Mr. HAZEN. The hon. gentleman from the city of St. John has at last thought it necessary, that somebody should give some explanation to this House and the country as to why it was that the government of which he was a member delayed for so long a time without taking any action on the tenders that were submitted in answer to the call for tenders for the building of certain cruisers of the 'Bristol' type, and certain torpedo destroyers, for the purpose of constituting the nucleus of a Canadian navy. I might remind the House of the fact that these tenders were received on the 1st day of May last. The firms who tendered were: Cammell Laird & Company, $11,280,000; Swan, Hunter & Wigham Richardson, $12,174,000; nearly $1,000,000 more; the British Canadian Ship Building & Dock Company, $12,464,000; Vickers Sons and Maxim, $12,712,000; Sir William G. Armstrong, Whitworth & Company, $12,842,000; William Beardmore & Company, $13,055,000; and the Thames Ironworks Shipbuilding & Engineering Company, $8,532,000. The last mentioned tender, which is $3,000,000 less in round figures than the lowest of the other tenders, provided that the ships should be built in England and, therefore, was not open to consideration under the call for tenders which was that the ships were to be built in Canada. The tender of Cammell Laird & Company was nearly $1,000,000 lower than the tender of Swan, Hunter & Wigham Richardson. These tenders were received on the first day of May in the year 1911 and, beyond opening the tenders and tabulating them, there is not a scratch of a pen to show that any action was taken, or any thought given to the tenders until the 5th of October, 1911, two weeks after the general elections, and more than five weeks after these tenders had been received by the Department of Marine and Fisheries in Ottawa.

The first record we have of anything being done with regard to these tenders is in a memorandum that was submitted to council on the 5th of October, 1911, more than five months after they were received by my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), who at that time was in charge of the Department of the Naval Service.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not over six months—five months.

Mr. HAZEN. Yes, a little over five months. The memorandum of my hon. friend says.

> Under existing circumstances, and having regard to the magnitude of the transaction, the undersigned is of opinion that the question of awarding the contract may probably be left to the incoming administration and has the honour so to advise council.

So, for a period of five months after tenders were received, nothing was done with regard to the matter, so far as the record shows, by my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) or the members of the government to which he belonged. But on the 5th of October, shortly before they handed over the seals of office, my hon. friend reports to council that the matter should

be left to the incoming administration. My hon. friend, who to-night is in such a tremendous hurry that something should be done, has, I think the House will admit, entirely failed to give to the House any good reason why five months should have elapsed after tenders were called for before any action was taken. I feel that I was amply justified in saying, when speaking on the address, that the reason that appeared to actuate my hon. friend was that after the tenders were received it was felt that even if the contracts were awarded and carried out, before the contracts could be completed the vessels constructed would be useless, being out of date, and that the $15,000,000 or thereabouts spent in their construction would be spent to no good purpose, and be actually lost money so far as the interest of Canada or of the empire was concerned. I mentioned the sum of $15,000,000, for although the lowest tender amounted to between $11,000,000 and $12,000,000, it did not include the armour-plate or armour and certain other portions necessary to a war vessel which would have to be bought and paid for entirely outside the contract price, and these would have added very materially to the cost of these ships.

The hon. gentleman has said that I was not justified in drawing the conclusion I did from the report made to me as Minister of the Naval Service by Admiral Kingsmill. Let us look at the report of Admiral Kingsmill as read by my hon. friend. The hon. gentleman has said that the first clause affords absolute and complete justification for what the government did, for its whole course in regard to this naval matter. What is the first paragraph? He first refers to the fact of the programme of new construction adopted by the late government which consists of:

4. Cruisers of the improved 'Bristol' type.
6. Improved 'river-class' destroyers.

And says:

Whilst this programme does not appear an ambitious one, yet it meets present requirements from the fact that ships of this type do not require very large complements, and we are in a position to train sufficient men to form part of their crew, and will not require to obtain the loan of such large numbers of officers and men from the imperial government as would be necessary if large armoured cruisers were included in the programme.

In other words, Admiral Kingsmill says that the programme might meet present requirements, and this opinion is based solely on the ground that for these ships we might get the sailors in Canada without having to go to England to get men to man the ships and make them effective. That is the only reason given in the memorandum prepared by Admiral Kingsmill as to this programme being sufficient for the requirements; and on that the hon. gentleman bases the assertion that Admiral Kingsmill's statement shows that the course taken by the government was absolutely and completely justified. And here is what Admiral Kingsmill says with regard to these vessels, after first recommending that they should be allowed to be built in England:

In the meantime a shipyard can be established in Canada and the remainder of the programme would thus be completed in four years——

My hon. friend talks of our ships being completed in eighteen months. But he forgets that there was not then a yard in Canada capable of building ships of this sort and that these yards had to be furnished with material and plant at great cost and workmen had to be brought from different parts of Canada and in some cases from outside, and it would be at least four years after the contract was awarded before anything could be expected to be turned out from this Canadian ship-yard. Admiral Kingsmill goes on:

—the programme would thus be completed in four years instead of in six years as at present arranged. Owing to the rapidity with which designs change it is anticipated that, if it takes six years to complete the programme, the ships will be out of date before they are completed.

So, the contract which my hon. friends opposite advocated and laid before the people of this country provided for contracts being awarded for ships that would be out of date before they were completed. For the ships were not to be completed, if the whole contract was to be carried out, until six years from the time the contract was awarded; and we have the statement by Admiral Kingsmill that as it takes six years to complete the programme, the ships will be out of date before they are completed. What purpose would there be in embarking upon a naval programme to build ships when all these ships would be out of date before the last one was completed in the ship-yards of Canada? Would there be any advantage in spending a large portion of the money of the ratepayers of this country, $15,000,000 on a programme that would be obsolete and on ships that would be out of date before the programme was completed, ships that would be unable to render any service in case the empire or Canada were attacked and could only be used for training ships?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I desire to ask a question. Does the hon. gentleman know how long it would take even the best shipyards in England to build the ships as mentioned in the naval programme of last year?

Mr. HAZEN. Admiral Kingsmill, who was an authority on matters of this sort, who was selected as the Admiral of the Canadian navy by my hon. friends—and a very proper appointment and selection no doubt—calls attention to this in these words:

Tenders were called for and have been received by the government for the construction of these vessels in Canada; whilst it may be desirable to encourage a firm or firms to establish shipyards in Canada, the interests and efficiency of the naval service would be better served if some portion of the ships, one or two of the cruisers, and two destroyers, were constructed in England, orders being placed without delay. We should thus be able to obtain delivery of one destroyer within eighteen months; by that time a sufficient number of men will have been trained to form the nucleus of the crews and training will be more efficiently and expeditiously carried out with the advent of modern ships.

Evidently Admiral Kingsmill believes that if the contract were placed in England one destroyer and one cruiser could be delivered this year and a second destroyer within eighteen months, but that if we followed the programme laid down by hon. gentlemen opposite and if the contract had been awarded to Cammel, Laird & Co., the lowest tenderers, or to any of these other firms, the contract could not have been completed within six years from the time it was awarded and by that time the ships would be completely obsolete and out of date.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the hon. gentleman understand Admiral Kingsmill to mean that all the ships will be built in six years? Does he deny that two ships will be completed in eighteen months?

Mr. HAZEN. I do deny that two ships could be completed in eighteen months. It would be absolutely impossible to have a Canadian shipyard established, the plant, materials and men assembled to do the work and to complete any one of the vessels in eighteen months. The language of Admiral Kingsmill's report is plain and clear, that having regard to the whole contract it could only be completed in six years and at the end of six years we would have ships delivered to us obsolete and practically fit for the scrap heap.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Within what time does a first-class warship become obsolete?

Mr. HAZEN. Judging from Admiral Kingsmill's report, in about six years. Owing to the rapid improvements and new inventions a ship ceases to become an effective fighting machine in a very short time. Having regard to that set of facts, I do not believe there is a man in Canada unless, he is speaking from some political standpoint, who would for a moment advocate that it was desirable to enter into this contract and on the other hand I believe that the people of Canada would almost unanimously have condemned any government that would enter into a contract under which they would receive ships obsolete at the time they were built. I think I was placing the most charitable construction possible on the action of hon. gentlemen opposite who for six months and over after the receipt of these tenders did nothing, apparently did not even give serious consideration to the matter and took no action, when I say I believe their action was prompted by the realization that the contract into which they proposed to enter was improvident and not in the interests of the taxpayers; that they would be spending a large sum without getting an adequate return to the people of Canada or rendering service and assistance to Great Britain in case she became involved in a war with a foreign power.

My hon. friend to-night asked what we intended to do when we consult with the admiralty. The Prime Minister in adressing this House during the debate on the address stated plainly that it was our intention not to rush into a scheme as hon. gentlemen opposite did which was not well considered but to carefully consider all the different interests involved and after consultation with the admiralty, to formulate and bring before this House a naval policy that we believe will meet with the approval of the people of Canada irrespective of the province from which they come and also of the empire whose interests we want to protect with those of Canada in the framing of any naval policy or any navy that we may have.

With reference to some remarks made by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), I would say that I am not afraid in any respect of the people of the province of Quebec. I have the very greatest respect and admiration for the patriotism and loyalty of the people of the province from which my hon. friend comes, and I believe that the people of Quebec, in common with the people from the rest of Canada, realize that it is a duty that we owe to the empire to take some effective means not only for the protection of our own ports and shipping, but also that we join hand in hand in promoting the interest and defending the cause of the British Empire as well .

This naval question undoubtedly is a question of very great importance in this country. We are gaining in Canada a position of wealth and importance as one of the sisters beyond the seas of the British Empire. I believe that there is not a self-respecting citizen of Canada who does not feel that the position we occupy to-day, allowing the taxpayers of Great Britain without any assistance on our part

to continue as in the years when we were in our infancy to maintain the British navy for the support and protection not only of the British Isles but of the British Colonial possessions beyond the seas, is rather humiliating to us as a self-respecting people and that it is our duty plainly, clearly, and manifestly, to contribute our fair share towards national defence.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Hear, hear.

Mr. HAZEN. I believe that throughout Canada that is the strong sentiment of the people, but while that is the general feeling, while we feel that we have outgrown our swaddling clothes, and are standing on strong ground financially and in every other respect, it is humiliating to us as a nation to go on and allow the mother country to continue to pay all the expense of the support of the navy that has done so much for us in the past, and must be maintained if the British Empire of which we are an integral part is to maintain its supremacy in the future. Therefore, I say it is our duty to contribute our share fairly to the support of the British navy; but while I say that I think our contribution must be on grounds that will meet with the approval of our citizens and will be consistent with our position as a selfrespecting part of the British Empire. A navy to be effective must be for the purposes of the empire. If we are to continue as an empire we cannot have one navy for New Zealand, another for Australia, another for South Africa, another in Canada, and another for the British Isles. A navy which exists for the purpose of the general defence of the empire must be a navy concerning which there shall not be a divided control which would destroy its usefulness and efficiency in time of trouble. As General Botha, Prime Minister of South Africa, said soon after the imperial conference: I fail to see how South Africa can fail to be at war if any other part of the British Empire is; it is not consistent with the idea of empire, that ont part can be at war without the other parts assisting and rendering effective aid. That must be the feeling and ambition so far as the navy is concerned, and whatever navy is designed—and for the moment I am not considering whether each portion of the empire should have representation on the board controlling that navy—must be a navy concerning which there will not be a divided control and must be prepared to act and strike as an effective whole when necessary in defence of the flag.

This question has been discussed to-day largely from the standpoint of the effect of the naval policy of the recent government upon the province of Quebec. Let me say to hon. gentlemen opposite that I believe that naval policy as enunciated by hon. gentlemen opposite was not any more popular in the other provinces; I believe that the general feeling in Canada was largely adverse to the scheme which was embarked on hurriedly without carefully considering the consequences. We hope and believe that the government of the day will be able to formulate and lay before parliament at a not far distant date a proposal in regard to the important question now under consideration that will meet with the enthusiastic support not only of the English provinces but of Quebec as well, and that will prove itself in the future a very great force for the preservation of the peace and for the security of the whole British Empire.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Has my hon. friend the tenders and, if so, will he kindly send them over to me?

Mr. HAZEN. The tenders I read were contained in the report made to council by my hon. friend who sits opposite to me, the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux). The tenders were laid before the House. I think the papers can be got.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Perhaps my hon. friend can tell the committee within what time these vessels were to be completed?

Mr. HAZEN. I have not the call for tenders; all I have is a list of the amounts of each tender. I may be able to get the information without any great delay.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think this is a matter of a great deal of importance, and that my hon. friend ought to allow this item to stand until we have the conditions of the call for tenders, and proceed with some other item.

Mr. HAZEN. We will get it for the hon. gentleman in a moment. The deputy minister of Naval Affairs tells me that the call for tenders required the delivery of one cruiser and two destroyers within three years of the date of the awarding of the contract; after that one cruiser every year and one destroyer every nine months.

Mr. BELAND. Only one cruiser would have been obsolete.

Mr. HAZEN. They would all have been obsolete at the end of six years.

Mr. BORDEN. As a matter of fact, the British admiralty have abandoned this type of vessel alogether during the present year.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I agree with what has been said by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) that something ought to be done for the naval defence of Canada and we must all join hands in maintaining the supremacy of Great Britain in case of danger. There

has never been any difference of opinion between this side of the House and the other as to that material point in the discussion, namely, the defence of the British flag and the maintenance of British supremacy over the seas. Let that be clearly understood throughout the country. The words we are speaking this evening will, I hope, be repeated by the press throughout Canada. The issue was obscured during the election. My hon. friend must be aware, that in certain provinces the policy of my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was assailed, because, forsooth, his policy did not go far enough, and in the province of Quebec it was assailed, because, forsooth, it went too far. Now, I admit we suffered heavily from the joint attacks of the extremists on both sides during the election. I have no doubt whatever that on the 21st September last many constituencies were lost to the government of the day because the policy of my right hon. friend had been represented as being a little Canadian policy, whilst in the province of Quebec it was represented as being too much of a British policy. Now, after the defeat, the late government could not consistently give the contract for the carrying out of the naval programme that had been elaborated before the elections. We thought, and properly so, that the question should be left to our successors who had defeated us on that very question because, let there be no mistake about it, while we may talk about reciprocity and other issues that were involved during the last campaign, I can assure the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Borden), that in our province we were simply pilloried on the naval question, because, indeed we had gone too far. I repeat again to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that the majority of the people in the province of Quebec, in spite of the appeals there were made, pronounced themselves in favour of the naval defence and of the maintenance of the supremacy of Great Britain upon the seas and in the world at large. The question has been solved There is a majority amongst the people in favour of that policy. Now, it remains for my hon. friend to evolve a new programme. He is going to consult with the admiralty, he says. I am glad of the words he has spoken this evening. He does not speak this evening in the back concession of the county of Quebec; he speaks on the floor of the House of Commons, to the Canadian people, and his words to-morrow will be re-echoed in Great Britain, in the heart of the empire. We are going to have a naval policy. That naval policy, from what I understand from the hon. gentleman, will be a policy which will take one of two forms, either a contribution in money to the British exchequer, or the construction of cruisers, of destroyers, perhaps of Dreadnoughts in Canada or Great Britain. Have I understood the hon. gentleman rightly?

Mr. HAZEN. I did not say what form it would take.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Ah, my genial friend should know that I will vote for this item in a few minutes; I stand for naval defence. I want Canada to do something for the mother country. But will not my hon. friend inform me, will he not state what he is going to do, what he intends to recommend to the British admiralty? He will have a mandate; he will speak on behalf of the government, nay, more, he will speak on behalf of the Canadian people when he reaches London. What will he say to the British admiralty? Will he say that the policy propounded by my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition and his colleagues, the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) and the late Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden), was not the policy of the Canadian people, but that the true policy was his policy and the policy of his friends? What is that policy? What is he going to say? —that notwithstanding what may be suggested by the British admiralty, the matter must remain in abeyance until the firebrands, and there are some in this House, not very far from the hon. gentleman, are silenced? What will he say? Will he say to Mr. Winston Churchill; Canada is willing to have shipyards, to vote money, to build cruisers, destroyers, Dreadnoughts, or will he say: Canada is a wealthy nation, we have a surplus of nearly $40,000,000, we are ready to take from the treasury say $10,000,000 annually, as was suggested by the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) and give it to the British exchequer in order to help the mother country in her troubles abroad?

I should like to know what he will say. I can tell my right hon. friend that I as a Liberal and as a Canadian of French descent am quite ready to stand by the British flag and by the duty which Canada owes to the mother country in matters of defence. It is no trouble for me to stand by that flag; I fought in my county, and the farmers of Rouville have accepted nobly the policy of the right hon. gentleman to do something towards our naval defence. I have no difficulty at all with my electors as regards the naval programme. And, Sir, I tell the Prime minister that the province of Quebec is ready to stand by his government if they evolve a sane naval policy. But, I want to know what the government will do. We are in doubt;

it is being whispered by the friends of the Postmaster General and by the friends of the Minister of Public Works: no, no, the government will do nothing, the government is only shilly-shallying; the papers may say this or the papers may say that, but nothing will be done, don't be afraid, there will be no navy, there will be no 'Niobe' and no 'Rainbow,' your children will not be disembowelled in the Chinese seas or in Oceania. That is the policy of the Postmaster General in the province of Quebec, but I want to know from the leader of the government what is his policy. We Liberals, English-speaking Liberals, French Canadian Liberals, we stand by the naval defence of this country, we are ready to help the motherland, we will help this government; even when they will be deserted by their Nationalist friends at the first opportunity on that very important question. Sir, this is an important question. The election was fought in my province on that sole issue and on no other. I can assure the Prime Minister that in the province of Quebec we did not hear much of reciprocity. In fact, every Nationalist candidate who now supports the government told his electors: Reciprocity is not important; it is a question of dollars and cents, we don't mind that, the navy is the real issue. In fact, Mr. Lavergne, the leader, the inspirer of the Postmaster General, the Beau Brummell of the Nationalist party, ironically referred to reciprocity as a paltry question of figures, and said: We don't bother about the fiscal issue, but we are concerned about the navy. And in every county of the province Mr. Armand Lavergne aroused enthusiasm; aroused the passions of the people on the iniquitous navy. He told his hearers: Is Canada to be fleeced, Canada is to spend her millions for England? But, Sir, we Liberals in the province of Quebec, we told the people: We are ready to do something for the empire; we stand for a Canadian navy, we want our ships as far as possible built in Canada, we want to fly the Canadian flag on our ships—and what do you think, Sir, but the British Admiralty agreed to that. Just fancy these traitors across the seas: Mr. Churchill, Mr. McKenna, the Asquith government, fancy them agreeing that a Canadian flag should fly on our country's navy. What traitors; what arch-traitors they are Sir! It is remarkable that some people in this country are more British than the British themselves. Amongst Catholics we say that the Ultramontanes are more Catholic than the Pope, and so in Canada we have some people who are more British than His Majesty the King. In England, they agreed to our naval policy, they accepted it. What will the hon. minister say to the admiralty now when he goes over there? Will he advise the British admiralty that it was all wrong? Will he advise them that Mr. McKenna was wrong, that Mr. Churchill was wrong, and even that Lord Charles Beresford was wrong? Why, in his recent book 'The Great Betrayal,' Lord Charles Beresford mourns the fact that the admiralty has not yet seen its way to efficiently protect the trade routes of the empire, and he complains that small cruisers, such as we proposed to build in Canada, have not been built. What is my right hon. friend the hon. minister going to say to the admiralty? I am sure of one thing; I know my right hon. friend; I said a few moments ago that he was a sane imperialist, that he was a good Britisher, that he would put aside the vicious attacks made here against the British flag, and against the policy of naval defence. He will tell the admiralty that something ought to be done by Canada, or by Great Britain and Canada jointly. I know that. But, will he say to the British admiralty: you were wrong when in discussing a policy with the representatives of the Canadian government you agreed to a certain plan. Will he in return suggest something new? Suppose the British admiralty, being consistent with itself, would say, the arrangements made by the Canadian government were all right; we are satisfied if you will carry them out. What then, will the Prime Minister carry out that arrangement; will he come back to Canada and lecture his friend, the Postmaster General, and say: you were all wrong in Quebec county, we are going to adopt the Laurier policy, or will he—he a layman as I am—will he undertake to lecture Mr. Churchill and the British lords of the admiralty and say to them: no, we must not have shipyards in Canada, we must not encourage Canadian enterprise and Canadian skill; we must not revive Canadian shipbuilding; you will build the ships for us, and we will pay the piper; Canada is rich; we have forty millions of a surplus, we will take ten millions from our surplus, and send it to you. I am quite sure my right hon. friend will do one of two things—he will either maintain or perhaps enlarge the Canadian policy evolved by the Liberal government, or he may go a step further, and contribute in cash a few millions. If it is the wish of the Canadian people that we should take our own money and send it to England, Sir, I am a Liberal, I believe in democratic institutions, and I will abide by the decision of the Canadian people, whatever it be. But let me tell my hon. friend this—he was not in the House when the resolution of the 29th March,

1909, came before this parliament; let him open 'Hansard,' let him read the debate which took place on that occasion. Sir, in my recollection, there never was a debate in this House which did more credit to both the Liberal and Conservative parties than did that great debate. I, a young Canadian of French descent, I was enthused by the remarks made on that occasion, not only by my leader, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, but especially by the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster, North Toronto).

He is a great orator, a born orator; but on that occasion he was more than equal to himself. The House listened to him; what did he say? Sir, he followed in the footsteps of the right hon. the leader of the opposition; he declared himself for the policy of the Liberal government. He said that he was in favour of a Canadian navy, built in Canada. My right hon. friend the leader of the government, was also in favour of that policy, and he suggested, in the amended resolution which was accepted unanimously—except by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, now the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk)—that there should be a speedy construction of Canadian battleships. My right hon. friend went to England shortly after this. I followed him very closely. He was the guest of the Constitutional Club in London. There was present the leader of the opposition, the Right Hon. Arthur Balfour, who I think presided at that dinner. Mr. Balfour made a speech; Mr. Donald Macmaster, K.C., now M.P., also delivered a speech. My right hon. friend the leader of the government was the guest of honour at that dinner, and he there and then boldly declared himself in favour of the policy propounded by the right hon. the Prime Minister of the late government; he was in favour of a Canadian navy; he wanted to revive old Halifax and its industries. He made a lofty speech; I have it somewhere, but not under my hand just now. I applauded it; I said: How manly is the leader of the opposition; he sticks to his colours; he is consistent. He came back. He had time to pause. Across the ocean, although tossed by the billows of the sea, and dreaming that he would be some day the Premier of Canada—which he has become, thanks to the double-barrelled policy propounded at the last election—still he stuck manfully to his guns. He reached Halifax, the city he represents, and there he delivered another speech, in which he said—and I wish my hon. friend to correct me if I am not telling the truth: Men of Halifax, who elected me in days of opposition, I stand by the Canadian policy; Halifax will have a revival; new industries will spring up; the construction of a Canadian navy will make a new Halifax of the old Halifax. Then, the hon. member for North Toronto during the recess also went around the country delivering many speeches, and at many places again declared himself in favour of a Canadian navy, built in Canada, and manned by Canadians. Thank Heaven, the Conservative party was once true to its colours; it was a Canadian party. On that question of a navy, evolved on the very pretext, the obvious pretext, of helping the mother country it put that question above party lines. It did not want to play the politicai game with that national question. But that mood did not last many months. An election took place in the county of Drummond and Arthabaska. The firebrands, the Minister of Public Works, Mr. Bourassa, Mr. Armand Lavergne, the Postmaster General saw an occasion to create troubles for the Liberal government. They could not well attack the Liberal government on its general policy; but they went before the people of Drummond and Arthabaska on the naval question; and what did they say there? My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in those days was quietly presiding over the affairs of New Brunswick at Fredericton, honestly administering the affairs of his province. The right hon. the Prime Minister was away somewhere else, perhaps outside of Canada—If I remember well. At all events, although about half the electors in the county of Drummond and Arthabaska are English-speaking and the other half French, my right hon. friend the leader of the government kept away from the constituency; so did the Minister of Trade and Commerce; although some years ago I remember, when there was a by-election in the country of Sherbrooke, we met there the Prime Minister and the Minister of Trade and Commerce—it was not then too far for them to come and visit us. But on that very serious occasion of a by-election in Drummond and Arthabaska, they kept away from the country. There we saw the Postmaster General, the Minister of Public Works, you, Mr. Chairman, the member for Dorchester (Mr. Sévigny), Mr. Bourassa and the Beau Brummell of the Nationalist party, the young man of the red necktie, Mr. Armand Lavergne. And what appeals did they make?

Mr. PELLETIER. Will my hon. friend allow me?

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend may answer me by-and-by. They all came to the constituency, and there we know what incendiary appeals they made. We know

that an hon. gentleman spoke of certain holes in the British flag. Another gentleman appealed to Divinity itself. The Canadian nationality, meaning the French Canadian, he said, was being crucified on the Golgotha of militarism, and the crucifiers were the Liberal ministers and their right hon. leader. The Judases of the nationalité were the Liberal ministers; the traitors were the Liberal ministers; yes, we in their estimation, were selling our birthright for a mess of pottage. Great Britain was encroaching on the rights of Canada, and we were mean enough, we were unpatriotic enough, we were anglicised enough, to forget our own blood, our traditions, to our aspirations, our ideals, and we were playing into the hands of John Bull.

Sir, we know the result: They went from concession to concession, people with brass buttons knocked at the door of Jean Baptiste the farmer, and said to the mother in that household: 'Mother, how many sons have you?' 'What is the matter with you?' 'Well, have you got any sons?' 'Yes.' 'Then you had better give me their names, because Laurier is going to take them and enlist them in the navy, they will be sent from Quebec to the China seas, or to India, or to Japan, and they will be disembowelled. Laurier wants them to fight for the British flag for an unknown cause. The Postmaster General, was he then Zandrang? I do not know. The Minister of Public Works, the Minister of Inland Revenue, and you, Mr. Chairman, were all there; and the people of Drummond and Arthabaska in a moment of weakness, to quote an historical phrase, were so upset as to believe in what the hon. gentlemen said. Thank heaven the people of Drummond and Arthabaska were found on their way to Damascus at the last election. They paused, they reflected, they read, they listened, and they saw the light and they sent back to his farm that modern Cincinnatus Mr. Gilbert. Now, Sir, to be serious.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am only repeating the arguments used in Drummond and Arthabaska. My hon. friends on the other side—and I have many there I know—my Tory friends, for whom I have great respect, frankly applaud the appeals made by the Postmaster General when he turns to them and says: 'Yes we are ready to fight for the British flag. We adore the same God, we Catholics and Protestants.' He never misses that peroration; but if they knew him as I know him, if they could have listened to him in the county of Quebec, in the county of Lotbinière and in the county of Drummond and Arthabaska, they would find, not the Britisher who appeals to their noblest passions and looks for their applause in this House, but the very worst firebrand this country has ever known.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Now to be serious again. I say to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries: He has taken my portfolio—I was Minister of Marine and Fisheries for two months, and I know that there has been no mistake in that department—and he will find the department clean and unsullied, and even the honest Ducharme will find nothing to investigate there. My hon. friend (Mr. Hazen) will go to England. Let me tell him in all seriousness that he carries with him the best wishes of the Canadian people, whether Conservative or Liberal. He will consult the admiralty; behind him will stand the Canadian people. There in conjunction with the British statesmen he will evolve a new policy. Whatever that policy may be, if it is all accepted, it will be the policy of the Canadian people, and I can tell him this further: The Liberal party in this House, composed not only of English speaking Liberals, but French Canadian Liberals, will stand behind the government when that policy is put before the House. We will not make a party question of the defence of the empire.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, we will not make a party question of the defence of the empire, of the defence of the British flag and the supremacy of the mother country over the sea. This is a national question. That is how we put it before the people of the province of Quebec, in spite of the vicious appeals made by the friend of the Minister of Marine who is sitting to his left, in spite of the passions roused by his colleagues in the cabinet. We stood firmly by the Canadian policy during the last elections, and we intend to stand for it in the future, as in the past. We stand by the mother country when the government's naval policy is brought before parliament.

Mr. BORDEN. My hon. friend this afternoon and this evening has reminded us very much of those beautiful lines of Tennyson:

> Men may come and men may go, but I go on for ever.

If there is anything the hon. gentleman said this afternoon which he did not say this evening, or anything he said this evening which he did not say this afternoon, I, for one am unable to appreciate it. He was evidently so thoroughly satisfied with his performance this afternoon that he found it necessary to repeat it this evening. Well, had we plenty of time,

and were we here purely for the purpose of giving my hon. friend that practice which he really does not need, no one would have any objection to it; but I would suggest to my hon. friend that perhaps he might devote himself to some matters that he did not explain very well, and as to which I will ask an explanation from him now. I presume that he spoke for his party. One is a little in doubt as to whether he, or my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) is leading on the naval question, but I would perhaps be safe in concluding that as far as the construction of ships is concerned my hon. friend from St. John is the mouthpiece of the party, and so far as the fighting part of it is concerned my hon. friend from Rouville is their exponent. Now he informs us that he stands absolutely and literally by the letter which he wrote on the 4th of August, 1903. There is no mistake about that, is there?

An hon. MEMBER. Speak now?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is the Prime Minister appealing to me?

Mr. BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Then I will reply that I am certainly against militarism.

Mr. BORDEN. I am not speaking of militarism—

Mr. LEMIEUX. That is what I mentioned in the letter.

Mr. BORDEN. However, that is one statement. Does my hon. friend not speak for his party in that regard?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am speaking for myself.

Mr. BORDEN. Then apparently it is not a happy family on the other side of the House.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Everything is serene.

Mr. BORDEN. I ask my hon. friend again whether in making that statement he is, or is not, speaking for his party.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Since my hon. friend the Prime Minister has asked the question I am bound to answer. I say that the letter in question I would write again to-day; I stand by every word and by every line of that letter.

Mr. BORDEN. I would like to inquire whether the hon. gentleman's party stand by every word and by every line. My hon. friend does not seem inclined to give any very direct answer to my question. However, I will leave it in that way. Now let us look for one moment at the letter, and at the resolution which it criticised—because I have taken the pains to look at the resolution—and we will find exactly where my hon. friend and presumably his party stand—unless they repudiate him, because they put him forward to speak—we will find exactly where they stand with regard to this question before we get through.

My dear Colleague,—

I would greatly have desired to have been present at the meeting on Sunday evening in order to protest with you against the untimely resolution adopted these last days by the Congress of the Chambers of Commerce of the empire. For reasons entirely of a personal nature I was unable to be present. Permit me, however, to express my astonishment that the delegates of the Chambers of Commerce of Canada, and of the province of Quebec in particular, had thought it their duty to support a resolution which affirms a principle absolutely false——

Mark the words 'absolutely false'—

—that is to say, the obligation of the colonies to participate in the defence of the empire.

Now, what was the resolution which my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) thought it necessary to attack, and which he attacked to-day—in the name of his party, I presume?

Mr. LEMIEUX. On my own behalf.

Mr. BORDEN. Was it? Well, let us see. He stated that once before to-day. I will read the resolution he has attacked on his own behalf and in the name of his party as reported in the Montreal 'Gazette' and various other places:

That this Congress affirms the principle that it is the duty of the self-governing colonies to participate in the cost of the defence of the empire——

Mr. LEMIEUX. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN. Why, my hon. friend wrote a letter denouncing it. He did not hear the rest of it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Go ahead.

Mr. BORDEN. We will read it again, so as to be absolutely sure we get the whole of it:

That this Congress affirms the principle that it is the duty of the self-governing colonies to participate in the cost of the defence of the empire——

Mr. LEMIEUX. The cost.

Mr. BORDEN. My hon. friend should endeavour to calm himself, I will try once more, and I will ask him to use the greatest possible self-control and let me get through with it. I know that it disturbs him, but let him exercise self-control, and we shall be able to get through. This is the letter——

Mr. LEMIEUX. That is the old one.

Mr. BORDEN. He is still disturbed. I would commend to him the advice of a good old friend of mine in Halifax, who

occasionally made use of a Latin word in a wrong way when he exhorted a friend, 'Now, don't get too excelsior.' Now, let us begin once more:

This congress affirms the principle that it is the duty of the self-governing colonies to participate in the cost——

Not a word from my hon. friend that time.

—of the defence of the empire; but the colonies claim the privilege of taking their own initiative as to the nature and mode of help which they agree to offer.

Now, that is the resolution which called forth this letter of protest from my hon. friend as I understood——

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am not quite sure of that.

Mr. BORDEN. There was a previous resolution which was drafted in these words:

It is resolved that this congress hereby affirms the principle that it is the duty of the self-governing colonies to participate in the cost of the defence of the empire.

Mr. LEMIEUX. That is the one.

Mr. BORDEN. Now my hon. friend's face lights up when the latter words are omitted.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I thank my hon. friend. I had forgotten it; but that is the very one.

Mr. BORDEN. And not the other? The one I read last was never adopted. The hon. gentleman has stated in this letter, as distinctly as it could be stated, an exactly opposite position from that which his leader took this afternoon. Does not he recognize that. It was put forward as a reproach to my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) and others that they had declared that there was no duty on the part of Canada to participate in the defence of the empire.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN. What does the hon. gentleman say? I will read it again. Apparently his ability to comprehend either the French or the English language is disturbed for the time being. Let us read it first in French:

Permettez moi cependant d'exprimer mon étonnement de ce que les délégués des Chambres de Commerce du Canada, et de la province de Québec en particulier, aient cru devoir appuyer une résolution qui affirme un principe absolument faux, à savoir: l'obligation pour les colonies de participer à la défense de l'Empire.

Now, let us read it in English in the best translation I can give:

Permit me, however, to express my astonishment that the delegates of the chambers of commerce of Canada, and of the province of Quebec in particular, have thought it their duty to support a resolution which affirms a principle absolutely false, that is to say an obligation on the part of the colonies to participate in the defence of the empire.

My hon. friend says that the obligation or the duty of the colonies to——

Mr. LEMIEUX. Not duty; obligation.

Mr. BORDEN. That is a delightfully fine point.

Mr. LEMIEUX. 'The obligation.'

Mr. BORDEN. The principle that there is an obligation on the part of the colonies to participate in the defence of the empire is a perfectly false one, but the principal that there is a duty on the part of the colonies to participate in the defence of the empire is a perfectly sound one. I am glad to know where we have my hon. friend at last. What a beautifully fine distinction he makes of it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Will my hon. friend allow me? Does not he see that there is quite a difference?——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The right hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) is interpreting a letter of mine. I suppose I can help him to interpret it. Does he not see the difference between a moral duty and an obligation?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, I stand by my words. I appeal to my right hon. friend as a lawyer, and a lawyer of distinction, is not there an essential difference between a moral duty—that was the Laurier policy—and an obligation, which was another policy.

Mr. BORDEN. I suppose the word 'moral' might be applied to an obligation as well as to a duty. I never heard that the adjective would be misplaced in one case and properly placed in another. As a matter of fact the letter of my hon. friend does not contain the word 'moral' at all, and does not refer to it. I submit to any hon. member of this House, that when my hon. friend endeavours to squirm out of his letter in that way, he is not doing his intelligence or his standing in this House great credit. It would have been a perfectly proper and reasonable thing to do if he had stood up and said: I did write that letter; but I came to a different conclusion afterwards. But when he ventures to tell this House that any reasonable man could regard for a moment such a distinction as he has attempted to draw, he makes demands upon our intelligence which are either above or below the grasp of any man in this House. My right hon.

friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) made similar reproaches to hon. gentlemen on this side. As I understood him this afternoon he said that the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) or some one else on this side had declared that Canada owed no duty to the mother country—owed nothing to the mother country, I think was the form of it. Surely he is confusing the utterances of hon. gentlemen on this side with those of gentlemen who were his own colleagues for fifteen years. He knows as well as any hon. gentleman in this House that the gentleman who presided as Minister of Trade and Commerce over one of the departments of his government declared in this House and outside of it and repeated it to me across the floor that Canada owed nothing to the mother country except Christian forgiveness for the wrongs she has wrought to this country.

The main point is the one to which my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) addressed himself, that is the question which arises very naturally upon this estimate, as to the reasons why the present administration did not see fit to carry out the policy of the late government. That has been made patently plain by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen). As a matter of fact, the type of vessel which was adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite has been abandoned this very year by the British Admiralty; if the press reports are correct they have reverted to a cheaper, smaller and swifter type of vessel so it is very fortunate indeed that this contract was not entered into. The hon. member for Rouville says: What are we to do when we go to England, what are we to say to the admiralty? We are to say in the first place that we do not believe that the policy brought down by the last administration would have been of any advantage either to Canada or to the empire. The next thing we will say is that the people to whom that policy was submitted have come absolutely to the same conclusion as that at which we have arrived. And then we will say that we are prepared to discuss with the admiralty the details of a policy which we will submit to parliament and to the people of Canada. In other words, instead of formulating a policy first and thinking about it afterwards, we will think about it first and formulate it afterwards.

I would remind my hon. friend the member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) that this government has been in power hardly as long as the period during which those tenders were before him and his colleagues and yet during the past two, three or four months we have heard the most bitter complaints and the most amazing indignation, because the present government did not formulate a policy during the period we have been in power, a little over five months; yet for a little over five months the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) had these tenders before him and could not make up his mind about them although he did not have, during that time the stress of a parliamentary session to engage his time and attention. He had very much more leisure than the present administration have had to consider any policy of naval defence. I am glad to know that the Department of Marine and Fisheries under the control of my hon. friend the minister who presides over that department will have the advantage of the earnestness and ability and determination to mould such a policy which that hon. gentleman possesses, such a policy as will be in the interest of the people of Canada and of the empire as well. I am glad to know that my hon. friend has determined that such a policy can only be arrived at after care and consideration, which are obviously necessary for the solution of a great problem such as this. It is a problem as I have said on many a previous occasion in this House that concerns in the most vital, in the closest way, the relations between the self-governing dominions and the mother country because no man in this House or in this country need disguise from himself the fact that if the various dominions of the empire do enter into a system of naval defence which shall concern and belong to the whole empire, those dominions, while that system continues, cannot be very well excluded from having a greater voice in the councils of the empire than they have had in past years. I think we all, on both sides of the House, realise that any man who applies his intelligence to the solution of that particular problem will arrive at that conclusion. We might bring down a policy for consideration, a policy of the construction of a certain number of small cruisers.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN. I am not speaking of myself, I am speaking of parliament, I am not proposing to do anything of that kind. I say that we in parliament, speaking of parliament as a whole, might enter upon a policy of constructing a certain number of cruisers of light type.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Hear, hear. I agree to that, does the Postmaster General agree to that?

Mr. BORDEN. My hon. friend does not understand the context in which I am using that illustration. I say we might do that, but in doing that we would not be framing the basis of a naval policy that would stand in all the years to come. It is for that reason that we thought the late government were wrong in proposing such a policy, and that they did not go to the

very heart of the matter; and that before we entered into any arrangement of that kind we must know where we were standing within this empire. So, we propose that the naval policy of the late government should not be continued, and we do propose before any naval policy is entered upon that some of those matters shall be considered, and when that policy is brought down it shall be presented to parliament, and the people of this country shall be given an opportunity to pronounce upon it.

So far as the future policy of this government is concerned, we propose to formulate it after careful consideration and attention to the problems which I have mentioned here to-night. We propose to give to those problems our very best consideration. We propose, so far as the technical question is concerned, to be guided by the empire's experts, because he was not guided because the admiralty must be better informed upon the technical side of this question than any man in this country can possibly be.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Just as we were guided.

Mr. BORDEN. My hon. friend says he was guided. He told us a while ago that he was not guided because the admiralty proposed one thing which they would not do, and then proposed another thing which the late government would not do, and then the admiralty finally consented to something, which they regarded as not wholly satisfactory, because the late government were so anxious to have it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Which they quite approved.

Mr. BORDEN. Therefore, I do not appreciate the force of my hon. friend's statement that they were guided by the admiralty.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Guided as to the class of vessels by the admiralty.

Mr. BORDEN. I would not view it in that way, but my hon. friend has his opinion and I have mine. In conclusion there was a certain organization left to us by the late administration. My hon. friend has already said that we would not be expected to sink the vessels or to set fire to the building they erected. We have kept them up, we are maintaining the organization so far as it may be necessary and desirable until a definite policy can be arrived at, but when a definite policy is arrived at we shall be very glad indeed to have from the hon. member from Rouville that fervent support which he pledged to us to-night.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Always provided it is on safe lines.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. For my part, and I believe for the whole House also, the discussion we have had is most instructive and will bear excellent fruit. At last we know where we are on this question of the naval policy. We know that it is the policy of this government to have a naval service. We know that it is their intention, somehow or other—I do not know how—they do not themselves know exactly—to take part in the defence of the empire, but whether by a contribution or whether by maintaining a fleet of their own is a matter to be decided, very properly, in the future. The present government took issue with that policy, the policy we laid down, and for which we had the approval of the last parliament. I have no fault to find with those who condemned that policy from the point of view represented by my hon. friend opposite. He was not satisfied with the line which we took, nor were his friends behind satisfied with it. In their view we had kept too much autonomy in our policy. In so far as I remember the discussion during the last parliament, the reproach of my right hon. friend and his friends from all the provinces, except the province of Quebec, was that there was too much autonomy in our policy. But everybody knows in the province of Quebec that for eighteen months and more, from the month of January, 1910, when we introduced the naval policy Bill, up to the 21st September, 1911, the gentlemen who support the present administration, the gentlemen who represent the province of Quebec in this administration, one and all, upon all the hustings in Quebec, upon every stump upon which they could plant their feet, stated that we owed absolutely nothing to England, that we should not have a ship to assist in her defence and that we should never give a penny for that defence. I suppose that I am not to bring proof of what I say, but if that statement is denied upon the present occasion——

Mr. LEMIEUX. They cannot deny it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If it is denied, I leave it to those who sit behind them to say whether or not I am right. But, after all, we have gained this out of this present discussion that we know that all this talk was for political effect and that now that the elections are past every gentleman who represents the province of Quebec in this administration will come up and do his duty like a British subject and a Canadian. There is nothing more to be said on this point; it does not require any discussion. The government tell us that they are not satisfied with our programme and that they want to go to England and consult with the admiralty. Well and good; I have no objection to that. We will await their policy. If they can do better than

we did, well and good—nobody will begrudge their efforts, but we will judge of their policy when it comes up for discussion. Now, I have only one more remark to make. We have been told that we ought not to have entered into this contract for building ships because the ships would be obsolete before they were completed. How is my hon. friend to proceed? If he is to have ships built in this country he must proceed just as we have proceeded, and when he tells me that ships are obsolete in six years, I take issue with him. There may be, in the space of six years, improvements, or some change in detail, but the types of the ships are not changed once in 25 years. We can follow the course of shipbuilding from the time of the American civil war in 1862, when iron ships came into use and supplanted wooden ships. True there has been improvement. We can follow from type to type, and while it has taken about 25 years to evolve a new type, probably every year there has been some new method, some change of detail in every ship that is built. I dare say there is not a ship built by England, France, Germany or the United States in one year but is somewhat different from the ships built the preceding year, but it does not follow that the type is different. The statement which my hon. friend makes is not serious when he says that the reason these contracts were not gone ahead with was simply that the ships might become obsolete when they were completed. My hon. friend should not have made that statement. He had a better reason, and that better reason was that, having fought upon the policy that we had fought upon and it having gone against us, he was bound to go to England and try to make a new arrangement with the British Admiralty. He will say that from the government standpoint there is nothing else for him to do than this. So, he is going to England. I wish him well, I wish him every possible success, but in the meantime I say that we have established a new basis in the province of Quebec, and that we will never hear any more the treasonable language by which we were defeated.

Mr. PELLETIER. Mr. Chairman, I shall not indulge in the kind of—should I call it argument—which the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux)——

Mr. LEMIEUX. I stated your own words.

Mr. PELLETIER. If the hon. member for Rouville will only hold his tongue for a few minutes—he is so much excited that he cannot refrain from talking all the time. The hon. gentleman would not allow me to say anything while he was speaking.

Mr. LEMIEUX. And you did the same to me.

Mr. PELLETIER. His leader ought to give him some advice. I am not going, Sir, to indulge in that kind of argument. The hon. member for Rouville has thought fit to go as far to-night as to address a member of this House by giving him, not his name, or the name of the county which he represents, but by giving him a name of his own invention.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What name?

Mr. PELLETIER. The hon. member for Rouville will allow me to speak; he has not allowed me to interrupt, and he will please sit down and keep quiet. I shall not follow the hon. member for Rouville on these lines. The hon. member for Rouville is sore, his heart is full of all kinds of regrets, and, of course, we must have some pity on the poor fellow. If we were to follow him this House would be turned into a bear garden. Somebody must have some dignity, and somebody must not forget himself; we will try to show him that good example, and if he is susceptible of learning something, he may learn that.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Thank you.

Mr. PELLETIER. He will not hold his tongue. The hon. member for Rouville has become a great Imperialist, and he is a great Imperialist notwithstanding his own letter in which he says the reverse. I shall not try to explain all that he has put before this House, but I am just going to give you an example of the kind of man the hon. member for Rouville is, and this House will know him, and judge him after that. This man has repeated three times to-night——

Mr. LEMIEUX. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. PELLETIER. I should have said 'gentleman,' I suppose.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, 'I suppose,' but 'hon. gentleman.' My hon. friend will be polite in spite of himself.

Mr. PELLETIER. I intend to be polite, and I shall never go as far as the hon. member for Rouville went to-night. If the expression 'man' is not parliamentary, I am willing, in order to be parliamentary, to say 'gentleman'——

Mr. LEMIEUX. 'Honourable'; go on.

Mr. PELLETIER—which is made the obligation of every member of this House. This House has heard three times from the

lips of the hon. member for Rouville to-night, that I went over into the county of Drummond and Arthabaska, and that I said this, that, and the other thing. I will ask the hon. member for Rouville (Mr Lemieux), if he is enough of a man—

Mr. LEMIEUX. Of an honourable man.

Mr. PELLETIER. No, not this time. I ask him if he is a man to come boldly forward and put his seat at risk and I will put mine in the balance with his, if my statement is not correct that I did not even put my foot in the county of Drummond and Arthabaska during that election.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I wish to say—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I wish to say—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, sit down.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Does he ask for an answer?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The rule of the House is that no member can interrupt another who has the floor unless with the consent of the hon. member addressing the House.

Mr. PELLETIER. The hon. member for Rouville must not be surprised if I do not allow any interruption, in view of the fact that he several times refused to let me answer him when he was speaking. I have tried to show him all possible courtesy since the House opened. I have allowed him to put all kinds of questions, and when he to-night asserts that I took part in the Drummond and Arthabaska election and I wanted to tell him that I was not there at all, he would not allow me to say so and I declare that to be very unfair. I do not want to uselessly prolong this debate, but I cannot resist the temptation of comparing these great imperialists opposite of to-day with their traditions as a party. We have heard to-night the member for Rouville addressing the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, say: bring a bold policy forward and we on this side of the House will support you. He spoke for his side of the House, and it would seem that whilst we were told that there was a lieutenant needed for the leader of the opposition, some of these gentlemen on the front opposition benches think that they are the lieutenants and that they should not be ousted by the arrival of a new figure in the House.

Mr. LEMIEUX. You went to Renfrew and could not prevent him coming here.

Mr. PELLETIER. And to-night we have the member for Rouville promising the support of his party to the government, following the footsteps of the hon. member for South Wellington, who, during the debate on the address told our leader: why don't you get rid of these bad Nationalists and we will support you if you put them to one side. Well, these gentlemen are lonesome in the cold shades of opposition, but let me tell them that this government is quite capable of taking care of its own policy. Let me tell them further that if any good policy is submitted to this country we will always find these gentlemen opposite taking a stand, as they have always done, against the public interest, or else behind the lines of Torres Vedras. Let us compare for a moment the patriotic principles and lofty sentiments of the member for Rouville to-day, when he has become a great imperialist, with the platform of his party years ago. Let us compare his utterances to-day with the programme his party had in the province of Quebec when they came into power in 1896. The member for Rouville, I think—I do not make assertions as he does without being perfectly sure—but I am informed he was one of the founders of a paper called 'Le Soir.'

Mr. LEMIEUX. No.

Mr. PELLETIER. The hon. member (Mr. Lemieux) says 'No,' but he also says I was in Drummond-Arthabaska during the last election, when I was not there. There was in Quebec a paper which my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition—who by his courtesy always gives a good example to the young fellow from Rouville— there was in Quebec a paper which the right hon. leader of the opposition had written articles for and which was his organ.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I rise to a point of order. My hon. friend (Mr. Pelletier) is rather too cheeky.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Will the hon. gentleman state his point of order?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Pelletier) speaks of the 'young fellow' from Rouville. He may speak that way in the county of Quebec, but not in this House. He must speak of the hon. gentleman from Rouville.

Mr. PELLETIER. The rules of parliament do not oblige me to say more than the hon. member for Rouville.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The hon. gentleman will have to be polite in spite of himself. I do not lose my temper, but I say the hon. gentleman has no right to make that remark. The rules of the House will compel him to refer to another member as the 'hon. gentleman.'

Mr. PELLETIER. The 'hon. member' will do. Well the hon. member says he is

not losing his temper, but if we saw him when he really lost his tempper he must lose control of himself altogether. There was a newspaper in Quebec in which the leader of the opposition sometimes wrote very good articles and which was known as his party organ.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am responsible for the articles I wrote myself.

Mr. PELLETIER. Yes, and there were other articles written in support of the policy of my right hon. friend which he never repudiated.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Life is too short.

Mr. PELLETIER. I will read what one of these articles now, and we will see what these great imperialists said when they wanted to reach power. This is from the Liberal organ in Quebec:

Do you want war; thence million dollars in guns, cannons and bayonets; imminent danger for you farmers.

These are the head lines and here is the article:

One of old Tupper's dreams was imperial federation. Imperial federation means a closer alliance between England and her colonies generally and Canada in particular. One condition of such an alliance would be that in time of war Canada would be called upon to pay its share of the cost in money and in men. And, as England is nearly always at war with somebody we would be continually taxing ourselves to find money, always drawing lots to raise men. In return England would make these fakirs baronets, knights of this, commanders of that. But the people would remain food for cannon. Hardly had Sir Charles Tupper returned from England than he began to pave the way for the realization of his awful plan. England was threatened with a difficulty with the United States over a few acres of mining land which she claimed in Venezuela, thousands of miles away from our country, in Central America. Immediately Sir Charles Tupper, to be officious hastened to order the purchase in England of guns, cannon, &c. to the extent of $1,800,000, in the midst of a session without consulting the House. That was not enough for him. He wanted three millions. Mr. Foster proposed on April 21st, 1896, '(Hansard,' page 6902) a resolution authorizing a loan of $3,000, 000 to pay for the purchases made and to be made. There had then been ordered 40,000 Lee-Enfield rifles and 23,000 carbines of the same make for the cavalry. There have been ordered four batteries of six cannon, 12 pounders with the necessary ammunition. The rifles cost $18 each.

Now I come to the climax, and when I read this, let it not be forgotten that these were the words spoken to the public by the party organ in Quebec:

Why all these armaments, if we are not to have war? And why fight for England? The electors should remember that these big and great chiefs who are always anxious to show themselves greater patriots than others, more loyal than others, and ready to throw themselves into war for the benefit of others, will not be those who will bear the burden. These carbines, these cannon, the electors will have to handle them. You are considered good enough food for powder. The Tuppers, Angers, the Taillons will be in their ministerial offices, whence they will send us forth to death, joy in their hearts and a glass of champagne in their hands. Once more, why all these rifles, these cannon, these bayonets, if these good Tupper & Company do not meditate some bad action? Your children will be sent to Africa, to Asia, whence they will never return. If you vote for Blue candidates, you approve all these warlike preparations. Does the government come to your assistance when you are crushed by taxes of all kinds, when misfortune overtakes you, either through flood or fire? And we spend three millions of dollars for guns. Vote for Laurier and his candidates if you want to see your country enjoy the same tranquillity, and not to expose yourself to start some of these fine mornings, leaving behind your wives and families and all that you hold dear.

And the same men tell us to-day: Bring on a bold imperialist policy, and we will be at your back. Mr. Chairman, I will not say more; the country knows them now.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, Mr. Chairman, the country does not know them now. The country may know one side, but it does not know the other side. Let us see a little what the country will think of the other side—at least, a portion of the other side; because I know my hon. friends opposite; I know there is no mistake about them; they are staunch Tories, staunch Conservatives. But these words do not apply to my hon. friend, and I wish to reply at once to the question that was put to me a moment ago. It is good for the House, it is good for the country, that this ultra imperialist, this ultra Tory, should be known—not by us; we know him; but by his own friends. My hon. friend said a moment ago that he did not go to Drummond and Arthabaska. He did not, and I will explain to the House why.

Mr. PELLETIER. You said three times that I went.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Listen to the reason why the hon. gentleman did not go to Drummond and Arthabaska. The hon. gentleman, I stated to the House the other day, has changed colours as often as the sky changes. In 1886 he was a Rielist candidate in the county of Temiscouata against the Ross government. In 1887 he was a Liberal candidate in the

county of Three Rivers. In 1888 or 1889 he was elected in the county of Dorchester, succeeding his bosom friend, Mr. Larochelle. In 1890 he was again a Liberal candidate. In 1891 that stalwart loyalist, who would not stand for reciprocity in 1911, supported unrestricted reciprocity.

Mr. MORPHY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is not discussing any issue bearing on the question before the committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think certainly that the committee is wandering far from the item under discussion.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend spoke of articles published in 1896 and before 1896 to explain his stand, and I think I am entitled to answer him to show him before the country and before his own friends. I was just saying that in 1891 the hon. gentleman stood firmly in favour of unrestricted reciprocity as a straight Liberal in the county of Dorchester. A few months afterwards——

Mr. MORPHY. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is now entering upon an issue——

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am coming to the point.

Mr. MORPHY. I quite understand that I am not entitled to make my point of order without being interrupted. It seems to me that the House is degenerating to a pretty low standard. The hon. gentleman is entering upon a discussion of unrestricted reciprocity. What that has to do with the naval question I cannot see. I ask your ruling.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must repeat that the hon. member has gone far from the question under discussion. Both sides of the House have done so. I would invite the hon. member to come back to the point under discussion.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am nearing the point, Mr. Chairman. I was just saying that in 1891 the hon. gentleman stood with this party. In 1896 he stood with the other party, but in 1904 he had a quarrel with the other party, and that is how 'Zandrang' comes in. He wanted to know why I should call him 'Zandrang.' He had a quarrel with his party on that very point; that is why——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MORPHY. Mr. Chairman, I cannot see that the hon. member is coming to the point.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am coming to the point.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. LEMIEUX. As a result of that quarrel, the hon. gentleman was kept away from Drummond and Arthabaska by his own friends. That is why he did not go to that county.

But in the last election finally, having passed from the Riel to the Nationalist candidate, then to a Liberal candidate, and then to a Blue, he became again an out and out Nationalist candidate in the county of Quebec, opposing the Canadian navy, opposing any navy, opposing any aid to Great Britain, and opposing his present leader on every hustings in the county of Quebec, standing side by side with Mr. Armand Lavergne, and opposing all naval policy that might be propounded in this parliament by either the Liberal or the Conservative party. He wanted to be elected and he was elected by a majority of 48 after many unsuccessful attempts during those ten years to carry any county in the province of Quebec. Ultimately he was elected on racial and anti-British appeals.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. LEMIEUX. And to-day he stands in this House ready to support anything emanating from the government. The other day on another question the hon. gentleman said to the faithful of the county of Quebec that there were times in the life of a public man when it was more difficult for him to keep his portfolio than to throw it aside. He decided, however, to keep his portfolio on the school question, and make sure, Mr. Chairman, he will again keep his portfolio on the naval question also.

Mr. BENNETT (East Simcoe). It may be an advantage, or a disadvantage, but I happened to sit in this House in 1896, and it would be hard to reconcile the voluble gentleman who has just taken his seat with the same gentleman who sat here silent as the tomb on a certain occasion. What was that occasion? The Postmaster General quoted to-night utterances from newspapers published in the province of Quebec prior to the elections of 1896. There happened to sit in this House at that time a gentleman who stood prominently high in the opinion of both sides in his reputation for fairness, and his splendid character in the province of Quebec. I refer to the Hon. John McIntosh who had the honour of representing the city of Sherbrooke, which city did itself credit in electing him as its member. I remember seeing then a blanched face which held a palsied tongue, and it was the face and the tongue of the hon. member for Rouville on the occasion of a scathing denunciation by Mr. McIntosh. Sir, the occasion of criticism were the speeches uttered by the hon. member for Rouville

who paraded from one end of the province of Quebec to the other making denunciation of 'Old Tupper'. The hon. gentleman did not even have that respect which he should have had for the grey hairs of that distinguished statesman as to term him by his title of 'Sir Charles'. That is the taste which the hon. gentleman displays for a man in public life. Did that hon. gentleman dare to deny one word uttered by the hon. John McIntosh on that occasion? No, Sir, not a single word. And his leader and the ministers sitting with him on that side of the House hung down their very heads for shame of him. The statement which Mr. McIntosh made at that time, at the same time enumerating the different places where the hon. gentleman had made the speeches complained of, was that he was a man who instead of being in the Canadian parliament, should have been prosecuted for treason to the British Crown. That is the hon. gentleman who has been prating here to-night, and presenting his views on imperialism as to the views that should be entertained by the hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House.

An hon. MEMBER. Save the mark.

Mr. BENNETT (East Simcoe). The wreck in the shape of His Majesty's loyal opposition which sit on the opposite side are at such variance with each other that they do not know in what direction they are going. I have been in this House, with a slight interruption, for which hon. gentlemen opposite devoutly prayed, for three parliaments, and in that period who ever saw such a spectacle as was presented in this House on the Manitoba school question the other night? Sir, it is a well known rule in the British navy that when a ship sinks owing to the blunder of the commander, that commander like a man goes down with his ship. That has not been done by the leader of the opposition. He is still clinging to the ship, and if any man should be humiliated how must the leader of the opposition have been humiliated the other night. He took a stand on the school question, in connection with the Manitoba boundaries extension Bill, and I give him credit for being conscientious; but if he was conscientious in his attitude with respect to that question, then he stands in the unenviable position that he no longer leads his compatriots from Quebec, but they lead him. Under these circumstances the time has come in the province of Quebec when the right hon. gentleman cannot lead his own following. Sir, the public are getting tired and sick of these hon. gentlemen prating about race and religion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BENNETT (East Simcoe). I represent a constituency in the province of Ontario where there are 1,500 French Canadian voters, and in the last election what was the whole issue in that French Canadian settlement? Was it the question of reciprocity or the question of the navy? No, Sir, but the bosom friend of the leader of the opposition, the creature of his hand, the putty which he moulded, Senator Casgrain, travelled all the way from Montreal to the riding of East Simcoe, and for two hours harangued at different points French Canadian audiences. What was the subject? Was it reciprocity, was it the question of the navy, was it the economic question? No, Sir, it was: 'Vote for the old man because he is a French Canadian and a Catholic.' That was the whole cry raised during the last election amongst the French Canadians in my riding. And, Sir, in making that statement I do not go behind Senator Casgrain's back, I am a personal friend of his—at least I hope I am—and I saw him after the opening of the session, and said to him: 'You ought to be ashamed of yourself. The idea of a man of your intelligence going into that riding and endeavouring for two hours to excite the people on questions of race and creed in a county where the people were intelligent enough to deal with questions on their merits, and on their merits alone.' Senator Casgrain admitted the very statement that I attributed to him, that the whole trend of his speech was, 'vote for Laurier because he is a Roman Catholic and a Frenchman.' What happened? An intelligent French Canadian elector said: 'We know Sir Wilfrid is a Frenchman and a Roman Catholic. Tell us about reciprocity.' Senator Casgrain's response to that question was: 'That has nothing to do with it. Vote for Laurier, because he is a Frenchman and a Catholic.' Sir, that policy was not only carried on in East Simcoe, it was carried on in other ridings, and what was the result? Why, Sir, the returns show it. The county of Prescott, in Ontario, went Liberal in answer to the appeal along those lines. Glengarry with its large French vote, went Liberal in response to the same appeal. South Essex, the two Kents, and Russell were all carried in the same manner, I repeat that people are sick and tired of these eternal howls from hon. gentleman opposite, and from their leader, on this question of race and religion. However, it has stood them in good stead. The leader of the opposition has never thought it was not the proper thing to do it himself. I sat in this House during the session of 1896, and what happened when his Chicoutimi speech was attributed to him? The leader of the opposition had there made the

statement 'that he thanked God there was not an Orangeman in the Liberal party,' and yet, sitting right behind him at the time, was the Grand Master of Eastern Ontario, the hon. member for Addington.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The Orange order never so far disgraced itself.

Mr. BENNETT (Simcoe). And then Mr. Bellay, member for Chicoutimi and Saguenay, made the statement repeatedly from his place in the House, and produced a bunch of affidavits in support of it.

The right hon. gentleman who leads the opposition did not dare deny that he had made the statement attributed to him, and 'Hansard' will prove it. It was a pitiful sight, and for this reason, that though the right hon. gentleman did not deny it himself, it fell to the lot of two gentlemen to stand up—two of his own supporters, Mr. Carroll and the present Senator Choquette—and declare that they were present and had not heard it said, and it could not have been said. But, as I have said, the right hon. gentleman himself would not make the denial, and I do not suppose he would deny it to-night even after twenty years. That is the style of election cries that we have been subjected to in the riding of East Simcoe and in all the ridings in Ontario in which there are many French Canadians. And I want to tell hon. gentlemen opposite that had they eliminated that feature from the discussion in these contests the French vote in their ridings would have been much broken up, but instead of that it was a solid mass, and that by reason of the appeals that have been made from time to time. As to the member from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), I do not suppose that the House is very much concerned with his personal troubles. I have heard the adage that fools rush in where angels fear to tread, and also that people who live in glass houses should not throw stones. If the hon. gentleman had come at me personally as he came at the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier), I would refer to a debate which took place in this House in relation to certain actions in the county of Gaspé that did not redound to the credit of the hon. member and to some person very near to him. And on that occasion, what did the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) plead for him? Why, it was enough to melt one to tears to hear the defence put up by the leader of the opposition for the hon. member for Rouville and a certain other person in connection with certain occurrences in one of the ridings in the province of Quebec. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) talks about the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) as being a firebrand. Well, there is one thing about a man who carries a firebrand—you can always see him coming. But this dark-lantern brigade gentry who infest the French settlements are not always to be caught. For my part, I prefer the man with the flaming torch to the man who arms himself with a dark lantern.

These hon. gentlemen are in opposition, and I think before many years are passed exposures will be made in this House of the way millions of dollars were frittered away and stolen from the public treasury, and the result will be to keep them where they are for many years to come. They may as well accept the inevitable. They are in opposition, and they are in opposition to stay for many years. But all this talking of the hon. member for Rouville may be summed up in this: He is very busy about nothing and out of wind to no purpose.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I desire to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) for information as to the ships included in this item. What is the nature of these ships?

Mr. HAZEN. It is not expected to purchase any ships with this vote. The total amount is $1,660,000, and it is divided under the following heads:

To pay the officers and men of the 'Niobe' and 'Rainbow' and of the Naval College, $583,080.

Stores for the two boats, and guns, $533,900.

Repairs to ships and vessels (nearly all for repairs of damages to the 'Niobe'), $200,000.

Repairs to the dockyards machinery at Halifax and Esquimalt, $13,200.

Miscellaneous dockyard services at Halifax and Esquimalt, $44,444.

Miscellaneous other services, $118,600.

Repairs and maintenance of buildings, provision of additional improvements for the college, $5,500.

Purchase of new machinery for dockyards at Halifax and Esquimalt, $19,200.

New buildings and other works, $4,276.

Construction of lighters, water-tank and service boats, $64,500.

That makes the total of the vote. I would be glad to give the right hon. gentleman details of any of these subdivisions if he desires.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, I only wished to know if new boats were to be purchased. I understand it is not intended to make such purchases.

Mr. HAZEN. Nothing except lighters, a water-tank and service boats. Nothing in the way of what might be called boats for the navy.

Mr. BELAND. Are men being recruited for the service?

Mr. HAZEN. Yes, from time to time, to keep the number on the 'Niobe' and the 'Rainbow' up to strength.

Mr. BELAND. How many men on each of these ships?

Mr. HAZEN. The authorized numbers are: For the 'Niobe,' 60 officers and 630 men; for the 'Rainbow,' 18 officers and 251 men; Royal Naval College at Halifax, naval officers, 8; civilian officers, 4; cadets, 45; naval men, 40; civilians, 10. This makes a total of 1,068. That is the authorized strength, but I do not think we are up to strength at the present time. For instance, there is accommodation in the naval college for 45 cadets, and I think that at the present time there are only about 30.

Mr. BELAND. Would the hon. minister sum up the services which are being rendered now by these two ships?

Mr. HAZEN. Those upon the ships, of course, are enlisted for the purpose of receiving instruction. The course of instruction is similar to that on board the ships of the British navy; and the intention was, in the scheme proposed, that after taking a certain course of instruction they should be shipped into other vessels actually engaged in outside waters instead of doing the work among the harbours which the 'Niobe' and 'Rainbow' are doing. The training summary included the British navy instruction in gunnery, the management of a ship and other matters to make them efficient seamen for a man of war.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have seen it stated in the papers that certain of the cadets had been sent to England aboard of some of the ships there. How many young Canadians have been sent to the other side? And will they come back?

Mr. HAZEN. Thirteen have been sent to continue there the work of their course of training that they could not get on board the ship here.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Who commands the 'Rainbow'?

Mr. HAZEN. Commander Holmes.

Mr. LEMIEUX. And on board the 'Niobe' Commander Macdonald?

Mr. HAZEN. Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX. When I was Postmaster General, I was asked by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries of that time, to ask the postmasters throughout the country to recruit men for the navy. Are the postmasters continuing that work? Are they continuing to recruit?

Mr. HAZEN. That is continued, those instructions to the postmasters have never been cancelled.

Mr. HAZEN.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Are you recruiting men?

Mr. HAZEN. We are getting men from time to time, there is no very active recruiting going on.

Mr. McKENZIE. Would the minister give some further information about the college at Halifax?

Mr. HAZEN. The college is the old hospital building in the navy-yard. The cadets are instructed by a staff of instructors in different branches of education necessary to fit them for the navy. They are also instructed in mechanical work, there is a machine shop and carpenter shop and they receive manual training. In fact they receive the sort of training for the navy that is given at the college at Kingston for life in the army.

Mr. McKENZIE. Do they all receive the same kind of training?

Mr. HAZEN. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. What is the length of the course?

Mr. HAZEN. About two years.

Mr. McKENZIE. Do they spend part of that time on the ships?

Mr. HAZEN. Not until they are through with the college. Then if they want to continue a naval career they go on board a ship and continue their course.

Mr. McKENZIE. What qualifications must a cadet possess?

Mr. HAZEN. He has to pass a preliminary examination such as a boy would get at the common schools of the country, but although the examination is simple some boys fail. The boys are usually about 17 years of age. It is found impossible to get the boys to go to school as young as they do in Great Britain.

Mr. BELAND. The idea of the minister undoubtedly is to have these men who are trained on those ships serve on the new navy he is going to devise when he goes and consults with the admiralty?

Mr. HAZEN. That, of course, was the idea, object and purpose of establishing the college just as with the college at Kingston, but many of those who graduated from the college at Kingston do not go into the army or even take out commissions in the militia; the education they receive fits them for engineering or any other calling because of the very excellent training they get. The same thing is true of the naval college at Halifax. I visited it last autumn and was very much pleased with what I saw. I thought the discipline was excellent and the training good. It would be a benefit to a boy even if he did not enter the navy as a profession. Of

course if we are going to have a navy in Canada and to have naval officers we must have means to properly educate them. In England they have the naval colleges and a naval college is an essential and necessary part of the naval system.

Mr. BELAND. The minister of course is aware of the tenor of the resolution adopted here on March 29, 1909. As I understand the minister is going to England within a short time. Some other course will be adopted after negotiation with the admiralty. I would call the minister's attention to a paragraph in the resolution unanimously adopted in this House two years ago:

The House is of opinion that under the present constitutional relations between the mother country and the self-governing Dominions, the payment of regular and periodical contributions to the imperial treasury for naval and military purposes, would not, so far as Canada is concerned, be the most satisfactory solution of the question of defence.

Another course might be adopted, that would be the building of a navy either in close co-operation with the British navy or an entirely Canadian navy. Does the minister wish to adhere completely to the resolution of March 29, 1909, or does he not propose to do that?

Mr. HAZEN. I am not prepared to tell my hon. friend at this moment what the policy of the government will be in that respect.

Mr. BELAND. The minister is not even in a position to say whether he will adhere to the resolution which was adopted unanimously in this House and in the wording of which his own leader, then the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden), participated.

I am sure of that because I was present in the House when this resolution was adopted with the participation of both parties and with both leaders sharing in the framing of it. It has one paragraph which is important. The minister is not in a position to say whether he will adhere to the resolution which was adopted here unanimously not two years ago—may I ask?

Mr. HAZEN. That is correct.

Mr. BELAND. The minister, a few minutes ago, said, if I understood him correctly, that the scheme propounded by the late government had been hurriedly conceived. This resolution was adopted almost three years ago. It was adopted in March, 1909, and the Bill was presented to this House for the carrying out of the policy regarding naval defence on the 3rd February, 1910. That is almost one year later, and, in the meantime, there was a conference in London between two ministers, at least, of the late government and the Brisish admiralty. I do not wish to delay the House at all, but this is a subject in which I am very much interested. I have been discussing it a good deal with gentlemen who sit behind the minister. One paragraph of this most important resolution reads as follows:—

The House will cordially approve of any necessary expenditure designed to promote the speedy organization of a Canadian Naval Service in co-operation with and in close relation to the Imperial navy, along the lines suggested by the admiralty at the last Imperial Conference, and in full sympathy with the view——

And so on. We have contended that the policy inaugurated by the late administration was exactly on the line of this part of the resolution. We have been contending that in the province of Quebec, and I think we were right. The naval policy which was adopted provided for the building in this country of a certain number of ships, the control of which was to be in the hands of the Canadian government, but it was provided in a certain clause—I do not remember the number of it—that if it was judged necessary, this Canadian navy could share in the defence of the empire and be a part at a given moment of the imperial navy. We have been condemned in the province of Quebec, by the Postmaster General, because this scheme was in too close co-operation with the imperial navy, whilst, if I am well informed, in the province of Ontario we have been condemned because it was not in co-operation sufficiently with the mother country.

Mr. PELLETIER. In defence of the Naval Bill, did not the hon. member for Beauce, in the counties of Montmagny and Beauce where he ran, tell the people that this navy was not so bad as it looked because it was for the protection of the export of cheese and butter?

Mr. BELAND. Certainly, and in saying that I was repeating the very words of the right hon. gentleman who leads the government. He expressed that in the seat which is now occupied by my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition when he said that this naval organization would provide for the protection of commerce. Are cheese and butter not important factors in our commerce, I would ask my hon. friend?

Mr. PELLETIER. Certainly, but what I meant to suggest was that the hon. member for Beauce, as a minister of the Crown, told the audience which he addressed during the election, that there was no danger at all of anybody being hurt by those poor ships, because they were not

going to wage war, but were merely for the protection of cheese and butter.

Mr. BELAND. I never stood for an academic resolution to protect the country but I always stood for a navy to protect our coast and trade and how could we protect the country when we went to war unless we fired guns? I see that the Postmaster General is right when he says that he was not in Drummond and Arthabaska; otherwise he would have known what I said there.

Mr. PELLETIER. I am told that it was about the same thing.

Mr. BELAND. Yes. this navy was to be a Canadian navy under the control of the Canadian government for the protection of our ports, coasts, trade and commerce, and sharing with the mother country in the moment of need. Those are the words I used in Drummond Arthabaska.

Mr. LEMIEUX. And the Postmaster General said that it was a crime to do that.

Mr. PELLETIER. The hon. member for Rouville does not know anything about it.

Mr. BELAND. I never heard the Postmaster General on a platform in the last election. I have read some of his speeches in a paper which is supposed to be friendly to him and one paragraph conveyed to me the idea that this navy was condemned very severely and that any participation whatever in defence of the empire would be a national crime. Of course, to-day it is changed as on the school question everything is changed. We have gained to-day the knowledge that everybody in this House is in favour of this country sharing in defence of the empire. Is there anybody in the House against it?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Speak now.

Mr. PELLETIER. I will speak.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Speak now.

Mr. PELLETIER. Would the hon. member for Rouville try and take some advice from his leader and be somewhat more calm? I will speak when my leader speaks on this question and when we have formulated a policy. Let my hon. friend wait a little.

Mr. LEMIEUX. You cannot speak.

Mr. OLIVER. In the meantime the hon. gentleman is within the lines of Torres Vedras.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Do you mean Mr. Lavergne or your present leader?

Mr. PELLETIER. Let the hon. member for Beauce speak.

Mr. BELAND. As far as I was personally concerned I had not taken very strongly to the idea of the organization of the Canadian navy until the 29th March, 1909. But on that occasion we witnessed the great spectacle of both leaders and both parties uniting on the one idea that the time had come when we should organize, in so far as naval defence was concerned, and the word 'speedy' was included in this paragraph at the suggestion of the leader of the opposition of that time. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries claims that it was conceived hurriedly, that we were too quick, that we were too fast, too swift, too speedy and yet this word 'speedy' was included at the suggestion of the right hon. gentleman who now leads the government. Since then I have been a fervent adherent of the idea of naval organization in Canada. I realize that it is necessary, that it is a duty, an obligation, and I take this opportunity to say that I believe there is a difference, at least in French, between the word 'duty' and the word 'obligation'. There is a big difference between the word 'duty' and the word 'obligation' and I am sorry that I have to differ from the right hon. gentleman who leads the House in that regard. I have done my best to have the people in Quebec come to the idea that the time has arrived when we should organize a naval defence.

The minister stated to-night that when in six years the ships would be built, they would be obsolete, but if such an opinion were ever given by any gallant admiral it would be a suprise to me because a good many British ships are older than six years and yet they are in effective service in the navy. I tell the minister : I still adhere to the resolution adopted on the 29th of March, 1909, I adhere to every word of it and I trust that when he goes to England—and this country will be well represented by him—he will emphasize the fact that this Parliament was unanimous in passing this resolution, and that direct and periodical contributions to the British admiralty are not allowed by this resolution of the Canadian parliament, but that a speedy organization of a naval service in co-operation with the mother country is ordered by the resolution. The Liberal, party has been doing its best to carry out that resolution as fast as possible, and we have been blamed for it. We now await the policy of the government, and I trust that whatever the minister proposes will be well devised and well planned, as the result of these negotiations with the home authorities and the experts of the British navy. I hope that every man in this House, not only the minister and his leader, not only the gentlemen who sit behind him, not only the Liberal party as a whole, but even those whom you, Mr. Chairman, know so well and who have been denouncing any naval

organization in this country, will support the policy the minister submits. Then will be done away with these vicious appeals that have been made in the province of Quebec especially, and even in Ontario and the other provinces on exactly opposite grounds.

Mr. CARROLL. I realize that it is perhaps in the interests of the country that we should get quickly through with the estimates, but I must say a few words upon the resolution now before us. It seems to be well understood that the policy of both political parties in this country is to contribute some aid, in whatever shape it may be, to the defence of the empire. It may be that in the heat of a political combat things have been said which would not be said on the floor of this parliament, but taking the discussion we have had in this House to-day, we may fairly come to the conclusion that the Canadian Parliament endorses some contribution towards imperial naval defence. I think we may also draw the conclusion from the discussion that the present government does not intend to give a money contribution to the British admiralty. I take it that that contribution will be in the shape of ships, because otherwise the government would not be maintaining what naval defence service we have in Canada at the present time. Of course, it must be supposed that if the government had the intention of doing anything else than supplying ships, which may be built either in this country or in England, it would be absurd for the government to be voting money to keep up the two ships we now have. Much has been said about the delay that has taken place in reference to this question of contribution to our naval defence, but it must not be forgotten that much has been done in Canada towards helping out the British Empire in connection with the defence of our country. It takes a long time to work out a plan of this kind; it took a long time to work out a plan for taking over the fortifications at Halifax and Esquimalt, but, in this as in other cases, the longer it takes the better may be the final result. Much has been said about the delay on the part of the late government in providing for our defence, but it seems to me that the present government is not in any great hurry, and the best we have heard from the Minister of Marine is that in the not far distant future there will be something done in the matter. We are led to understand that the Minister of Marine is going to England to discuss the question with the home authorities, and as this is a business government and supposing as a business government it will not contribute money towards naval defence, but that it will build ships, then the question arises as to whether ships should be built in Canada or in the mother country. From the mere standpoint of loyalty alone, and without considering anything else, it would of course be just as loyal for the Canadian government to give the money to the British admiralty to supply itself with these ships, as for the Canadian government to build the ships in our own country. But, there are other things which may be considered. The man who takes the ground that we would not, in the course of a few years, be able to build as good ships in Canada as they can build in the English dockyard is not a true Canadian, because he underrates the skill and the industry and the ability of Canadian workmen. I believe it to be the sentiment in the province from which I come, that if there is going to be a contribution to naval defence, then that money should be spent in Nova Scotia, in New Brunswick, in Prince Edward Island or in British Columbia, as the case may be. If we go into the building of these ships, the British workman can come here and earn Canadian dollars if he will, but the people of Canada who are putting their hands into their pockets should have the right to earn these dollars if dollars are to be earned. I look upon this matter from a business standpoint, and I say that in the course of a few years we will be able to build just as good ships on this side of the water as they can in Great Britain. We may talk as we like about conferring with the admiralty, but as I understand it the admiralty has already concurred in the naval policy of the late government.

But the principal point that I wish to lay stress on is this, that the hon. Minister of Marine, when he goes to England to confer with the admiralty on this question, should not forget that there is a sentiment in this country, especially in the maritime provinces, in which I include British Columbia, that if we are going to contribute ships—and I believe we should contribute nothing but ships—those ships should be built by Canadian workmen, of Canadian material, and with Canadian dollars. That is the stand that I believe every maritime man will take. They may tell us: Yes, the people of Nova Scotia, the people of New Brunswick and the people of British Columbia will have a chance to obtain some graft from such government expenditure. Surely every government that comes into power in this country has enough business capacity to see to it that there is no such thing as that. That is an argument that is put up by the 'Montreal Star'—that our people who ask for money to be spent in this country are people who have some axe to grind. There is no one in this parliament who has not some axe to grind, and the axe

that we should grind is to see that our workmen are protected, that if money is to be spent, we should take a strong Canadian, business view, that it should be spent on this side of the water.

Mr. McKENZIE. I am glad to observe that the government is making very rapid progress towards the true Canadian policy in respect to the navy. I can see a very marked advance in the attitude of the minister himself since he addressed this House the first time, in the debate on the Address. At that time he had his position guarded at the right and the left, the front and the back, and his lines marked out with great care. He would not say one word that could be construed by anyone as indicating that he was in favour of a Canadian navy. I must congratulate him and the government that those dark and doubtful days have passed away, and that we have now reached a position where the Minister of Marine and Fisheries can stand up and say that it is only a question of degree, that there is no question of policy or principle, that we are in favour of a navy, that there will be a Canadian navy, and that it will be the best Canadian navy we can produce, that it will be a Canadian navy that will stand shoulder to shoulder and side by side with that of the mother country, that it will be a Canadian navy that will not only protect our commerce and our homes, but will protect the mother country in every line of life where protection is necessary. That is true Canadianism, and true imperialism, if you choose to call it so. I am myself a Canadian; I am of Scotch descent; I belong to people who for the last four or five hundred years have been willing to fight to protect their country when fighting was to be done. It strikes me as very ridiculous that there should be any other idea in this country on the part of any Canadian than that he is true to the flag, first, last and all the time. I cannot conceive of the idea gaining ground anywhere in Canada that we have any other policy, or that any other can be the true policy than that we regard ourselves as Canadians true to Canada, and that in being true to Canada we are true to our King and empire; so that outside powers must know that they must regard Australia, South Africa, New Zealand and Canada as part and parcel of the empire, ready to spring at the throat of any enemy who may dare to think of interfering with or molesting her supremacy all over the world. That is the kind of policy that I support, and that has always been the policy of the Canadian people. I am glad if to-night it is the policy of this government, although a few months ago, when this government was organized, it was well understood that there was a division in its ranks on the question of the navy. My reason for thinking so is well founded. There may be some difficulty in knowing exactly what people have said when talking in the country, as we have only the newspaper reports; but we have the opinion of the Minister of Inland Revenue, as expressed in this House, and I have reason to believe that he expressed the opinion of the Postmaster General and the opinion of the Minister of Public Works when he spoke in this House, coming fresh from his triumph in Drummond and Arthabaska. Speaking in this House on the Naval Bill on the 21st of March, 1910, he said:

> I shall vote against the Bill because it involves the recognition of military imperialism, because it aims at having that principle recorded in our statute-books. I shall vote against the amendment because I do not admit that there is any emergency under the present circumstances. I do not wish to justify the motion of the leader of the opposition. I have just said that I am against it. But I believe, in all sincerity, that it does not involve such serious consequences as the government measure. It involves an expenditure not of $25,000,000, as stated by hon. gentlemen opposite, but of only 18 to 20 millions. The sub-amendment, which calls for a referendum to the people on a question of such importance, is the only proposal which meets with my full and entire approval.

That was the policy of the Minister of Inland Revenue less than a year before he took office in this government; that was the policy of the Minister of Public Works, and it has been stated that the Minister of Public Works was given permission to select his colleagues in this government—and we have every reason to believe that the Postmaster General was in entire accord with the Minister of Inland Revenue and the Minister of Public Works on this question of the navy. Their policy was that there should be no navy at all, that there should not be a dollar spent for men or ships, at least until the matter was submitted to the people. There was no ground for any such submission as far as the present leader of the government is concerned. He laid down his policy clear and strong in the resolution of the 29th of March, 1909.

The right hon. gentleman stood for nearly a year after that resolution had been passed by every part of that resolution, and every principle that it involved. The only way by which he could get away from us was perfectly clear; he got away on the ground that that resolution declared that the navy should be built upon the resolution laid down by the conference of 1907. That matter I wish the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to bear in mind. The right hon. gentleman said further that our programme was not as far reaching, that the ships under our programme were not as

powerful as those which were called for by the resolution of 1907. Therefore, because we did not go as far as those imperial resolutions called for he would not follow us, and he was therefore not in favour of the navy. Now, all that the Minister of Marine and the government have to do is to look up the resolution of 29th March, 1909, and the imperial resolutions of 1907, and follow them out. They are consistent with themselves, and possibly also consistent with the policy of the party which has put hon. gentlemen opposite in power. But to say that they must stop until they have had further conference with the imperial authorities is not at all consistent with the grounds which their party took when in opposition. Hon. gentlemen opposite said they would not follow us because we were not complying with the programme laid down by the Imperial Conference of 1907. Well they have now the opportunity of complying with those resolutions in every respect. It was said by the Minister of Marine that we—the late government—were taking too long a time in constructing this navy. Now the present Prime Minister speaking in the House on the 12th January, 1910, knew exactly what time it would take to build a navy. He said:

> An army takes twenty years to create, and a navy half a century.
>
> The speediest organization would not make our Canadian naval service effective in less than ten years.
>
> Probably fifteen or twenty years would be required; and the crisis, if a crisis is to be apprehended, will come and probably within three years.

This is the language used by the present Prime Minister in supporting the resolution. He was saying that if a crisis was in sight we would not wait until we built ships, and that it would be better to make a contribution. It would have been well for the Minister of Naval Affairs before making the statement he did, to have studied those utterances of his leader. For any Canadian of spirit, any Canadian with a fair amount of comprehension of his responsibility as a citizen of the British Empire, to live as we do now seemed to him to be impossible, particularly for a follower of the present Prime Minister in view of the language he used in that speech, as to his conception of the man who would be content to accept the protection of the British navy, and do nothing to support it. I will quote further a few words from his speech on that occasion:

> I cannot, however, understand how any man receiving and accepting the protection of the British flag, the advantages of British citizenship, the safeguarding of our coasts, the security of our shores, the benefits and advantages of the diplomatic and consular service throughout the world, the talismanic protection of our flag, can reconcile it with our self respect to have every dollar of the cost paid by the over-burdened taxpayers of the British islands. We have the power to adopt that position if we choose because our liberties which we hold as a right and of grace are in this regard absolute, but, with all respect for the conscientious opinions of others, I cannot conceive it to be a worthy or honourable course. It is not so much a question of our duties or obligations to the mother country as of our own honour and self-respect. I am the descendant of those who have never lived under any other than the British flag since it first streamed to the free winds of heaven. I am as profoundly and unalterably attached to British institutions and connection, and as ready to work, and if necessary to fight for them as any man in Canada. But if my country, one of the richest in the world in proportion to its population, should accept the humiliating, the degrading, the pauperizing position of receiving future protection and safety at the hands and cost of the British taxpayer without contributing one dollar in aid or assistance, I would say that the sooner the empire was rid of her the better for all.

That was the position taken by the present Prime Minister, a position which I accept, and a position which I am willing to support. That being the stand, and necessarily I should say the stand of his followers, I cannot really comprehend how he or his government are consistent in delaying to deal with this question. We have now his idea of the time it would take to build a navy, we have the Prime Minister's idea of what our position really is in that regard, and we have the pattern that he laid down for himself. There seems to be nothing left now except to implement those ideas by immediate and speedy action on the part of the government. Now, I am surprised that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and the Prime Minister, would even for one moment tolerate the anti-navy and anti-British ideas that seem to have received some attention from a certain quarter in his government. After the first victory which the Nationalists obtained in Drummond and Arthabaska, in October of 1910, the Halifax 'Herald,' the organ of the Prime Minister in that city spoke of that Nationalist victory in this way:

> It is vicious, incendiary and anti-British.

Yet I am sorry to say the Prime Minister started out with a fair number of the supporters of that policy in the present Cabinet.

I am very glad indeed that some of the members who had started on the way to Damascus with authority to do destruction and injury, like Saul himself, saw a

light and are now ready to abandon every idea they had except to stand loyally and consistently by the ideas announced by the Prime Minister. And I for one will not harbour any grudge against them, nor hold an account against them, if they will even at this late day stand loyally behind the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) in carrying out the policy of the resolution read a moment ago by the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Beland) and adopt the imperial resolution of 1907 which is the standard adopted by themselves, and go forward with the policy and let us no longer remain under the condemnation meted out by the Prime Minister to any class who are not willing to contribute to their own support and defence in this empire of which we are so proud to form a part.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I wish to add just one word of exhortation to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Two days ago the hon. member for Yamaska (Mr. Mondou) asked a question:

Does the government intend to propose the repeal of the Naval Act?

And the answer was 'Yes'. and then the Minister of Marine and Fisheries went on to explain some kind of policy that is to be adopted by the present government and said that policy would undoubtedly require legislation, which legislation would involve the repeal of the present Naval Act. I took the trouble to look up the Naval Service Act to find what in it could be objectionable to the minister. I find that the first section is the title. Sec. 2 and 3 refer to interpretation. Sec. 4 provides that the King is to be commander-in-chief of the Canadian navy. I suppose that will not be objectionable to my hon. friend?

Mr. BELAND. It is objectionable to the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Sevigny).

Mr. SINCLAIR. Sec. 5 provides for a department of the naval service. Sec. 6 provides for a deputy head of the department. Sec. 7 gives the minister charge of naval affairs. Section 8 provides that the minister shall have charge of the navy establishments Sec. 9 authorizes the appointment of a director of naval affairs who is to be of rank not less than a rear admiral. Section 10 provides for a naval board. Section 11 provides for a permanent naval force. Section 12 provides that every officer shall take the oath of allegiance. Then there are provisions for the administration of the naval college, the management of the cadets, etc. I was puzzled to know why the minister should think it necessary to repeal the whole Act. There are no provisions in this Act, to my mind, that require to be repealed. If there are any, would the Minister of Marine and Fisheries point them out—point out if he can a single clause in this Act that he would not require if he decides to have any kind of naval service in this country? But we are told that the Naval Act must be repealed because in some schoolhouse of the province of Quebec a promise was made, I suppose, by these hon. gentlemen that the Naval Act should be repealed. These hon. gentlemen have no better reason to give; but I submit that if we are to have any kind of naval service in this country, we must have the provisions of this Naval Act. This Act further provides for the fisheries protection service. The idea of a marine service is not new in this country; we have had it for many years. We repealed by a section of this Naval Act the Act of 1886 which provided for a service at sea in case of national trouble. We repealed the old Act and put this in its place; and now we are told that this is to be repealed. I would like the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to tell us why he has decided to repeal the Naval Service Act, and to ask if he will point out the clause in it that involves the necessity of repealing the Act, in order to introduce a new policy. It has been said over and over again that the government has the choice of three things. After conference with the British authorities, the former government had three lines of policy proposed. They could give a money contribution, which would be the most acceptable step for the admiralty. Also if they took charge of the protection of the Pacific coast and placed a fleet unit there that would be the next step; and the third was to build protected cruisers and destroyers to protect their trade routes on the Atlantic. The late government selected the third. No doubt if my hon. friend (Mr. Hazen) goes to England, the same propositions will be placed before him. He has another choice. In place of protected cruisers, he can build Dreadnoughts. But he has not ventured to say that that is his policy. The question has been raised by the Minister of Marine that there is something wrong with these protected cruisers, that they are not the type of ships that the Canadian government ought to build. I would like to refer for a moment to the doctrine I find laid down in the Navy League, which I understand is the greatest authority in Britain on this question. The Navy League Annual of 1911-12 issued not many weeks ago referring to these cruisers says:

These are in all respects admirable light crafts and it is difficult to say why a far larger number is not placed upon the stocks.

The same authority estimates that the naval expenditure for 1911-12 in Great Britain will be £44,392,500. This includes 5 capital ships, 4 protected cruisers, of the type we have in Canada—they are actually

building these to-day in Great Britain, 4 of them are now on the stocks and they will be launched now this year——

Mr. EDWARDS. What good would they be without the Dreadnoughts?

Mr. SINCLAIR. If they were no good the British admiralty would not build them.

Mr. EDWARDS. They are good with the others, but what would be the use of them without the others?

Mr. SINCLAIR. They are the kind of ships used for the protection of the trade routes. They are swift ships, battleships. They are building also 20 destroyers, 6 submarines, 2 river gun-boats, 1 department ship and 1 hospital ship. We proposed 4 of these cruisers of the 'Bristol' type and 6 torpedo destroyers to begin with, the very kind of ships they are building in England. They are building these constantly. One of them was launched in June last, and they are proposing to launch one on the 18th of June this year.

They are proposing to launch another on the 19th of August, a third on the 31st of August and a fourth in September. During the past two years the British government has built in British yards the following protected cruisers: Five of the Bristol type (that is the type we are proposing to build); four of the Dartmouth type; three of the Dublin class; three improved of the Dublin class, and three for the Australian government, making in all 18, and we are told by the Minister of Marine and by the Prime Minister that these vessels will be useless in time of war. Then 18 of these useless vessels have been built by the British Admiralty within the last two years, or are now building, and they are also being built by every civilized country in the world. There is a dispute among experts as to the best type of ship. There is no doubt that the strongest and most effective ship is the Dreadnought, but these other ships are being built by every civilized and progressive nation in the world. The British government to-day own 92 protected cruisers, Germany 41, Japan 16, United States 14, Austria 9, Russia 8, Italy 7, France 5. The last proposal of the British admiralty was that they would build five in Great Britain each year and if they were the kind of ships my hon. friend says they are, I submit that the British admiralty would not be building them at all. A couple of years ago the government of Australia asked for an expert to be sent out to make some investigations and give them some advice and then the report of Sir Reginald Henderson the expert who went there recommends within the next 22 years the construction of the following vessels: Eight battleships, 10 protected cruisers, 18 destroyers, and 12 submarines. I can understand my hon. friend saying we ought to have some Dreadnoughts. If that is his policy why does he not announce it? If the only difference between the two parties is that we on this side of the House believe in protected cruisers to begin with and those on the other side in Dreadnoughts, it should be easily settled, but the postmaster General and the Nationalist party have not made that demand, and they are not in favour of any kind of ship. These are the questions with which the Minister of Marine will be met when he reaches London, and I submit he will have either to pay a cash contribution or to adopt some policy very close to the policy of the late government.

Fishery protection service, to provide for repairs and maintenance of vessels, $320,000.

Mr. HAZEN. This estimate is $38,000 more than last year. The details of the estimate of expenditure are:

'The Canada,' $45,000; structural alteration $10,000; new armament $5,000; new motor boat, $1,500;

Steamer 'Curlew,' $20,000; steamer 'Constance,' $20,000; steamer 'Petrel,' $20,000, steamer 'Vigilant,' $30,000; steamer 'Restless,' $12,500; steamer 'Falcon,' $12,500. Hire and maintenance of extra vessels for patrolling on the Pacific coast, $120,000.

This makes up the amount of $320,000 that is required for this service.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Has my hon. friend taken into consideration the serious remarks made by the hon. member for Vancouver about poaching by Americans on the Pacific coast?

Mr. HAZEN. Oh, yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What precautions are you taking?

Mr. HAZEN. We have here an item of $120,000. We are unable to get new vessels for the service this year to patrol on the Pacific coast. So we propose to lease.

Mr. McKENZIE. The protection of the fisheries along the coast from Canso around to Cape Breton as soon as the drift ice is gone is very important, because we have many American vessels around the coast at that time, and it is highly necessary that the three-mile limit should be enforced. Is there any system by which the ships will be in readiness to go to that part of the province as early as they will be required?

Mr. HAZEN. I entirely concur in what my hon. friend has said. We have three steamers in the service on the coast men-

tioned, the 'Canada,' the 'Constance,' and the 'Petrel.' They will all be put in commission when the season opens and their services are required.

Mr. SINCLAIR. It is reported on the coast that the laws are not well enforced in regard to steam trawling, that in the Gulf of St. Lawrence the steam trawlers have been working inside the three-mile limit. Some doubt has been expressed as to what is a bay in all parts of our waters. The steam trawler is prohibited from working in bays or harbours or within three miles of the coast line. In the gulf between Cape Breton and Cape Jack some fishermen contend that they should be kept out of that place altogether.

Mr. HAZEN. How wide is the bay at the mouth?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Perhaps ten or twelve miles.

Mr. McKENZIE. Twenty miles.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I am not quite sure about the width of the bay; at all events, I think the minister should have some authority that would define the bays along the coast that are excluded from the operations of the steam trawler, and also the instructions to the protective agents to look out for these steam trawlers and see that they observe the law.

Mr. HAZEN. This question with regard to bays was dealt with at the arbitration which took place at The Hague two years ago when Sir Charles Fitzpatrick was the representative of the Canadian government, and Sir Allen Aylesworth was the agent of His Britannic Majesty. The tribunal at the Hague practically adopted the rule in regard to bays that was adopted in the treaty of 1888, spoken of as the Blaine-Chamberlain treaty, which was negotiated by Sir Charles Tupper, and which was subsequently thrown out by the Senate of the United States. It defines, except in the case of the Bay of Fundy, which is not considered at all, where the three mile limit shall be with regard to bays. In bays that are not more than ten miles in width it shall be a line from headland to headland at the point where the bay ceases to have the conformation of a bay, and at other places it shall be three miles from the shore. But, there are bays in Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, like Miramichi Bay and the Baie des Chaleurs, in Nova Scotia and Newfoundland, more than ten miles in width, in regard to which it is expressly provided that the line shall be drawn from headland to headland at the point where it ceases to have the conformation of a bay. There is a general clause in other cases to the effect that the line shall be drawn from the first point at which the bay is not more than ten miles in width. A treaty has been agreed to practically in so far as Canada is concerned, and Newfoundland is now about to do the same, but there must be a reference to the United States Senate for confirmation. The deputy minister tells me that the department has been unable to get any evidence whatever that steam trawlers have been fishing within the three mile limit in the waters mentioned by the hon. member for Guysborough. The Naval Department has been unable to find steam trawlers, whether from the United States or France, inside the three mile limit. I will ask the deputy minister to give instructions to the commanders of these vessels to take more particular pains this year, to watch out and see that no trawlers are allowed within the district referred to by my hon. friend.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Might I suggest that the deputy minister will ask the protection vessels to lay out at nights when the trawler is in the vicinity. I am told that it is at night that the damage is done. The trawler works at night, and as a rule the cruiser goes into some snug harbour where they can have a nice easy time, and they do not see anything, of course. If the protection vessel would lay out at night and watch the trawler perhaps it could get at the difficulty.

Fisheries protection service—to provide for two new vessels required for fishery protection sevice on the coast of British Columbia, $275,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There was a rumour a few days ago that Commander Wakeham who has charge of the 'Princess' in the Baie des Chaleur and generally on the north shore, was going to be superannuated. I have known Commander Wakeham for several years and, although he has been in the service of the government for nearly forty years, he is still quite alert, vigorous and an excellent officer of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I do not think that Commander Wakeham is willing to be superannuated. I know there are many requests made for the succession to his position. I hope the minister will take into consideration the very great service he has rendered to the Crown and to the government and retain him as long as he is willing to perform service.

Mr. HAZEN. Commander Wakeham is not in the naval service, but in the service of the Marine and Fisheries Department. No application, in so far as I know, has been made by Commander Wakeham for superannuation and no application has been made to me from any source to superannuate him. I do not know of any reason

for superannuating him. He has been a very capable officer and I am sure that I have not the slightest intention of superannuating him at present.

Mr. JAMESON. Before we leave this question with regard to steam trawlers, which has been introduced by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), I wish to say a word with respect to it. The hon. member for Guysborough, during last session, introduced a resolution on this question which resulted in a very full and free discussion. I spoke upon that occasion and I condemned very strongly the system of taking fish by means of beam and otter trawlers. I entertain to-day exactly the same opinion in regard to the matter as I did upon that occasion. On that occasion there were statements made by various gentlemen supporting the administration of that day which effectually evidenced the fact that these trawlers were operated within the three-mile limit. I dare say that the hon. member for Guysborough will recollect that such was the case. The subject is one which is of very vital importance to the fishermen not only of Nova Scotia, but to all the maritime provinces, and is one which might very well engage the serious attention of the officers of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. For two or three years in the reports of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries of the late government some reference to these beam and otter trawlers was made and in each case the intimation was thrown out that beam trawling had come to stay, that it was something which might as well be accepted because it was inevitable. For my own part I think that it would be a very serious thing if it were allowed to go on unchecked. If large sums of money were permitted to be invested in these trawlers it might be said later on that there was a vested interest and that it would be improper to interfere with the operation of them. I think that the government should now do all that it possibly can to check the operation of these trawlers. Of course, in the case of trawlers operating in the North Sea, there is a very different condition prevailing from that which prevails in this country. In the maritime provinces the government has expended millions of dollars in constructing breakwaters, wharfs and aids of that character to the fishermen and the fishermen have invested large sums of money in high-class fishing boats and vessels.

If these trawlers are permitted to carry on their operations in our waters, it will mean that the money invested in our ordinary fisheries will be very largely wasted. That is to say, the tendency will be to drive the fishermen who are now prosecuting their calling by the ordinary method, out of that business and compel them to engage in some other, while the steam trawlers will themselves carry on the operation of taking fish. That may be profitable perhaps in countries where there is a very large population and having many industries, such as Great Britain, but in this country I think it would be a most serious thing, and everything that we can do should be done to prevent the operation of these steam trawlers. I took the view at that time, and I think the hon. member (Mr. Sinclair) also entertained a similar view, that if possible these steam trawlers should be debarred the use of our harbours, that they should not be permitted to enter our ports for the purpose of landing their fish or for coaling. In that way they would be excluded from the benefit of the ports in the maritime provinces and the prosecution of this business would be discouraged.

Mr. HAZEN. Would that in any way interfere with the trawlers coming from France and operating from St. Pierre-Miquelon?

Mr. JAMESON. I quite understand that difficulties might arise in that way, but that is a matter that might be dealt with by diplomatic negotiations with the United States and with France. I believe that if the United States and Canada agree that there shall be no beam trawling in the waters of the North Atlantic, there will be none. I furthermore believe that the conditions are such upon this side of the Atlantic that it would be manifestly in the interests of those who have large sums of money invested in the fisheries, and in the interest of the fisheries themselves, that efforts to suppress and discourage steam trawling should be made. Something has been said lately with respect to the steps which the late government took in respect to the suppression of steam trawling. They passed regulations preventing the operations of beam trawlers within the three mile limit. Regulations were passed preventing the operations of these beam trawlers within the territorial waters of Canada, but in so far as the payment of bounties to the steam trawlers was concerned, I know that bounties were paid. For instance, they paid to the trawler 'Wren' the amount of $111.50 in one year, and it was not until a question was asked by myself in this House in 1911, and the matter thus brought to the attention of the administration, that regulations were passed by which beam trawlers were excluded from the benefit of these bounties. To-day we find that although this government and the Minister of Marine have been charged by certain gentlemen, who are not upon this side of the House, with being in favour of the operation of the beam trawler, the fact is

that the government has taken a firm stand in regard to the enforcement of the regulations with respect to the three-mile limit, and also with regard to the non-payment of bounties to these steam trawlers. I am assured by the minister that he has gone a step further, and has already opened up correspondence which may lead perhaps to some arrangement being arrived at whereby the United States and Canada will stand together in preventing in future the operations of these trawlers in the North Atlantic waters. I trust it will not be thought that we on this side of the House are in favour of the operation of the steam trawlers, because we are not. For my own part I am as strongly opposed to them to-day as I was a year ago, and I believe that all those who take an interest in the fisheries of our country feel that the best interests of the fisheries, and the best interests of the fishermen themselves, will be conserved and advanced by preventing, so far as possible, the operation of trawlers in the North Atlantic waters.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The question to which my hon. friend (Mr. Jameson) refers is a very interesting one on the coast of Nova Scotia. I have not much to say against what my hon. friend has said; I think he and I agree as to what ought to be done in regard to these steam trawlers. I will not call it a 'beam' trawler, because I understand there is no such ship now in use as a 'beam' trawler. There was a good many years ago a ship of that kind used in the North Seas but a new type of ship has been adopted called the 'otter' trawler, and is now in use. In order to distinguish what I mean I call this kind of trawler a steam trawler to distinguish it from the usual line trawls. My hon. friend (Mr. Jameson) has given a little credit to the late government, although it seems to hurt his feelings to do so. He has admitted that the late government did prohibit this kind of fishing and did so very promptly a few weeks after the arrival of the first steam trawler in Canadian waters. He also admits that when he brought the question of payment of the bounties to the attention of the late government, at once the regulation in regard to the bounty was repealed and a new regulation was adopted by which the steam trawler is in future to get no bounty. I do not admit that he was at all instrumental in bringing about this change. Although it has been drawn out of him to a certain extent he is compelled to admit that the attitude of the late government was decidedly against this mode of fishing, and if the present government is able to do as much as the late government to show its sincerity in this matter I think we will have reason to be pretty well pleased. My hon. friend (Mr. Jameson) has suggested some method by which this could be done, and perhaps it is the best method. If it can be carried out I shall certainly give it my support. I had the pleasure of travelling yesterday to Ottawa with certain gentlemen who have come from Nova Scotia to interview the government in regard to this matter. A number of them are captains of schooners sailing out of the port of Lunenburg and fishing on the banks. They are what we call deep-sea fishermen; splendid fellows; some of them are in the gallery to-night listening to the speeches. They have come here supported with affidavits showing the destruction of their gear on the banks by these ships, and they have sufficient proof in their pockets to show the government that the fishermen cannot carry on their business at all on the Grand Banks if the steam trawler is to be allowed to work in those waters. This means the rapid destruction of the inshore fisheries and of the deep sea fisheries of Canada in which eleven millions or twelve millions of money has been invested. And not only will the money be lost, but the best type of men we have on our coast will disappear; the men who we will have to draw on to man our navy if we are to have a navy in the future. I say that we should stand by these men because it is quite certain that if this kind of fishing is allowed to become a rule on the coast of Canada the ordinary fisherman who now owns his ship and is his own master, will be wiped out and he will have to work for some capitalist who will own the steam or beam trawler.

I trust, therefore, that the Minister of Marine will take this matter to heart, and give it his best consideration. My hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Jameson), said that if we could exclude the steam trawler from the ports of the United States, and also from the ports of Canada, that would perhaps settle the business. I know that it would be difficult to get the assent of European governments to the prohibition of the steam trawler in these waters, from the fact that it is the usual mode of fishing in France, and has come to be the mode of fishing in Great Britain. The trawler has driven the ordinary fishing vessel out of the North Sea, and if that mode of fishing is carried on for many years longer, there will not be any fishing worth anything left there. On the coasts of Canada we have a great fishing industry, and we should do what is neccessary to preserve it. I think my hon. friend will find a good deal of sympathy at Washington with the proposal that something drastic should be done, and if the two governments unite, I

think something can be done. I would like, however, to have the policy of the government from the minister himself rather than from the hon. member for Digby. I have no doubt that the hon. member knows what he is talking about, but when this matter was discussed a few days ago, the attitude of the government did not seem to be what the hon. member for Digby says it is. If the minister is opposed to steam trawling in these waters, and is ready to advocate regulations under which fish caught in steam trawlers cannot be allowed to land on the coasts of Canada, and steam trawlers engaged in this industry cannot receive coal from the coal mines of Canada, it will be interesting for the House to know it.

Mr. HAZEN. I am surprised that in some quarters an endeavour has been made to create the impression, in consequence of some remarks that I made in the House a few weeks ago, that I was not in favour of the suppression of the steam trawler. I made a statement to the House, prepared for me by the officers of the department, dealing with this question, and showing the pros and cons of it—a statement very similar to one made a few years ago by my predecessor in office, the Hon. Mr. Brodeur; and an attempt was made for political reasons to create the impression that I was not in favour of suppressing steam trawling if it could be suppressed. Nothing could be farther from the truth. I am convinced, from what I have read on the subject, that steam trawling is a serious menace and danger to our fisheries on the Atlantic coast, and I presume on the Pacific coast as well, and if persisted in must lead to the destruction of the fisheries. The difficulty in the matter, however, is this. Steam trawling is not now permitted inside of our territorial waters; no trawler can operate in Canada within the three-mile limit. The vessels engaged in trawling come chiefly from France, and the United States. In the North Sea steam trawling is carried on very extensively. There are probably over 2,000 steam trawlers carrying on operations there now, and it is impossible for Canada to get the support of the British government in any attempt to prohibit steam trawling, so long as Great Britain is a party to the arrangement under which it is carried on in the North sea by the people of the different countries engaged in fishing in those waters. In fact, the government of Great Britain will not take any steps to prevent steam trawling on the Atlantic coast, and cannot do so consistently so long as she is a party to that arrangement. There does appear, however to be some reason for hope that the government of the United States will be willing to join with the government of Canada in endeavouring to do something to prevent this mode of fishing being carried on, as there is, among the fishermen who go out from the port of Gloucester, at the present moment a very determined agitation in favour of the suppression of fishing in this way. The difficulty that arises, however, is this: The United States and Canada may enter into an agreement providing that neither country should engage in steam trawling. But that will not control France, which sends steam trawlers close to the three-mile limit and makes Pierre and Miquelon their base of operations; and if we adopted regulations providing that steam trawlers should not land their fish or buy coal at a Canadian port, that would not prevent the trawlers from France from carrying on their operations. Perhaps, however, if the United States and Canada came to an agreement on this subject, they might bring moral pressure enough to bear on other countries to induce them not to allow steam trawlers to carry on these operations in future. I have taken up this question with the authorities at Washington, and I am carrying on a correspondence of an informal character through Mr. Bryce, the British Ambassador, which may lead to something later on. I am not in a position to inform the House what that correspondence amounts to; but I can assure the hon. member for Guysborough, the hon. member for Digby and other hon. members who are interested, that, if it is possible to do so, effective steps will be taken to prevent steam trawling being carried on. The question is whether we should prohibit at once steam trawlers, shipping fish or buying supplies from Canadian ports. Suppose we made that regulation, is it going to assist us at the present time? I do not say whether it is or not. If we made that regulation, and steam trawlers continue to come from France, while American trawlers will be able to take their catch to the American market, and probably bring enough coal for the round voyage. The only way to make such a regulation effective would be to prevent steam trawlers from carrying on their operations outside of the three-mile limit; otherwise you might have the spectacle of an American trawler coming to the three-mile limit and carrying on operations while ours would be unable to carry on a similar business. There are, I believe, only two steam trawlers operating from Canada, a large number from the United States, and a larger number from France. That is the situation. No matter how strongly any Canadian government might be in favour of preventing the operations of steam trawlers, there are great difficulties in the way, that will have to be over-

come before anything can be accomplished. I am having the matter given consideration in the department, I am carrying on correspondence with Washington through the British Ambassador, and I hope we may be able to accomplish something in the direction desired.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The responsibility of introducing this matter into politics does not lie with this side of the House, but with the other side.

Mr. HAZEN. I do not think either side of the House is above making political capital out of anything of that kind.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The minister said a few minutes ago, that some person had been endeavouring to make political capital out of this question.

Mr. HAZEN. I noticed that in some extracts from the press of the province from which the hon. gentleman comes.

Mr. SINCLAIR. It has been one of the chief planks in the platform of my hon. friend opposite representing the eastern part of Nova Scotia during the last few elections. I was accused of owning a share in a steam trawler. When my opponents discovered that they could not find out any other way of trying to prejudice the fishermen in the county I have the honour to represent against me, they told a false story round the shore that I was a shareholder in the steam trawler that was working in that vicinity. This question has been a political one in that province for the last four or five years, and when the late government had taken the step to abolish steam trawling in Canadian waters, the provincial convention of the Conservative party, at a meeting held in Truro some years ago, passed a resolution condemning that government for not doing more in connection with this question. You will therefore see that no person on this side of the House is responsible for introducing this question into the political arena, but that it is owing to hon. friends from Nova Scotia, who were trying to harass and annoy the late government over this question, that their chickens are now coming home to roost, that they have to deal with this question themselves.

Mr. JAMESON. The hon. gentleman said that I somewhat grudgingly admitted the late government had taken certain steps for the prevention of steam trawling within the three-mile limit. I do not grudgingly admit it, I say it is a matter of record that on the 9th September, 1908, an order in council was passed which reads as follows:—

The use or operation of vessels known as steam trawlers, operating beam, otter, or other trawls for the purpose of catching fish is prohibited within the three mile limit and in the bays and harbours of Canada.

I do not make that at all as a grudging admission. I say that it is a matter of record, and the hon. gentleman, I dare say, was very well informed with regard to it himself. Now, let us see what the late government did under that regulation, and I will quote for that purpose from the debate which took place last session on the resolution of my hon. friend from Guysborough. That question was discussed in this House on the 6th February, 1911, and I will quote from the remarks of one of the hon. gentleman's own friends on the subject, the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Chisholm) which are to be found on page 3116 of 'Hansard.' This is what the hon. gentleman in question said:

I have just a word or two to say with regard to the operations of steam trawlers within the three-mile limit. I am of the opinion that the steam trawlers do operate within that limit.

This, be it remembered, was over two years after the enactment, by the late government, of the regulation prohibiting the operation of steam trawls within the three-mile limit.

On more occasions than one that famous beam trawler the 'Wren,' and another whose name I do not remember, operated off the coast of Inverness last year.

That would be in the year 1910, a year and upwards after the passage of this regulation.

This steam trawler would come about dark, move along aimlessly, and just as soon as night fell they would drop their nets and steam on. That I have from the fishermen of Inverness, who have watched their movements. From their statements I am satisfied that their steam trawler did operate within the three-mile limit.

So that while I am perfectly satisfied to admit that the late government passed a regulation prohibiting the operation of steam trawlers within the three-mile limit, I put the hon. member for Inverness in the witness-box and proved out of his own mouth, that the late government did not enforce that regulation and did not protect the fishermen.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The late government, it was shown over and over again, had given instructions to the vessels to watch the steam trawlers, and see that the regulation was not violated. They also challenged the parties who were making those statements to produce proof, and if they did so prosecutions would be conducted. Those parties, however, failed to produce the proof called for, and the government is not responsible in that case.

Mr. JAMESON. The hon. member for Guysborough may not be prepared to take

the statement of his colleague the member for Inverness in that regard, but it certainly went unchallenged in this House when the question was debated in 1911, and I believe it will be unchallenged by any member who is cognizant of the state of affairs as they were. The hon. member for Guysborough states that we are attempting to make political capital out of this, and insinuates that the government which came into power on the 10th October last are responsible for the present condition of affairs. I do not wish to labour the question, but I think it is very obvious that the late government only trifled with the matter, that they were not serious at all in their attempts to deal with it. They went on and paid a bounty to steam trawlers after the regulations had been passed prohibiting the operation of steam trawlers within the three-mile limit. It was not until some days after I had brought the matter to the attention of the late government by placing a question on the order paper with regard to the payment of these bounties, that on the 22nd of February, 1911, an order in council was passed which prevented steam trawlers from sharing in the bounties paid to fishing vessels. Therefore, I do not think it comes with very good grace from the hon. member for Guysborough to cast insinuations upon either the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, or this administration, with respect to the steam trawlers or intimate that they are favouring them. The hon. gentleman has gone a step further and said that the Conservative party in Nova Scotia pitch-forked this question into the political arena by passing a resolution in respect to the matter, after, as I understood him, the late government had passed a regulation by which they debarred the steam trawlers from participating in the bounties paid to them. That regulation, as I have said was passed on the 22nd of February, 1911, and the resolution to which he refers was passed, if my memory serves me, in June or July, in 1909, almost two years before the late government had taken the stand with regard to these bounties to which I have just alluded, and one year after they had passed the regulation prohibiting the operation of these steam trawlers within the three-mile limit, during which time they had actually permitted such operation by steam trawlers. So that when the matter is looked at from a fair and reasonable point of view, it will be seen that the late government only trifled with the situation and never dealt with it energetically. Either they disregarded the interests of the fishermen, or they stood in with those gentlemen who were operating the steam trawlers. I drew attention on more than one occasion in this House to reports of officers of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, suggesting that the steam trawlers had come to stay, and when the question was being discussed in the House I quoted on the 6th of February, 1911, from the report of Mr. Cowie, an officer of the department, an officer engaged by the late government and who I believe is yet in the government employ. I quoted from the statement made by that officer at page 377 of the report of the Marine and Fisheries Department for 1910, and this is what he says:

> I think it is now beyond a doubt that trawling has come to stay here, and although its development will, of necessity, be slow, nevertheless, looking to the time when Canada will have many more millions of people within her borders than she now has, when railway rates have been reduced, and the distributing facilities will have been increased to keep pace with the expanding trade, I believe there will be seen a fleet of Canadian steam trawlers running in from the Atlantic grounds with daily supplies of wholesome fresh food fish.

That was the statement which appeared in the report of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for the year 1910. Does not that seem to have favoured the operation of these steam trawlers? And yet when the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries a few days ago read a report prepared by officers of his department—officers not of his own selection, but officers that were in the department when he came into office—that is along somewhat similar lines, the Liberal newspapers in Nova Scotia attribute to him the views that are expressed in the report and my hon. friend from Guysborough is not fair enough to admit that the statement was not one made by the minister, but was a statement made by men whom he found in office when he took charge of the department over which he has now the honour to preside.

Hydrographic surveys, including survey of Hudson bay, $320,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Has this anything to do with the work of the 'Arctic?'

Mr. HAZEN. No, that is in the main estimates which were passed the other night. This is divided as follows: Lake Superior, $30,000; Lake Ontario, $30,000; Atlantic coast, $40,000; Pacific coast, $90,000; Hudson bay, $100,000; Harbour surveys, $20,000; general account, including engraving and printing, $10,000—total, $320,000; the same amount as voted for the service last year.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not wish to detain the House, but I was not here when the question of the Arctic came up, and perhaps I may be permitted to say here that the government ought to recognize the work done by Captain Bernier in the far north. The Captain ought to receive

through the recommendation of his minister the recognition generally given to an old officer of the Crown. Had I been here the other evening I would have spoken more of the merits of Captain Bernier. But I would ask the minister to bear in mind the service that Captain Bernier has rendered to Canada and the empire.

Hydrographic surveys—to provide for a new vessel required for surveying the Atlantic coast, $200,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. This is a new vote?

Mr. HAZEN. Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Has the contract been given?

Mr. HAZEN. No, tenders have not been asked for yet.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Are tenders to be asked for as soon as possible?

Mr. HAZEN. Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Does the Minister intend to build the vessel in this country?

Mr. HAZEN. I prefer to have it built in this country if possible. I think the old government had a rule in regard to vessels of this sort that if the tender put in from Canada did not exceed that from outside, by more than a certain percentage, the contract was awarded here. I would like to have it built in Canada, but sometimes our shipyards are so busy that it is almost impossible to have vessels built.

Radiotelegraphic service—to provide for the building and maintenance of wireless stations, $271,500.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is the hon. minister aware of what is taking place in England in connection with the wireless system? I see it stated that the British government have decided upon a policy on this subject, and that they are arranging to girdle the whole globe with the wireless system, connecting the various colonies. Has the hon. gentleman been in communication with the home government on this subject? The naval service being established, would not this be a timely subject for discussion at future naval conferences by my hon. friend with the British admiralty?

Mr. HAZEN. That, I believe, was agreed upon at the Colonial conference. We have practically bridged the Atlantic with the wireless. The idea then is to reach Australia, but I do not think that up to the present time they have been able to get messages across the Pacific ocean. Of course, we have the cable on the Pacific.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If new stations are to be built, I renew my request with regard to Bird Rock.

Mr. LEMIEUX.

Tidal service—to provide for maintenance of tidal stations and surveying steamers,, $45,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. Before we leave the large amount in which the Hudson Bay is involved—I do not wish to detain the House—but I would ask the privilege when the Hudson Bay Railway is under discussion to ask my hon. friend some questions about this survey of the Hudson Bay as it will affect the question of the railway.

Mr. HAZEN. I shall be happy to give my hon. friend (Mr. Graham) information at any time.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is connected with the Hudson Bay route, and the discussion will naturally come up on the railway item.

Some resolutions reported.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 153) for the relief of George McKay Sutherland.—Mr. MacNutt.

Bill (No. 154), to incorporate the Guarantee Life Insurance Company of Canada. —Mr. MacNutt.

Bill (No. 155), to incorporate the British American Trust Company.—Mr. Bradbury.

Mr. HAZEN moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. GRAHAM. What business will be taken up to-morrow.

Mr. HAZEN. I think we will take up whatever Bills are on the Order Paper ready to be taken up and the Supply will be the balance of the Railway estimates and I think the Militia estimates.

Mr. GRAHAM. With the estimates for the Grand Trunk Pacific it has been the custom to give the members notice exactly when they are to be taken up.

Mr. HAZEN. I have no doubt that to-morrow if hon. gentlemen on the other side are not ready to go on with those estimates they will be allowed to stand until they are.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.50 a.m. Tuesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 19, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT.

Bill (No. 143) to amend the Canada Shipping Act (Mr. Hazen) was read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. HAZEN. I explained the purpose of this Bill at the time of its introduction. The first of the two clauses which it contains is for the purpose of exempting sailing ships, fitted with ordinary gasolene engines, that are engaged partly in fishing and partly in the transportation of freight, from having to employ certificated masters or mates. Under the existing law these vessels would be exempt if they were employed solely in fishing, but some of them are engaged for a portion of the year, say for nine months, in fishing and the balance of the year is devoted to carrying freight around the neighbourhood in which the owners live. As the law stands at present these vessels have to have certificated masters and certificated mates. They are operated in most cases by the owner, by the fisherman himself. There are not enough certificated masters and mates, even if the owners were in the position to employ men so qualified, to serve upon these boats; and in addition to that the employment of such masters and mates would impose a burden of expense upon the owner that would not be justified, considering the business in which they are engaged. The junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean), when I introduced this Bill, suggested that there would have to be some change in its provisions to show that these vessels should either be engaged in the coasting trade, or in the deep sea trade. I told my hon. friend I would look into the matter, and I find that the point raised by him was well taken. So I will ask to amend section one by inserting after the word 'ships' in the sixth line, the words, 'engaged in the coastwise trade.' That will meet the objection that was well taken by my hon. friend from Halifax. I therefore move to amend the section in that respect.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not familiar with the provisions of the Bill. But I gather from what my hon. friend has said that boats propelled by gasolene, not engaged in fishing at any time, would require to have certificated officers?

Mr. HAZEN. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. Is it reasonable that while a boat propelled by gasolene which happens to be engaged in fishing, may be handled by officers not certificated, and boats propelled by the same means engaged in other callings, should not be relieved from that requirement?

Mr. HAZEN. It has been thought not desirable to extend this privilege any further at the present time. There does not seem to be any hardship in having this requirement for boats which are regularly engaged in trade as carriers. There is no complaint at all from the owners of such boats, because those boats, as a rule, are doing a business that enables their owners to employ a certificated master or a certificated mate. This is intended simply as a relief to those persons who are engaged in the fishing industry. It is from the standpoint of the fishermen that the matter has been dealt with, and it has been thought not desirable to extend the privilege any further at present. If it is found that there is any hardship in applying this requirement to vessels of over 100 tons, propelled by gasolene, which are engaged wholly in trade, and I suppose there are very few of them, the matter will be dealt with at another session; but at the present time we are acting upon what was practically the recommendation of the committee of Marine and Fisheries at the last session of the House. I might say to my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) that probably at the next session a Bill will be introduced dealing with the Merchant Shipping Act and making a very considerable number of changes in that Act. The subject which my hon. friend has presented could then be dealt with, if it was thought desirable.

Mr. OLIVER. Does the exemption not apply to boats over 100 tons?

Mr. HAZEN. The exemption applies to boats under 100 tons.

Mr. OLIVER. Speaking particularly of the Yukon, the navigation of the Yukon river is in the hands of a monopoly. As a matter of fact a certain navigation company has full control of the navigation of that river. There might be some relief to that condition of monopoly in navigation if a small boat, propelled by gasolene, could be operated under the law. As a matter of fact, two years ago a small vessel built for the purpose of competing in traffic on the Yukon river and on its tributaries and upper waters was debarred from operating by the law as it then existed. I do not recall that that boat was propelled by gasolene, but I know that gasolene boats are in operation on the Yukon river, and I think I am safe in saying that the present provision of the law has been used as a means of preventing that kind of competition in carrying, on those streams, that otherwise would have been secured by the public. I would think, therefore, that it would be advisable to permit of competition in carrying if it can be done without danger to the public.

Mr. HAZEN. My attention has not been called to the condition of affairs on the Yukon to which my hon. friend refers. The matter is certainly one for very careful consideration. If there is existing on the Yukon river a monopoly such as my hon. friend has pointed out, and if the

excepting boats under 100 tons that are operated by gasolene, from the necessity of having a certificated officer would go towards breaking up that monopoly, the matter would certainly seem to be one calling for favourable consideration. But I would say to my hon. friend that I would not care to amend this Bill, at so late a period in the session, without careful inquiry as to how far-reaching in its effects such a change might be, but the matter will be considered before the amendment of the Merchant Shipping Act next session.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like very much for the minister to take up the point that I have raised when he is considering the Bill, because there is an immense river system in the northern part of Canada where there must necessarily be a very moderate development of transportation facilities, and where it is very easy for an aggregation of capital to hold the navigation, and it is a desirable thing that there should be every facility offered for competition.

Mr. McKENZIE. I would like to ask the minister if he has anything in this Bill to limit or name the time within which these schooners must be engaged in fishing, before they can get the benefits of the exemption. I can point out to the hon. minister where the Bill might be abused, where a schooner engaged in fishing might enjoy privileges which another schooner of the same size would not enjoy, if she were not so engaged. The owner of the former vessel might only devote a week or a fortnight to fishing and yet benefit by the provisions of the Act. I think there should be some provision for a limit of time within which the vessel must be employed in fishing before she could enjoy the benefits.

Mr. HAZEN. There is no provision of that sort in the Bill. Of course the intention of the Bill is that it shall apply to vessels that are bona fide engaged in fishing operations, or whose principal business is fishing. I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) that the law has not been observed in the past. As a matter of fact there have been violations going on all the time, and it is thought not desirable to have a law on the statute books which has been so violated, and which it is impossible to enforce. It is thought better, therefore, to have some such provision as the Bill contains so as to make the practice legal. The amendment was asked for by a very largely signed petition from people living chiefly in the province from which my hon. friend comes. The signatures are of people in different parts of Nova Scotia, such as Westport, Tiverton, Little River, Sandy Cove and so on, small places along the coast of that province. I think good will result from passing the Bill in its present form. If it is found that some amendment is necessary to guard against what my hon. friend suggests, it can be done at another session of the House. It is too late now at this hour of the session to consider any changes.

Mr. OLIVER. What I said had reference to gasolene boats. I think it would be well for the minister, however, to take into consideration some relief with respect to the requirements, even as regards steam propelled boats of small size, for the reason that I have mentioned.

On section 2.

Mr. HAZEN. The second section, I pointed out to the House, was for the purpose of remedying what I think is a small matter, but which seems to be a hardship. At the present time if a master, a mate, or a second mate loses his certificate, and evidence of that is furnished to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, another certificate is granted, but in order to get that other certificate, which practically costs the department or the government nothing, he has to pay one-half of what it costs to obtain his original certificate. For instance, in the case of a master I think the original cost is $15, and for getting another certificate he has to pay $7.50. It has been felt for a long while that this was rather a burdensome fee to exact from men whose incomes are not very large, and therefore it is provided that when a man proves to the satisfaction of the minister that he has without fault on his part, lost or been deprived of any certificate, the minister may, upon such terms and conditions as he deems fit, cause a copy or duplicate of the original certificate to be made out and certified as aforesaid and delivered to such master, or mate, or second mate, as the case may be. The minister can fix what he considers a fair and reasonable fee, and my disposition would be to fix that fee at the nominal sum of one dollar.

Bill reported as amended, read a third time and passed.

CANADIAN NORTHERN ALBERTA RAILWAY.

Bill (No. 144) respecting aid towards the construction of the Canadian Northern Alberta railway—Mr. White (Leeds)—read a second time and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). When the resolutions upon which this Bill is founded were under consideration by the committee, I made a rather full statement as to the necessity for the legislation, which statement

was concurred in by the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham). I think it unnecessary to add anything to what I stated on that occasion, so far as giving information to the House is concerned. I therefore suggest that we take up the Bill clause by clause.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

YUKON ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 123) to amend the Yukon Act (Mr. Doherty) was read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

On section 11—Territorial court.

Mr. BORDEN. The reasons for this Bill were explained fully by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) upon the resolution which preceded the introduction. If there is any information I can give I should be pleased to give it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The right hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) is right in saying that information as to the Bill was given by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty). The only suggestion I have to offer relates to one of the judges affected by this Bill. I have not the honour of the acquaintance of Mr. Justice Craig, but I know him by reputation as a well qualified judge. But I have the pleasure of knowing Mr. Justice Dugas. I see by the Orders of the Day that resolutions will be introduced to-morrow with a view to increasing the number of judges in the province of Quebec and to provide $5,000 a year for the new Superior Court judgeship. I do not know in what district the new judge will be appointed, but I suppose it will be the new district of Montcalm. But I know that Judge Dugas, after years of successful practice at the bar, was appointed judge of the Police Court in Montreal. He is highly qualified to fill any of the positions now vacant in the judiciary of Quebec. If Judge Dugas is in good health, as I hope he is, I think the government could avail itself of his services instead of appointing a new judge. The amount to be paid Justice Dugas under this Bill, $5,000, would be exactly the salary of the new judgeship in Quebec. Mr. Justice Dugas is not an old man by any means, but is full of life, a man of high qualifications and one who was quite eminent as a practising lawer. My suggestion, of course, is subject to the limitation I have indicated—that Judge Dugas' health is not impaired.

Mr. BORDEN. I do not propose that the Bill shall be read the third time at this sitting, but that, if passed by the committee it shall stand until the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) is able to be present. He will probably be here during the course of the forenoon sitting. I appreciate what my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) has said. The attention of the Minister of Justice will be called to it.

On section 2—Court of Appeal.

Mr. BORDEN. I will explain to my right hon. friend just what the position is. This section repeals sections 46, 47 and 48 of the Yukon Act, chapter 63, Revised Statutes of 1896. These sections are as follows:

46. The territorial court shall sit in banc at such times and places as the commissioner appoints, and the sittings thereof may be adjourned from time to time as may be necessary.

Of course, if the number of judges is reduced to one there can be no sitting in banc.

47. At such sittings the court may hear and dispose of motions for new trials, appeals and motions in the nature of appeals, and any other business or matter within the jurisdiction of the court.

As the court can no longer sit in banc, it is obvious that section requires to be repealed.

48. Two judges shall constitute a quorum of the court in banc; Provided that, where there are only two judges sitting upon an appeal the trial judge or the judge from whose decision the appeal is taken, shall not be one of them.

The same consideration which I have just mentioned applies also to this section. Then, as there is to be no court sitting in banc in the Yukon Territory, it is necessary to make provision for an appeal from the judge, and the proposal of the Minister of Justice, as embodied in this Bill, is that the court of appeal of British Columbia should be constituted as the court of appeal from the judge of the Yukon Territory. This section and the various subsections thereof contain the necessary provisions for that purpose.

On section 4,

Mr. BORDEN. Inasmuch as the territorial court will no longer sit in banc, the amendment which is embodied in this section seems to be necessary. That amendment gives an appeal in all cases from the territorial court to the Supreme Court of Canada.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Directly to the Supreme Court, passing by the Court of Appeal of British Columbia.

Mr. BORDEN. My right hon. friend will observe that the judgment of the territorial court sitting in banc was final and conclusive if that court was unanimous; but if the court was not unanimous, then

there was to be an appeal direct to the Supreme Court of Canada. As the court may be reduced to one judge under this statute, the appeal is given in all cases.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In this section you do not go to the Court of Appeal of British Columbia, but directly to the Supreme Court of Canada. There may be some reason for it, which I would like to know. So far you have made the appeal from the territorial court to the Court of Appeal of British Columbia. Now, you pass directly from the territorial court to the Supreme Court of Canada, passing by the Court of Appeal of British Columbia.

Mr. BORDEN. I observe that. I really do not know just what consideration influenced the Minister of Justice in that regard. I will be glad to let that section stand.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would like to know; there may be some reason for it.

Mr. BORDEN. I think the inquiry of the right hon. gentleman is very pertinent. I have not consulted the Minister of Justive with regard to that, and I cannot state what his view was when he drew up that amendment.

Progress reported.

SALARIES OF JUDGES.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the Judges Act, and to provide as follows:

For an assistant judge of the Exchequer Court of Canada, at a salary of $6,000 per annum.

For two additional judges of the High Court of Justice for Ontario at a salary of $7,000 each per annum.

To increase the salary of the judge for the district of Montmagny to $7,000 per annum.

For an additional puisne judge of the Superior Court of the province of Quebec at a salary of $5,000 per annum.

For an additional puisne judge of the Court of Appeal for Manitoba, at a salary of $7,000 per annum.

For an additional puisne judge of the Court of King's Bench of the province of Manitoba at a salary of $6,000 per annum.

For an additional puisne judge of the supreme Court of Alberta, at a salary of $6,000 per annum.

For an additional district court judge of the province of Saskatchewan at a salary of $2,500 per annum during the first three years of service; and after three years of service at a salary of $3 000 per annum.

For two additional district court judges of the province of Alberta at a salary of $2,500 each per annum during the first three years of service; and after three years of service at a salary of $3,000 each per annum.—Mr. Doherty.

Mr. BORDEN.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Chairman, this is rather a comprehensive motion. I have no doubt that some of its dispositions are quite necessary. I suppose there can be no objection to the additional judges in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan where the business has certainly largely increased. I am not so sure about some of the other proposals. I presume that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) is not in a position to-day to give all the information which it would be valuable to have when we come to discuss the Bill, and I would suggest that it would be advisable to ask the Minister of Justice to give statistics about the work in the court of exchequer to justify the appointment of an additional judge. Then, the judge of the district of Montmagny is going to receive an addition to his salary of $2,000. I do not think that the judge of the district of Montmagny is very much overworked, if he is worked at all, and, therefore, it would be well to get some statistics of the work that he has to do to justify this increase. I am not pressing the question to-day, but I would like my right hon. friend to get the statistics for the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. BELAND. I might remark that the judge of the district of Montmagny also attends to the judicial business of the district of Beauce.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, I know.

Mr. BELAND. In the district of Beauce there has been a great increase in the judicial business in the last ten years. I do not say that it would be sufficient to warrant an increase in salary, but I want to make this statement to the House. There is an important increase in the judicial business of the district of Beauce itself, but as to Montmagny I am not in a position to speak

Mr. BORDEN. I have understood from the Minister of Justice that in respect of the proposals embodied in this resolution, provincial legislation has been passed, with the exception of the two provisions which my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has mentioned. As far as the judge of the exchequer court is concerned, I will ask the Minister of Justice to get the information. As far as the judge of the district of Montmagny is concerned, I had understood from the Minister of Justice, in discussing the matter with him, just what the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Beland) has mentioned, that the judge presides over what is really equivalent to two districts, and does a very large amount of work. However, I shall ask the Minister of Justice with respect to that. And he will be prepared to give the information which my right hon. friend has asked for.

Mr. CARVELL. Before this resolution passes, I would like to call the attention of the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) to the fact that there is no provision here for dealing with the case of the county court judges of the maritime provinces. I would ask him to bring the matter to the attention of the Minister of Justice. Would it not be well to take into consideration the possibility of making some provision to increase the salaries of the county court judges in the maritime provinces? The reason that I mention the maritime provinces especially is, that, as I understand it, there is a great difference between the position occupied by county court judges in the maritime provinces and that occupied by county court judges in Ontario. In Ontario there are two judges in very many counties, and in a few instances only one. One judge who looks after the more important business while the other takes the district court business. In the province of Quebec the district court judge, as I understand it, has about the same jurisdiction and powers as the county court judges in the maritime provinces, and the only difference is that while in the maritime provinces the county court judge receives a salary of $3,000, in Quebec a man doing the same work gets $5,000 a year, and to-day we have a proposition here to give one of them $7,000. I do not say that the judges in the maritime provinces are overworked. I think that perhaps, with the exception of the judges in Halifax and St. John, they could do twice as much work as they are doing to-day. It is not reasonable to expect a man, who occupies a high position at the bar of his native province, to take a county court judgeship at the small salary of $3,000 a year. It seems to me that a man who is sufficiently competent to discharge the duties of a county court judge in the maritime provinces is entitled to a good deal more than that salary. You can hardly find an official in Ottawa, in the ordinary civil service, doing merely clerical duties of any importance who is not receiving $3,000 a year. The county court judge is excluded from taking part in any of the ordinary affairs of life; he is not supposed to augment his income from any commercial or professional pursuit and so he has practically to live on $3,000 a year unless he happens to have a private income. I do not think any of the county court judges would object to have additional duties imposed upon them, and while I do not expect the Prime Minister to give any promise today, I would ask him to bring the matter to the attention of the Minister of Justice in the hope that the county court judges may obtain that increase in salary to which they are entitled.

Mr. McKENZIE. I have much pleasure in supporting the suggestions made by the hon. member (Mr. Carvell). I trust that the Prime Minister, when he is considering the claims of the county court judges of the maritime provinces, will remember that the jurisdiction of the county court is very much wider now than it was in 1876 when these courts were created. In 1876 the county court judges, in Nova Scotia at all events, had no criminal jurisdiction except appeals from magistrates, but at the present day every criminal offence except the nigh crimes such as murder, can, with the consent of the accused, be tried in the county courts, and thousands of such cases are so tried. Then, when the county courts were created, the jurisdiction was only limited to $400 in civil cases, but it has now been extended in Nova Scotia to $800 so that a very large civil business is conducted in these courts. In Nova Scotia, the Lien Act has been extended and the county court judge has exclusive jurisdiction under it, no matter how large the amount that may be involved, which goes further to show that the county court judge is expected to have a good grasp of the law and of business matters. Then again, as an evidence of the extended jurisdiction of the county court, when that court was created we had no Judicature Act and the passage of that Act has involved a very large extension of the jurisdiction on the county court judges. In the city of Sydney a large volume of civil business is conducted before the county court judge as master of the Supreme Court, and so his work is very much greater than it was when the court was constituted. Again, a few years ago, the Railway Act was amended, to extend the jurisdiction of the county courts along the Intercolonial Railway to deal with cases arising between the government and individuals respecting damages caused on the I.C.R. As was pointed out by the hon. member for Carleton, the business as to law and fact dealt with in a county court requires from the judge as good talent as it is to be found in the (legal) profession anywhere. Speaking with more definite knowledge of the county of Cape Breton I can say to the Prime Minister with positive certainty that the judge of the county court is engaged every single day in the year, except Sunday, with criminal cases, civil cases, and Supreme Court cases. Last summer there was some unfortunate litigation arising out of the strike, and in connection with it three or four thousand ejectments had to be tried before him, which kept him continuously at work. Of course, we hope that a circumstance of that kind will not arise again. But, even without that, the population is large and the litigation is increasing every day. We have a competent county court judge there in whom the people have confidence, and they find it convenient to go to his court rather

than wait for the sittings of the Supreme Court. The county court judge starts with a salary of $2,500 a year and the maximum is $3,000 so that if it is necessary to give some judges $6,000 and $7,000—and I do not think it is at all too much—the government will understand that $3,000 is infinitely too small for a judge to maintain the dignity of his office. It is highly in the interests of the community that our judges should be well paid and that the county court judges should be as nearly as possible placed in the same independent position as the judges of the Superior Courts. I commend to the Prime Minister what has been so well said by the hon. member for Carleton, N.B.

Mr. KYTE. I desire to supplement the observations made by my hon. friend from North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) in support of the increase in the salaries of county court judges. I more particularly have reference to the county court judge in District No. 7, province of Nova Scotia, which includes the city of Sydney and three of the counties of the Island of Cape Breton. The jurisdiction of the county court judge of that district extends over a population of 120,000 and it is by far the largest constituency that any county court judge has in the province of Nova Scotia or in the maritime provinces so far as I am aware. My hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) has spoken of the enormous amount of business that the county court judge there has to do, and I may point out that that business is increasing all the time. There is no resident judge of the Supreme Court in that part of the province of Nova Scotia, and a large number of matters that are dealt with by Supreme Court judges in other parts of the maritime provinces have to come before him. Some years ago there was a re-adjustment of the salaries of the county court judges of the Dominion, and I think it was intended that special consideration should be given to the salary of the county court judge resident in the city of Sydney. For some reason or other the consideration to which he was entitled was overlooked, and the salary which was intended to be given to him equal to the salary of the county court judge of Halifax, was not apportioned to him. Apart altogether from the question whether or not the Prime Minister is disposed to consider the whole matter of increasing the salaries of the county court judges of the maritime provinces, I think the case of the county court judge of district No. 7 in Nova Scotia is entitled to special consideration and should be specially dealt with.

Mr. KNOWLES. My hon. friends from the maritime provinces, who have spoken of the propriety of increasing the salaries of the district court judges have undoubtedly made out a strong case. Every argument they have submitted applies to the judges of the province from where I come. If it is their duty to speak on behalf of the county court bench in their province, much more is it the duty of the representatives of the province of Saskatchewan to call attention to the remuneration of the district court judges in that province. At present the salaries paid to judges in the west are the same as those paid in Nova Scotia. Even if it is a debatable point whether or not salaries in Nova Scotia should be increased, that fact makes it almost conclusive that they should be raised in Saskatchewan. As every body knows, the cost of living and raising a family, and all the expenses to which a judge is put in order to maintain his position, socially and otherwise, are much greater in the west than in the east. It is an anomaly that judges in the western provinces are not paid higher salaries, and a very generous increase should be given to them, especially in Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia. Another point to be remembered is that the practice of the bar in the western provinces is much more remunerative than it is in Nova Scotia. The members of the legal profession in the province of Saskatchewan, as a rule, earn twice as much as they do in some of the older provinces by the sea. For that reason, as well as because of the greater expense of living, a larger remuneration should be given the judges. In the province of Saskatchewan we have a splendid district court bench. It is occupied by men who have gone on the bench desiring to make good and who have made good, and I think their services should be generously recognized by the government. With regard to the paragraph in this resolution in which provision is made for an additional district court judge of the province of Saskatchewan at the salary named, it goes without saying that he must be a junior judge, because there are eight districts in the province, and all are filled at present. I quite approve of this provision, because some of our judges are at present overworked. In my own district, the judicial district of Moosejaw, Judge Ouseley, a very able and diligent judge, is at present doing three men's work. Is the Prime Minister able to tell me in what district it is proposed to place this additional judge?

Mr. BORDEN. I regret that I cannot give my hon. friend the information. In respect to all the provisions for increasing the number of judges in the different provinces, I understand that this legislation is brought forward in order to supplement

and make effective provincial legislation. My hon. friend is entitled to the information, and I will see that it is furnished to him on the second reading of the Bill or when it is in committee. In regard to the general question which has been referred to by hon. gentlemen who have spoken, I am not prepared to make any statement to-day. The subject has not received any consideration, but I appreciate what has been said, and I will see that the attention of the Minister of Justice is directed to it. The situation with regard to the appointment and remuneration of judges is not free from difficulty under our federal system. That difficulty has made itself manifest on many occasions ever since confederation. The provincial legislatures create the judicial positions, and the federal parliament is entrusted with the duty of fixing and providing for the salaries. The result of that is sometimes thought to be that we have too many judges in some of the provinces, and those judges, as a result of that, have not been provided with such salaries as would be necessary for the purpose of securing the best available ability. I am not quite clear how that situation can be improved. So long as this system continues, it is very invidious for the government or the parliament of Canada to sit as a court of appeal from the unanimous vote of a provincial legislature which declares that these judges are necessary. On the other hand, it has, been thought on several occasions during the past 25 or 30 years that the number of judges has been increased without due consideration of some of the matters which have been mentioned here to-day. In the meantime, all I can say is that, with the two exceptions I have mentioned, this Bill is designed to supplement legislation which has been passed by the various provinces concerned. Beyond that, I leave the Minister of Justice to make further explanations on the second reading of the Bill or in committee.

Mr. MURPHY. Can the Prime Minister say whether any request has come from Ontario for the appointment of these two judges?

Mr. BORDEN. Yes, a request has come from the government of Ontario, and I think also from the Chief Justice of Ontario.

Mr. PROULX. I do not believe that these two judges for Ontario are needed. The legislation asking for them was passed two years ago, and the late Minister of Justice never saw any need to make the appointments. When hon. gentlemen opposite were in opposition they criticised the late government very severely for appointing judges on commissions, and yet one of the first things they did after coming into power was to appoint a judge on an important commission, taking him away from his judicial work. If the judges were left to their regular work, I do not think there would be any necessity of appointing two additional high court judges. Since these two new judgeships were created, the jurisdiction of the county court has been largely extended, that was done two years ago, in some cases from $200 to $500, and in other cases from $600 to $800, thus relieving the high court judges of certain work.

The hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) says that in the west they have not enough judges. I think in Ontario we have too many judges, especially on the county court bench, and the province, in my opinion could easily do away with about a dozen of them. I think there should be a conference between the Minister of Justice and the Attorney General of Ontario with the object of amending the law in order to give the county court judges more work. The province should be divided into seven, eight, or ten districts and the county court judges given power to hear appeals in banc from the county and division courts. This would be a great convenience for the lawyers living outside Toronto. At present the lawyers of Toronto do more than half the legal work of the province which is a great inconvenience and loss to their confrères outside who have to go to Toronto, except in the case of Assize and county court work. All the chamber work done before a High Court judge and the appeals we have to send the work to Toronto and divide the fees with the lawyers there, who sometimes take more than half and often more than the outside lawyers will get from their clients. If the county court judges were to hear appeals, it would cause them to brush up their legal knowledge and be a good thing for them, and relieve the High Court judges of a large amount of work. I would also suggest to the Prime Minister that he amend the Judges Act by obliging the county court judges to live in the county town. At present these judges have to live in the district in which they are appointed, but they do not always obey even tnat requirement. We have two judges for the county of Prescott and Russell, a junior and senior judge, but neither lives in the county town. The junior judge obeys the law by living in the district, about ten miles from the county town, but the complaint is made by the legal profession that sometimes two or three weeks elapse without their seeing a judge in the county town. In January last division court was to be held there but no judge came; the senior judge was to hold the sittings there but he did not arrive. There is not

enough work in the county of Prescott and Russell for one judge, yet we have two judges, and it is about the worst served district in the province. I would therefore suggest that the law be amended so as to make the judges reside in the county town, more especially when there is only one judge for the district. If there are two judges such a requirement is not necessary; the senior judge could be made to reside there, and the junior judge elsewhere in the county. In my district the majority of the lawyers live in the county town where most of the legal work is done. The High Court judges of Ontario have to live in Toronto or within a radius of five miles of that city. I think the same law should be made to apply to the county court judges, who should either be compelled to live in the county town or within a few miles of it.

Mr. BORDEN. I will draw the attention of the Minister of Justice to what my hon. friend has suggested. So far as the judges in Ontario are concerned, I understand that the legislation was passed unanimously by the legislature of Ontario, and that the government, including the Attorney General, had asked for the appointment of these judges. However, full information will be given on the second reading of the Bill.

Resolutions reported, read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. BORDEN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 156) to amend the Judges Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY—QUEBEC BRIDGE.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (South Renfrew). Before you leave the Chair, according to the announcement that I made yesterday I wish to make a brief statement concerning the letting of the contract for the construction of what is known as the Quebec bridge. I take this opportunity of doing so, not on account of any criticism that has been made in this House or on this side of the water, but rather on account of comments that have been made by certain gentlemen in the old land which comments have been reproduced, and in some cases enlarged upon, in sundry newspapers in this country and in the old land as well. The only result that could accrue from these statements would be that they would somewhat impair the pleasant relations that have existed between business men in the old land and those in Canada, and it is in order to prevent any misunderstanding of the methods of the Canadian government or the Canadian people in doing business, that I wish to place a plain statement of the circumstances concerning the letting of that contract on 'Hansard,' which I think all will agree affords a complete reply to the criticism which has been made by certain gentlemen, interested and otherwise. It might be well, Sir, in beginning to call the attention of the House, as I think I have often done before, to the fact that this undertaking is the most gigantic of its kind ever conceived by man. The next in magnitude is what is known as the Forth bridge, but it does not compare with this great project known as the Quebec bridge. Bearing this in mind, hon. gentlemen will understand how very necessary it was that every care should be exercised, and that the government should rely solely on the opinions and judgment of men trained in bridgework, the very ablest experts that could be procured throughout the world. I might say that no step was taken except with the consent of, and on the advice, of the majority of the members of the board appointed for the purpose of reconstructing this bridge. I need not remind the House that the first attempt to construct this great project failed, and a calamity, not equalled I think in our own country, connected with public works, occurred on August 29th, when the bridge, as first undertaken, became a wreck carrying with it to death a large number of workmen. On August 30th there were certain additions made to the government, and on the very next day, on the recommendation of myself as the then Minister of Railways, a board of commissioners was appointed in order to make full investigation as to the causes surrounding the calamity, also to investigate as far as possible the design, the workmanship and the material entering into this great structure. The board was appointed on August 31st, 1907, and was composed of the following: Henry Holgate, C.E., Montreal; J. G. G. Kerry, of Campbellford; and Prof. Galbraith, of the University of Toronto. If I remember well, Mr. Kerry had previously been connected with McGill University. These were very prominent gentlemen. They at once proceeded with their work. It is universally conceded their report is a contribution to scientific knowledge in bridge building of very great value. The report was in such demand that it was necessary to get a larger number printed than was at first arranged for. And if any hon. gentlemen will inquire at the library of any of the chief universities of the world, I think he will find there a copy of the report of these engineers. In the meantime the department appointed Mr. Schneider, of New York, a very prominent engineer, to make investigations into certain details, more particularly with a view to ascertaining if it were possible to accede to the wish and request of the Phœnix

Bridge Company that, as they were not allowed to reconstruct the bridge, at least a portion of the material might be used, and he made a thorough investigation, the result of which will be found in the records of the House. In the statute of 1908, that is 7-8 Edward VII., chapter 59, provision was made for taking over this work from what was known as the Quebec Bridge Company.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Graham) say with reference to the inquiry of the Phœnix Bridge Company as to whether a portion of their work might be preserved and used, does he know what the reply of the commission was on that point?

Mr. GRAHAM. When the commissioners appointed for the reconstruction of the bridge came to make their investigation, they unanimously agreed that no part of it could be used, except for loading, as scrap-iron can be used—it could not enter into the structure. Let me read one section of this Act of 1908:

The Minister of Railways and Canals may employ engineers and cause plans and specifications to be prepared for the reconstruction and completion of the said bridge and undertaking, or for the construction of a bridge to serve the same purpose as was intended to be served by the bridge undertaken and partially completed by the said company, on the same site, or on such other site, at or near the city of Quebec, as is recommended by such engineers or a majority of them and approved of by the Governor in Council, and the minister shall apply to such work any moneys appropriated therefor by parliament, including the sum of twenty-five thousand dollars appropriated therefor in the present session of parliament.

Now, acting under that statute, on August 17, 1908, the following were appointed a board to prepare plans and reconstruct the bridge on those plans:—Mr. H. E. Vautelet, member of the Canadian Society of Civil Engineers, Montreal; Ralph Modjeski, Director and member American Society of Civil Engineers, Consulting Engineer, Chicago; Maurice Fitzmaurice, C.M.G., Chief Engineer of the London County Council. It will thus be seen that the selections were made from Canada, England and the United States. I may say in passing that Mr. Fitzmaurice had been associated—as a young man, of course—in the construction of the great Forth bridge. This taken in connection with the fact that he was chief engineer of the London County Council was thought to be one of the highest recommendations that could be given to any engineer. It was conceded by the engineering world that the selection of these three gentlemen was possibly the best that could be made, not only on this continent, but in the world. I wish to put on record the order in council naming these men and prescribing at least partially their duties. I do this because later it was contended that certain acts of theirs which I insisted should be performed, did not fall within the purview of their work as outlined by the order in council appointing them:

On a memorandum dated 12th August 1908, from the Minister of Railways and Canals, representing that it is necessary that measures be taken for the reconstruction by the government of the demolished work known as the Quebec bridge, across the river St. Lawrence, authority for the taking over of which work from the Quebec Railway and Bridge Co., together with their whole undertaking, has been given by an order in council.

The minister further represents that on the consideration of the question, it would appear desirable that such reconstruction be carried out by means of a special Board acting under the Department of Railways and Canals, composed of three qualified persons, in whom should be vested certain duties and powers.

The minister, accordingly, recommends that he be authorized to appoint a Board of Engineers, to be composed as follows:—

Chairman of the Board and Chief Engineer, Henri Etienne Vautelet, member Canadian Society of Civil Engineers, consulting engineer, Montreal: Ralph, Modjeski, director and member of American Society of Civil Engineers, consulting engineer, Chicago; and Maurice Fitzmaurice, C. M.G., Chief Engineer of the London County Council, England, their respective salaries to be as may be hereafter determined. It shall be the duty of the said Board to make careful examination of the existing plans, together with any modifications thereof that may be suggested, in order to ascertain whether the design shown by such plans as so modified should be adopted for the reconstruction of the bridge, so as to utilize, as far as possible, the material already provided.

The Board shall consider carefully the existing specifications, and decide whether, having regard to the conditions, they are such as are suitable to the construction of the projected work.

They shall make full examination of the piers of the bridge now constructed and of such portions of the superstructure as have been built, to ascertain their condition and sufficiency, if utilized either in whole or in part.

In the event of the Board reaching the conclusion that it would be inexpedient to adopt or to modify the existing design, they shall prepare a new design, together with a specification, workings, drawings, estimate of cost and all such things in that connection necessary as preliminary to proceeding with the work and submit the same to the Department of Railways and Canals for its action thereon.

It is intended that the entire responsibility for the design and for the reconstruction of the work shall rest with the Board alone.

The head office of the Board shall be in the city of Quebec.

The chief engineer of the Board shall have

power to appoint from time to time such technical, clerical and other assistants as may be required, and at such salaries as may be authorized by the Governor General in Council, on his recommendation, made through the Minister of Railways and Canals.

In the event of serious differences of opinion arising between the members of the Board as to the scheme for reconstruction or any of its details, the Board shall call in eminent bridge engineers, not more than two in number, for the purpose of advising on the points of different, who, with the members of the Board, shall settle the question at issue.

The Board shall furnish monthly to the Minister of Railways and Canals a report showing the progress of the work, and the expenditure thereon; also such other reports as he may, from time to time, require from them in that connection.

Payments for work done and materials delivered and of office-staff pay-lists and accounts, will be made by the Department of Railways and Canals, only on certificates to be issued by the Chief Engineer of the Board, and after audit by the department. The accounts and books of the Board shall be at all times open for inspection by the departmental auditor.

The Committee submit the same for approval.

RODOLPHE BOUDREAU,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

Now, Sir, that board was appointed, and they began their work, began studies in various parts of the world. Mr. Vautelet went to the various points, not only on this continent but in Europe, where he thought the latest scientific information could be obtained. Their instructions were that the first necessity for the reconstruction of this bridge should be its stability; the second was its cost; and the third was the time in which it should be constructed, everybody understanding that in a work of this magnitude no hurry could be expected, and no undue haste was asked. The engineers made their studies in different parts of the world, it took them quite a long time, and at last they came to the point where they began to prepare a design. Now in order that the House may be well acquainted with the information received by the various companies as to the terms on which tenders would be received, I want to read an advertisement that appeared on November 24, 1909. This advertisement invited the various intending tenderers to come to the head office at Montreal and to co-operate with the board, in pursuing their studies and investigations necessary for the preparation of the plans for this great work. Allow me to read this advertisement:

DEPARTMENT OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS, CANADA.
Quebec Bridge.
Tenders for superstructure.
Notice to Bridge Builders.

Contractors for bridge superstructure are

invited to visit the office of the Board of Engineers in the Canadian Express Building, Montreal, Canada, after Janaury 3, 1910, where information may be had to enable them to prepare bids for the superstructure of a 1758 feet span bridge, 88 feet in width.

Bids will be received on the specification and for the design shown on the plans as prepared by the Board.

The contractor is invited to submit alternative designs which must conform to the conditions laid down in the general specification.

By Order,

L. K. JONES,
Secretary.

Every contractor had that advertisement, and every intending tenderer visited the office of the Quebec Bridge Board and made his own investigations. Now differences did arise between the engineers, just as differences arise between strong men on many points; and it may not be out of place to say that the stronger the men, sometimes, the more intense the differences. The engineers differed largely, so far as I could ascertain, on the principles of the double intersection and the single intersection for the construction of the bridge. A portion of the board contended that the design should be on the double intersection principle, and another portion contended that it should be on the single intersection principle. An hon. gentleman asks me to explain the differences. I could not explain it technically, but any one who has seen a lattice fence will have some idea of the difference. I will not attempt to explain the differences, they were engineering technicalities. One portion of the board insisted that with the double intersection principle you could not ascertain to such a definite point the amount of stress that would be on each member; while on the single intersection principle you could calculate to a more definite degree what stress would be on each of the members. The engineers continued to differ for some months, until at last the department said, we must come to a point where we can advertise for tenders for the construction of this bridge, and if this board of engineers cannot do it, we will have to get a board of engineers that can do it. Consequently, the board met on May 2, 1910, and they came to this arrangement as a sort of compromise. The Chairman had prepared a plan on the single intersection principle; the other members of the board were contending at that time for the double intersection principle, and they did not agree altogether with the design of the Chairman, but this compromise was arrived at in order that tenders might be invited. It is embodied in this resolution:

Copy of a resolution passed at a meeting of the board held May 2, 1910.

It is resolved that the plans and specifications for a cantilever design now completed be approved and submitted to the minister for

tenders, and that in the event of a better plan being submitted by any of the bidders same shall be adopted.

(Sgd.), RALPH MODJESKI.
(Sgd.), H. A. VAUTELET,
Witness: (Sgd.), H. A. Campbell.

Mr. Fitzmaurice was not in this country at the time, but he acquiesced in that arrangement. Mark you, the board itself passed a resolution confirming what had been done before, inviting for tenders on alternate designs, and placing themselves on record that if a better design were submitted by any tenderer than the design submitted by the board that design should be adopted. Consequently, tenders were asked for. There was an advertisement inserted on June 17, 1910, the usual advertisement calling for tenders for the construction of this bridge. Then a little later that time was extended in order that there could be no excuse given by any intending tenderers that they had not full time to complete their plans, after each one of them had been studying practically in the office of the board of the bridge company from the time the proposition was made and the board entered upon their duties. During six months Mr. Fitzmaurice had, on one or two occasions, suggested that he be allowed to resign from the board on account of inability to be present in Canada, and on account of ill-health. For a portion of that time he was off duty on account of ill-health. On my return from the west I wrote Mr. Fitzmaurice a letter pointing out to him that—if I remember correctly the contents of that letter—the situation had reached such a point in the carrying on of this work that it would be necessary that he should be in Canada quite frequently, at the call of the Chairman of the board, to consult on these important matters. Mr. Fitzmaurice wrote me this letter in reply:

The London County Council,
Spring Garden, London,
1st June, 1910.

Quebec Bridge.

Dear Sir,—I am obliged for your letter of the 7th ultimo. I feel quite sure that, owing to the state of my health and the impossibility of my fixing an early date on which I could be in Canada, it is much better that my resignation from the Board of Engineers for Quebec Bridge should be accepted. I quite agree that, at the present time, it is necessary that the services of a member of the Board should be available whenever required.

I think I should also say that the acceptance of my resignation will relieve me of rather an invidious position, owing to my not being able to see eye to eye with the Chairman of the Board as regards the design for the bridge which he has prepared. I feel satisfied that this design is not the best one which could have been got out, is uneconomical, and will give rise to great difficulties during erection. I am also of opinion that the specification on which the bridge manufacturers are to submit designs of their own is not such as will allow them to submit the most suitable design for this bridge.

This resignation, reiterated on the 1st of June, 1910, was accepted by the government in September of the same year. Following that, Mr. Charles E. Macdonald, C.E., L.L. D., now of Gananoque, a former resident of the county of Leeds, and for years a prominent engineer and bridge builder in the United States, was appointed in October; the appointment was dated on September 28.

I may say that in making this selection I consulted more particularly with Mr. Vautelet, chief engineer and Chairman of the board. There had been differences on the board and I was very anxious to get the ablest man I could on the continent and, if possible, one that the chairman would work in harmony with and who would work in harmony with the Chairman. In other words, I wanted to get some person who had not preconceived notions on this question which had been discussed by the members of the board. After consultation with Mr. Vautelet, I went to New York and saw Mr. Macdonald. As a result of the visit I sent for Mr. Vautelet and we talked the matter over with Mr. Macdonald, who accepted the position, much to the gratification of the Chairman and myself, but only accepted it until such time as the contracts should be signed. He did not care to act on the board during all the tedious work of the construction of the bridge. He is a man quite up in years, quite wealthy and does not have to work as he had in years gone by. He was appointed. He took a very active part in the work of the board and gave his best energies, intellect and judgment to the solution of the difficulty in selecting a design and the letting of the contract. After that was done he considered his work accomplished and he was allowed to resign. The tenders were asked for and received and on October 26 a report was signed by the board consisting of Charles Macdonald, Ralph Modjeski and H. E. Vautelet. That report is as follows:

Wednesday, October 26, 1910.

Sir,—Your board met in Montreal on Monday, October 10, 1910, to consider the plans sent by different companies for the Quebec bridge superstructure, and also copies of the tenders which had been made by the secretary of the board.

These copies were compared on the following day with the originals, which were brought to Montreal by an officer of your department.

A detailed statement in tabular form is enclosed.

Since that date the board has been in session practically continuously.

After a careful study of the tenders received on the board's design and on alternative designs submitted, amounting in all to thirty-five different propositions, your board has eliminated, as not acceptable, all but the following:

1st. Design No. V of the board, with short shore arms and floating erection of the suspended span on high staging, tenders on which were submitted by all four firms.

2nd. Design 'A' of the St. Lawrence Bridge Company, being different in outline from the board's design and having the top chords built of nickel steel plates throughout.

3rd. Design 'B' of the St. Lawrence Bridge Company, similar in all respects to design 'A,' except that the top chords of the anchor arm are built of carbon steel.

4th. Design 'C' of the St. Lawrence Bridge Company, similar in all respects to 'B,' with the exception of the top chords, which are designed with eyebars, instead of plates:

Classified for cost only they are as follows:

1. British Empire Bridge Co., board's design 'V'.. .. ..$11,025,566
2. Pennsylvania Steel Co., board's design 'V'.. 11,686,751
3. St. Lawrence Bridge Co., design 'B'.. 11,957,500
4. St. Lawrence Bridge Co., design 'A'.. 12,153,500
5. St. Lawrence Bridge Co., design 'C'.. 12,216,400
6. Maschinenfabrik Augs-Nurn, board's design 'V'.. 13,230,050
7. St. Lawrence Bridge Co., board's design 'V'.. 14,867,170

The cost as per specifications may be increased by 2 per cent and includes an amount of $118,500 to be paid to Messrs. M. P. & J. T. Davis for increased quantities of masonry in the anchor and short piers. The Pennsylvania Steel Company and the British Empire Bridge Company, according to their tenders, use a somewhat larger number of splices in the bottom chord than shown on the board's plan. Your board may later on recommend that their figures be slightly increased, in order to reduce the number of splices.

Your board does not consider that it is within their province to report on the financial status and ability of the different contractors.

They beg, however, to submit the following notes:

British Empire Bridge Company, Limited.—This is a company incorporated in Canada at a capital of $5,000,000. It was formed by the Cleveland Bridge and Engineering Co., Limited, of Darlington, England, and by the Patent Shaft and Axletree Company, of Wednesbury, England.

Our Chairman reported that he had visited the works of these companies. That the Cleveland Bridge and Engineering Company, at the time of his visit, was a modern bridge shop of about 12,000 to 16,000 tons annual capacity.

That the Patent Shaft and Axletree Company was one of the largest firms in England, and that their bridge department was composed of two large main buildings. He could not judge of their equipment, as no bridge work was being done at the time of his visit.

The representative of the British Empire Bridge Company submitted photographs showing some of the bridges built by the parent companies, including a 500 feet arch over the Zambesi River at Victoria Falls, Africa.

He also stated that the Patent Shaft and Axletree Company had a capital of £1,500,000, with a reserve of £400,000 together with other reserves; that their stock was issued at £1 par value and was now selling at £3.

This company has no assets known to us except an accepted cheque for $500,000, which we assume to be in the hands of the Minister, and your board does not know if the parent companies would become parties to the contract.

The British Empire Bridge Company state that they would establish works in this country, where all parts of the bridge, except the raw material, would be manufactured.

Pennsylvania Steel Company.—This firm is considered one of the strongest in the United States and has apparently very large assets.

Your board has no doubt about their ability to build the bridge and fulfill all the conditions of the contract.

It is not quite clear how much, if any, of the shop work would be done in Canada. Transportation of large members from their present shops would be very risky.

Maschinenfabrik Augsburg-Nurnberg A.G.—Your board does not know anything definite about this firm. It proposes to manufacture the bridge partly in Germany and partly in Canada, in connection with the Canada Foundry Company, Limited, of Toronto, in which case the same observation about transportation would apply to a much larger extent. They also state that they may decide later on to build everything in Canada.

St. Lawrence Bridge Company, Limited.—From information given by their representative, this is a company incorporated in Canada with a capital of $500,000, to be increased as need may be.

The Dominion Bridge Company and the Canadian Bridge Company each own one half the number of the shares, but neither parent company will become a party to the contract.

This company has no assets known to us except an accepted cheque for $500,000, which we assume to be in the hands of the Minister. The parent companies are very strong and very well known companies and there is no doubt about the ability of the men at their head to carry the contract to a successful issue.

Specifications.

The Machinenfabrik Augsburg-Nurnberg A.G. does not ask any modifications of the specifications. They only state that no nickel steel material will be longer than 53 feet, which is acceptable to the board.

The Pennsylvania Steel Company and British Empire Bridge Company discussed the specifications with the board. A complete understanding, signed in each case by the representative of the company and the members of the board, has been arrived at.

The St. Lawrence Bridge Company has asked for several modifications to the specifications. In the case of their tender on the board's plans an agreement can probably be arrived at on the basis proposed, except on the question of eyebars. They propose to make further experiments on the manu-

facture of the eyebars, so as to come to an agreement with the board.

There have also been some modifications and additions to the specifications and contract form, asked for by all the bidders, such as customs duties, &c., for which your board was not qualified to act and for which the contractors have been referred to you.

Your board is of the opinion that it is possible to construct a bridge in accordance with either of the tenders received upon the board's design 'V,' which would make a satisfactory structure.

Your board is also of the opinion that it is possible to construct a bridge in accordance with design 'A,' 'B' and 'C' submitted by the St. Lawrence Bridge Company, which would make a satisfactory structure, providing that plans, details and material were made in accordance with the specifications of the board, including modifications allowed to other bidders.

Respectfully submitted,
(Signed) CHARLES MACDONALD,
RALPH MODJESKI,
H. E. VAUTELET.

Hon. Geo. P. Graham,
Minister of Railways and Canals,
Ottawa, Ont.

That was sent to me, and as hon. gentlemen will see it gave me no definite advice as to what tender should be received by the department. It named several tenders and several designs and said any of these would make a satisfactory bridge. Considering it one of the most important parts of the duty of the board to advise the department definitely as to what design and tender it should accept, I wrote this letter to the chairman in reply to the report of the board which I have just read:

Ottawa, 1st of November, 1910.

H. E. Vautelet, Esq., C.E.,
Chairman, Quebec Bridge Commission,
Montreal.

Dear Mr. Vautelet,—I am in receipt of your letter of the 26th ultimo, containing resolution of the Board, and some very valuable information respecting the tenders, and the companies tendering in connection with the erection of the Quebec Bridge.

Your Board says that the bridge can be constructed according to the tenders on the Board's design No. 1, and also on designs 'A', 'B' and 'C', submitted by the St. Lawrence Bridge Company.

Although the information you submit is very valuable indeed and shows great care in working out, I fear that it does not afford me sufficient data on which to make a recommendation to my colleagues. I would ask the Board, therefore, to go one step further and make a recommendation to me, as to what tender, under all the circumstances, should be accepted.

In view of the close study the Board has given this great project, and also taking into consideration the fact that the members agree on certain designs, I think it is not unreasonable to suppose that they ought to be able to make a unanimous recommendation as to the tender that ought to be accepted by the government.

I note that the stock of the British Empire Bridge Company is held entirely by the Cleveland Bridge and Engineering Co., Ltd., of Darlington, England, and the Patent Shaft and Axletree Company, of Wednesbury, England; and that the stock of the St. Lawrence Bridge Company, Ltd. is held by the Dominion Bridge Company and the Canadian Bridge Company. The capital of the British Empire Bridge Company is $5,000,000, and the capital of the St. Lawrence Bridge Company is $500,000.

As you will readily understand in a gigantic enterprise of this kind, the ability of the contracting party to carry the work to completion is of vital importance.

Should the Board decide to recommend that the work be given to either of these companies I would request that you ask them to furnish the Board with an understanding that each of the parent companies holding the stock of the successful tendering company will become a party to the contract and responsible for its fulfilment.

I agree with you thoroughly that all the details ought to be settled between the successful tenderer and the Board before an announcement is made to whom the contract has been awarded because any tenderer to whom the contract may be given, refusing to sign such contract, forfeits its deposit of $500,000 now in the hands of the minister.

Allow me to thank the Board for the very careful manner in which it has gone about its work, and to express the hope that it may be able to arrive at a unanimous decision on which the minister can act with confidence.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) GEO. P. GRAHAM.

I received in reply a report, dated Quebec, and signed by Charles Macdonald and Ralph Modjeski, two members of the board, in reply to that letter. It is as follows:

Quebec, November 3rd, 1910.

Dear Sir,—In reply to your request of the 1st November asking for a definite recommendation for the acceptance of tenders respecting the Quebec Bridge, probably it would be well to give a little history of the situation. The public possibly do not realize the immensity of the undertaking and only members of the engineering profession can fully comprehend it. Nothing of equal magnitude has ever been attempted. Every engineer in connection with it has felt an indescribable responsibility. Under the circumstances, it is not to be wondered at, but rather is a proof of the care they have exercised that differences of opinion should have arisen as to the best method of accomplishing this task.

When the members of the Board as originally constituted first considered this great project they knew it was the greatest work ever undertaken and they endeavoured to approach it with open minds. After very careful study they discovered that their views did not coincide on some points. Part of the Board were inclined to favour the double intersection principle, similar to that adopted in the famous Forth Bridge, while the other por-

tion felt equally convinced that double intersection was not practical for such a structure. Studies were made along both lines, but neither party was convinced that their ideas were not the best. There being a divergence of view on the point, it was decided to advertise for tenders on the official plan prepared by the chairman and chief engineer on the single intersection principle with the mutual understanding that while tenders were asked on this design, tenderers were to be allowed to present any other design they chose, which would be fully considered by the Board on an equality with the official design.

This decision was embodied in a unanimous resolution of the board passed on May 2, 1910:

'It is resolved that the plans and specifications for a cantilever design now completed be approved and submitted to the minister for tenders and that in the event of a better plan being submitted by any of the bidders same shall be adopted.'

The advertisement for tenders consequently contained a clause embodying the principle of this resolution.

A full history of the tenders received appears in our former report. It will be seen that ten tenders were received for designs other than the official design, according to the advertisement, and they were considered, as outlined in a former report.

On close investigation of the alternative designs it was found that one, presented by the St. Lawrence Bridge Company, while designed on the single intersection principle, in a very practical way met all the demands that a portion of the Board had in their minds when they favoured the double intersection principle. It certainly is an original and happy combination, which embodies to a large extent the views of the advocates of each of the principles—single and double.

As stated in our former report, a bridge could undoubtedly be constructed on the official design, and once erected would be a substantial structure, but we are of opinion that design 'B', in addition to providing for a satisfactory bridge offers features which simplify the erection and minimize the risk to both life and property entailed in a work of such magnitude. This we consider of paramount importance. In addition to this we favour design 'B' for the following reasons:

1st. The numerous temporary members, sub-trusses and other connections to the permanent members involved in the official design are all dispensed with in design 'B'.

2nd. The erection can proceed in a regular manner, the traveller being carried on the main members only and as it advances each operation is similar to the preceding one, which similarity greatly favours speed and safety in construction.

3rd. There are no members in the trusses that do not carry live load with the exception of two small struts over the centre pier.

4th. There is less distortion and secondary stress as may be seen by comparing the Williot's diagrams, showing in each case the deflections of the trusses for different conditions of loading.

5th. The 'B' design admits of comparatively small stresses in the web members, thus rendering connections with the chords much more simple.

6th. No pin holes are required in the chords as connections are made by means of gussets, thus evading loss of section by large pin holes and permitting the compression members to abut with half holes in gusset plates outside the chords. The absence of pin holes in the centre line of the chord permits the use of a centre diaphragm connecting the several leaves of the bottom chord and presenting a more symmetrical section than in the official plan.

7th. By the substitution of riveted tension chords for eyebars all risk and difficulty of assembling a double line of eyebars with the heavy inclined posts in the official plan is removed and the diagonal tension and compression web members are in practically the same vertical plane as the corresponding leaf of the upper chord, thus insuring a more direct transmission of stress.

8th. All the heavy extras demanded by steel makers occur in the long and heavy web members of the official design. Owing to smaller stresses in the 'B' design these extras may be avoided, thus insuring less risk in the use of material which is beyond commercial limits.

9th. The general appearance of design 'B' will certainly be appreciated from an æsthetic point of view, the large open panels and wide riveted members convey the idea of strength combined with economical distribution of material, which is the true test of scientific construction. A bridge constructed upon this design would compare most favourably with the highest type of long span bridges in existence.

We, therefore, beg to recommend the acceptance of the tender of the St. Lawrence Bridge Company on their design 'B.' We do not wish to be understood as condemning any other design nor is this recommendation in any sense a reflection on any of the companies tendering, but we have arrived at this conclusion after a careful study of all the designs and conditions.

Respectfully submitted,
(Sgd.) CHARLES MACDONALD.
" RALPH MODJESKI.

Hon. Geo. P. Graham,
Minister of Railways and Canals,
Ottawa, Ont.

At one o'clock, the House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. GRAHAM. As soon as the report signed by Messrs. Macdonald and Modjeski reached me, I forwarded it to the chairman of the board, and he wrote me at some length on December 10, setting out very fully and at considerable length his objections to the report of the majority, and, among other things, in this letter or the one following it, he contended that the tender of the St. Lawrence Bridge company could not be entertained, as it did not comply in some respects with the advertisement, and he could not at all agree that it was a

better design than the one he had prepared. Again, on January 20, he wrote me another letter, which may be called a supplementary report, in which he again stated his objections and expressed a view strongly opposed to the report of the majority, and in favour of his own design, and giving many reasons. Among other things, he took the position which I think, it is fair to him to state: that it was no part of the duty of the board to recommend definitely to the minister what tenders the minister should accept; that their duty was performed when they laid their reports before the minister, and it was the duty of the minister to act. These are the letters:

Montreal, December 10, 1910.

Sir,—In reply to your letter of November 29, 1910, enclosing communication of my colleagues addressed to you and dated November 3, 1910, I beg to submit the following remarks:

The board derives its powers from the order in council dated August 17, 1908, in which it is said:

'They shall prepare a new design, together with a specification, working drawings, estimate of cost and all such things in that connection necessary as preliminary to proceeding with the work, and submit the same to the Department of Railways and Canals for its action thereon.'

Owing to different views held by the members of the board, an agreement was arrived at in November and December 1909 that tenders would be received on the board's plans and also on plans made by contractors, according to the specifications of the board.

In accordance with said agreement an advertisement dated Ottawa, November 24, 1909 was put in the papers by the department, stating that

'The contractor is invited to submit alternative designs which must conform to the conditions laid down in the general specification.'

Preliminary specifications were issued, dated January 1, 1910, in which we find.'

'Paragraph 6. Tenders. Tenders will be received on plans prepared by the board, but contractors are invited to submit plans of their own, made according to this and later specifications.'

Complete specifications were also issued dated June 1, 1910, in which we find.'

Paragraph 4. Contractors will be allowed to submit tenders on plans of their own or on modifications of the board's plans, but all tenders shall be subject to these specifications.'

Finally an advertisement dated June 7, 1910 was put in the papers by the department which states that:

(a) 'tenders will not be considered, unless made strictly in accordance with the printed forms.'

The printed forms (contractor's plans) state that the plans must be in accordance with the specifications exhibited and a footnote states that the specifications referred to above are those entitled 'specifications for superstructure' dated Montreal. June 1, 1910.

(b) that the deposit will be forfeited.

'If the party tendering declines entering into contract for the work at the rates stated in the offer submitted and in accordance with the terms stated in the form of contract accompanying the specifications.'

In connection with the above, see form of contract, page 47:

'Which said specifications and supplementary specifications, plans and drawings are hereby declared to be part of this contract.'

On October 26, 1910, a report was sent you signed by all the members of the board, in which you were advised:

(a) that four tenders on plan No. V of the board were acceptable.

(b) that tenders on plans 'A,' 'B' and 'C' of the St. Lawrence Bridge Company would be acceptable 'providing that plans, details and materials were made in accordance with the specifications of the board, including modifications allowed to other bidders.'

The last paragraph means evidently that the plans, details and materials were not, at the date, made in accordance with the specifications of the board and did not come within the requirements of the department as advertised by public notice.

The only tenders, therefore, acceptable to the whole board and conforming to the requirements of the board and department, were the four tenders on plan No. V of the board.

On November 1, you wrote me asking that the board recommend which of the tenders mentioned in the report should be accepted.

At a meeting of the board held November 2. I submitted your letter to my colleagues. At this meeting the St. Lawrence Bridge Company's officials were present and submitted a special specification for compression members, which was entirely different from the specifications of the board and which, if accepted, as will be shown later on, would result in the construction of a bridge much weaker than proposed by the board. Later in the day my colleagues advised me that they had made up their minds to recommend the acceptance of the tender of the St. Lawrence Bridge Company on its own design and that, consequently, they would either send a majority report to the minister, or ask that two engineers be added to the board as provided for by the order in council. I suggested that the first course proposed by them be followed.

This recommendation was forwarded to you b my colleagues in a letter dated November 3, 1910.

On November 12, I answered your letter of November 1, informing you that I had nothing to add to the unanimous report of October 26, 1910. My reason for doing so was that I have never understood, from the time I joined the board, that the clause of the order in council quoted above, allows us to recommend the acceptance of any particular tender. I have always understood that this clause in the order in council leaves the choice of the tender to be accepted, to the department, and that the duties of the board are only those of a technical adviser.

Conditions, other than technical, may affect the choice, such as financial status, honest per-

formance of previous contracts, public interest, &c., which the board is not qualified to judge of, and on which it cannot get information as readily as the department. My understanding of said clause was confirmed by the fact that the tenders for the masonry were not submitted to the board, nor was it asked to recommend to whom the contract should be given.

Referring to the first part of the recommendations of the board in their report of October 26, 1910, I beg to submit the following remarks, in regard to design V of the board:

(a) This plan has been accepted by all my colleagues. (Reports Nos. 11 and 15, and report of October 26, 1910.)

(b) Four of the best bridge companies of England, Canada and the United States and Germany have tendered on the board's design, and, in accordance with paragraph 8 of the preliminary specifications and paragraph 5 of the final specifications, are ready to absolutely guarantee, with a deposit of one and a half million dollars, the satisfactory erection and completion, as well as the materials, construction, design, calculations, plans, specifications and sufficiency of a bridge built in accordance with this design.

(c) Amongst the tenders submitted on the board's design No. V, one tender is $950,000 and another is $270,000 cheaper than design 'B' of the St. Lawrence Bridge Company, and the two tenders are respectively $1,200,000 and $520,000 cheaper than design 'C.'

(d) The English, American and German firms guarantee the completion of the bridge on design No. V of the board, one year earlier than the St. Lawrence Bridge Company on their own designs : A,' 'B' and 'C.'

(e) The plan of erection I proposed for the suspended span has been adopted by all the contractors and will eventually save one year in the completion of the bridge.

(f) The tenders received on the board's design and approved by the board are as follows:—

British Empire Bridge Company..	$11,025,566.20
Pennsylvania Steel Company.. ..	11,686,751.30
Maschinenfabrik Augsburg-Nurnberg..	13,230 050.10
St. Lawrence Bridge Company.. ..	14,867,170 00

The first three tenders are well within the estimated cost sent to the department on June 3, 1910, and which, for reasons given, ranged between $11,230.213 and $13,409,983.

(g) Plans and calculations of the board's design are very complete and fulfil all the requirements of the order in council creating the board. The estimated cost sent you on June 3, 1910, has proved correct.

(h) The design of compression members and connections has been thoroughly tested and the tests have given the most satisfactory results, as shown in the report sent you on August 1, 1910.

(i) Board's plan No. V complies with all the requirements of the board and department. From an engineering standpoint any of the four tenders on this plan could, therefore, be accepted by the department, having been unanimously approved in the board's report of October 26, 1910.

(j) Design No. V of the board is stronger than designs 'A,' 'B' and 'C' of the St. Lawrence Bridge Company, as will be shown later on.

Coming now to the letter of my colleagues dated November 3, 1910, I inclose a copy (Appendix 'A') having the paragraphs numbered for reference.

Paragraph 1. I heartily agree with this part of the letter. The difficulties noted therein, and my desire to put all the facts before you are my only excuse for writing such a long letter.

Paragraph 2. I beg to submit a few remarks on the question of single or double intersection, as follows:—

During the early stages of the work a majority of the board, composed of my two colleagues, favoured double intersection; a minority, composed of the Chairman, favoured single intersection.

I did not rely on my knowledge alone, but consulted on this point many well known engineers.

Amongst others the following, for one reason or another, favoured single against double intersection:

Mr. C. G. Emil Larsson, of the American Bridge Company.

Mr. Fred. W. Cohen, of the Pennsylvania Steel Company.

Mr. Phelps Johnson, of the Dominion Bridge Company.

Mr. John Sterling Deans, of the Phœnix Bridge Company.

The former deputy minister was present at some of the meetings where the question was discussed. Letters written on that subject by some of these engineers were sent you June 17, 1909, and April 25, 1910.

After two members had been added to the board, my two colleagues and Mr. Paul L. Wolfel of the McClintic-Marshall Construction Company, favoured double intersection; Mr. Phelps Johnson and myself favoured single intersection.

After tenders had been called, allowing contractors to present their own designs, three designs for cantilevers were submitted by the contractors; one by the Germans which is single intersection, and two by the St. Lawrence Bridge Company which are also single intersection.

No design for a double intersection bridge was presented by any firm. I felt, therefore, that my convictions on this point have been fully justified.

Paragraph 3. As shown by the advertisements for tenders and by the preliminary and final specifications, to this paragraph should have been added the words:

'Provided that plans, details and materials be made in accordance with the specifications of this board.'

This, of course, would have stopped any further argument, but without them the sentence referred to is incomplete and does not give all the facts.

Paragraphs 4 and 5. The same remarks on pargraphs 2 and 3 apply to paragraphs 4 and 5.

Further, the system of main panelling adopted in designs 'A,' 'B' and 'C' is not original, as it was published for the first time, to my knowledge, in 1901 by a Russian engineer for a 135 feet span. I am

not aware that any bridge, large or small, has been built on that system since that date. This must not be understood as condemning the system.

Paragraph 6. Out of three similar designs, 'A,' 'B' and 'C,' submitted by the St. Lawrence Bridge Company, design 'B,' which complies least with the specifications of the board, is recommended by my colleagues. I cannot see any reason for their choice except that it is the cheapest of the three.

My colleagues also state that this design offers features which simplify the erection and minimize the risk to both life and property.

This, of course, is an expression of opinion sustained by neither reasons nor facts. I can only submit the reasons which helped me to form a different opinion and which are as follows:

(a) The letters received from the engineers I had consulted and which are referred to above.

(b) The opinion of Mr. Phelps Johnson, as shown in page two of report No. 11 of the board, and in the minutes of the meeting held September 7, 1909:

'He saw no unusual difficulties in the erection of the design (board's design).'

(c) The schemes of erection proposed by the St. Lawrence Bridge Company are identical, both for the board's design and for their own design. I am, therefore, unable to understand why more men or property would be injured in the one case than in the other.

Blue prints (Appendix 'B') showing the different modes of erection proposed by all contractors and copy of a letter from the St. Lawrence Bridge Company dated October 15, 1910 (appendix 'C') explaining the different schemes of erection, are attached to this letter. (Note passages underlined by myself).

I would say, however, that I differ from the opinion re top travellers, expressed in that letter and believe they are at least not more dangerous than through travellers for the following reasons:

(a) Clauses 17 and 19 of the contract put the complete responsibility for damages to persons or property solely on the contractor. It is, therefore, to be presumed that all contractors have given this question their best consideration, from a business if not from a humanitarian point of view.

With this in view top travellers are adopted by the Germans in their own design, the British Empire Bridge Company and the Pennsylvania Steel Company, although the latter had lately used through travellers for the erection of an 1,182 feet cantilever span in connection with the Blackwell's Island bridge at New York. Their choice of top travellers for the Quebec bridge must, therefore, be the result of their experience in the erection of large cantilever bridges. Their engineer of erection is reputed to be one of the best in America.

(b) The latest large cantilever bridge, erected in America, at Beaver, Pa., was erected with top travellers and the engineer in charge told me their use had been very sucessful.

(c) Top travellers rest on the members of the trusses themselves, instead of on the bridge floor. As they are much smaller than the through travellers, offering less surface to the wind, and have a much wider base, they have consequently greater stability and the risks attending life and property are correspondingly less.

(d) Top travellers, which never are higher than through travellers, follow the top chord and come gradually lower as erection progresses and becomes more dangerous, whereas through travellers remain always at the same height and when they come near the end of the cantilever arm, offer a large surface to the wind and are apparently more dangerous for the men.

I think, however, in view of the guarantees exacted from the contractors by the terms of the contract, that the choice of the scheme of erection and the erection appliances should be left to the contractor, subject to the supervision of the board.

Paragraph 7. Temporary members will, of course, be numerous in any design for such a large structure. Three temporary heavy members in each truss or twelve altogether are required for the board's design.

They are similar to other members used heretofore for the erection of the suspended span of cantilever bridges.

All such temporary members are part of the falsework and their cost is included in the tenders.

Paragraph 8. The schemes of erection proposed by the St. Lawrence Bridge Company are identical, whether for their own design or for the board's design. If through travellers are used they are carried on the main members in either case. As all the panels of the board's design are similar, the operations are also similar. But as stated in paragraph 3, I am in favour of top travellers and cannot see, in a structure of this size, what difference it would make if the operations for each connection are different.

Paragraph 9. I fail to see the importance of this remark.

(a) because there are numerous members in the suspended span of design 'A,' 'B' and 'C' which do not carry live load. Why are they harmless in the suspended span and harmful in the cantilevers?

(b) There is a large number of members in both designs, namely, the materials and sway bracing which do not carry live load, and they have the same effect in preventing the free deformation of the trusses under live load.

(c) all trusses of large bridges such as the Thebes bridge and the projected cantilever bridge over the Hudson river have a large number of members which do not carry live load and I am unaware of any criticism having been levelled at them by any one on that account.

(d) Design 'C' of the St. Lawrence Bridge Company, which is the only one amongst 'A,' 'B,' and 'C' that comes within clause 74 of the specifications, has a large number of such members.

Designs 'M' and 'N' of the same company and guaranteed by them, contain such members, in excess of the number used in the board's design.

The design of the Germans has also a large number of such members.

None of the contractors have ever protested against such members in the board's design,

the construction, erection and efficiency of which design all of them are ready to guarantee.

Paragraph 10. The Williot's diagram of design 'B' are for a 502 foot anchor arm built of carbon steel, and no comparison can be made with the Williot's diagrams for the 586-foot anchor arm of the board's design built of nickel steel, and as Williot's diagrams of the cantilever arm of design 'B,' which would have given a true measure for comparison, and should have been furnished as per paragraph 108 of the specifications, have not been submitted by the St. Lawrence Bridge Company, no comparison at all can be made.

The diagrams produced do not, therefore, show that there is less distortion in each case.

This whole matter has really very little importance as deformation is not a measure of strength; for if we compare two members of same length, but of different depths, the same amount of bending deformation which would be harmless in the shallower member may cause the failure of the deeper one.

It is, however, necessary to determine the deformations and the strains they cause. This has been done, with the greatest care, in connection with the board's design, as may be seen by referring to the drawings exhibited, and in all cases the strains resulting from the deformations have been amply provided for.

Paragraph 11. As the web members, as well as the bottom chords of the board's design, are erected in half widths they are just as easy to handle and to connect, if not easier, than the web members of design 'B.'

Paragraph 12. The opinion hereby given is contrary to the universal practice of bridge engineers in America. Very few instances could be shown where this has been done. This kind of connection has been limited in the board's design to as few members as erection would allow, especially for compression members, where its use was deemed inadvisable. An instance of it is shown at the end of the cantilever arm, where special precautions have been taken to avoid the objectionable features of such a connection. I have, however, always intended to change this detail, if possible, in the final drawings. The excellency of the connections used in the board's design has been shown conclusively by tests T4A and T4B, and T6A and T6B, made at Phœnixville. The connections proposed by the St. Lawrence Bridge Company have not been tested.

Paragraph 13. This statement is irrelevant unless it means that the chords proposed by the St. Lawrenec Bridge Company are better than the chords of the board. It is a bold statement in the absence of actual tests of the St. Lawrence Bridge Company's chords and in the face of the extremely satisfactory results obtained in the tests made at Phœnixville on models of the board's chords T1A and T1B, and T2A and T2B, and of a sentence in letter number one accompanying the tenders of the St. Lawrence Bridge Company, where we read:

> 'The results obtained in the tests of nickel steel columns made by the board were, in some cases, unusually and unexpectedly high and it is doubtful that so high values can again be reached unless the board's experiments are exactly duplicated.'

I would also remark that longitudinal splicing, as shown in the St. Lawrence Bridge Company's design, has been tested by the board and has given very inferior results, as shown by tests T7A and T7B.

The results of all the tests referred to were sent to you on August 1, 1910.

Paragraph 14. The first part of the sentence is in direct contradiction with clause 74 of the specifications. It is also in direct contradiction with the often expressed opinion of one of my colleagues that eyebars are the most reliable form of tension members. One might well hesitate, before accepting field riveted connections of tension members over five inches thick, not including splice plates.

A double line of eyebars is very much easier to assemble and less risky than a single line. The St. Lawrence Bridge Company propose themselves to use two lines of eyebars in designs 'M' and 'N.'

Paragraph 15. What does it matter if pins are carefully calculated according to American practice?

Paragraph 16. Any extras demanded by steel makers are included in the prices named in the tenders and there is no risk, since all materials will be inspected and must come up to the specifications. Any material, which it is impossible to get on account of length, may be spliced and I would remark that splicing has been resorted to by the St. Lawrence Bridge Company to a much larger extent than contemplated by the board.

Paragraph 17. This is certainly an unexpected argument, but I have no right to criticise the æsthetic judgment of my colleagues.

Paragraph 18. In view of all the preceding observations contained in this letter I cannot join in the recommendation of my colleagues,

(a) because it is contrary to the recommendation of the whole board,

(b) because the tender referred to on design 'B' is not according to the requirements of the board and the department, since it contains the words:

> 'This tender is based upon the specifications and draft contract as modified by our accompanying letter No. 1, of this date.'

According to the advertisement issued by the department on June 17, 1910, this tender should not be considered.

(c) because in letter No. 1 referred to above, we read, amongst many requests for changes in the specifications:

> 'The results obtained in the tests on nickel steel columns made by the board were, in some cases, unusually and unexpectedly high and it is doubtful that so high values can again be reached unless the board's experiments are exactly duplicated.'

This is certainly a high compliment for the board's design, but I do not see why anything not quite so good should be accepted.

(d) because amongst other clauses, design 'B' does not comply with vital clauses 68, 74 and 278 of the specifications.

The tender on any such design, if built according to the specifications of the board, would be the tender on design 'C' at an ex-

tra cost of $250,000 or $1,200,000 above the lowest tender.

(e) even if such tender were based upon the specifications of the board, there are no plans before the board to show how this would be done. Plan 'C' shows only two preliminary strain sheets. Neither the connections of eyebars in the top chords or web members, their layout, nor any other information are given. The bottom chords of plan 'A' which might be used for plans 'C' or 'B' are not acceptable in view of the results of tests T7A and T7B. A note on one of the plans says that if tests are not satisfactory they would be replaced by something else.

The word 'satisfactory' in this case has no meaning since no guarantee of tests was given beyond the vague sentence in letter No. 1, accompanying the tenders:

'The specifications should, of course require only such values as can reasonably be expected from carbon steel in the light of compression tests already made upon it.'

Such results would give a bridge much inferior in strength to the board's design.

The board could not, therefore, give an opinion on plans which do not exist.

Referring to the comparative strength of the board's plan and of 'A,' 'B' and 'C' designs, I enclose calculations showing the superiority of the board's design (appendix 'D').

The calculations for elastic limit are to a certain extent based on assumptions, and, besides, elastic limit and yield point cannot be absolutely compared. I have made the comparison as conservatively as I could, owing to the lack of knowledge on the limit of elasticity of built compression members, in regard to which no investigation has ever been attempted, at least to my knowledge, previous to the experiments made by the board at Phoenixville.

The calculations for ultimate strength are correct and based on the minimum results obtained or specified by the board and on the minimum results guaranteed by the St. Lawrence Bridge Company.

Of course, in a work of this magnitude, where such guarantees are asked from the contractors and where a comparatively new kind of metal is used, I understand that the specifications of the board may have to be altered on such points that could not be ascertained before calling for tenders, such as extreme length of materials procurable, and the physical and chemical tests of materials that mills are ready to manufacture irrespective of cost. I was astonished to find out how little change was really insisted upon by the contractors and steel makers and, of course, such changes, as agreed to by the board, ought to be allowed to all contractors alike. The case is different when the conditions of the contract have not been fulfilled, when vital clauses are concerned and where the changes asked for are absolutely contrary to the requirements of the board and department or diminish the strength of the bridge.

To conclude. As implicitly stated in the report of October 26, 1910, the plans, details and materials of designs 'A,' 'B' and 'C' of the St. Lawrence Bridge Company are not made according to specifications. They provide for a bridge weaker than the board's design, as shown in Appendix 'D.'

Even if they could be made as strong as required by the specifications, there is no plan before the board to show how this result would be attained.

The tenders of the St. Lawrence Bridge Company on their own designs 'A,' 'B' and 'C' do not, therefore, comply with the requirements of the board, as expressed in the specifications, nor of the department, as expressed in the public notices and form of contract issued.

They cannot, therefore, be considered by the board.

The board's design, for the many reasons given on page 4, 5 and 6, complies with all the requirements of the board and the department. It is satisfactory to all engineers and contractors concerned, and I do not know of any technical reason why either of the four tenders on this design should not be accepted.

Yours respectfully,
(Sgd.) H. E. VAUTELET,
Chairman and Chief Engineer.

Hon. Geo. P. Graham,
Minister of Railways and Canals,

Ottawa, Ont.
Montreal, January 20, 1911.

Sir,—I beg to supplement my letter addressed to you on December 10, 1910, by adding to page 6, the following remarks in regard to design V of the board.

(k) A report of Sir Douglas Fox on the board's design was transmitted to me by a representative of the British Empire Bridge Company, and reads as follows:—

'Have made careful examination of board's specifications, general designs and details. Specification is clear and concise and prepared with great care and judgment. It will ensure structure built combining stability and permanence with reasonable economy. Design admirably suited for its purpose. It is perfectly sound alike as to construction and erection and in detail is worked out with skill and judgment. Experiments on large models of compression members have enabled the design of vital parts to be prepared with certainty. Think no hesitation in proceeding with works on lines laid down.'

(l) Letters number two, dated September 30, 1910, attached to the tenders of the St. Lawrence Bridge Company stated:

'Had it not been for the many difficulties that came up on considering the erection of the board's design we would have been content to have tendered on this design only, believing the bridge in other respects to be all that can be desired.'

As mentioned in my letter of December 10 (page 9), the difficulties of erection had become much less serious by October 15, 1910, when the St. Lawrence Bridge Company wrote:

'In a general way we may say that for each design we have worked up in detail a scheme we are satisfied will do the work safely, and on this we have based our estimates.'

And later, speaking of the board's design:

'With the inside traveller the risks above mentioned can, we think, be practically eliminated.'

It follows, therefore, that in the opinion of the St. Lawrence Bridge Company the risks of erection have been practically eliminated and that the design of the board is all that can be desired.

(m) On May 2, 1910, the following resolution was adopted at a meeting of the board held in Montreal:—

'It is resolved that the plans and specifications for a cantilever design now completed be approved and submitted to the minister for tenders, and that in the event of a better plan being submitted by any of the bidders same shall be adopted.'

I will remark first that this resolution allowed other plans to be submitted, but not other specifications.

When tenders were asked on the board's design, that design had no defects, as far as the knowledge of the members of the board went, because if any member had known of any defect it was his duty to have it corrected before advising the minister to ask for tenders on such plans, as in the event of no other plan being submitted, the contract would have been given on the board's design.

The choice, however, remains between a plan that has no defects and is all that can be desired and the designs of the St. Lawrence Bridge Company.

The only real argument brought in favour of the latter is that

'it offers features which simplify the erection and minimize the risks to both life and property.'

This has been answered, pages 8, 9 and 10 of my letter of December 10, 1910.

If this is true it should have resulted in a lower cost of the bridge.

What are the facts?

The weight of both designs is practically the same. The materials used in the St. Lawrence Bridge Company's design cost over one million dollars less than the materials used in the board's design. If the erection is simplified and the risks minimized the cost should be still less. Why, therefore, is the cost of the St. Lawrence Bridge Company's design $932,000 more than the lowest tender and $270,000 more than the next lowest tender on the board's design?

The difference between the tenders of the St. Lawrence Bridge Company on plan V of the board and on their plan 'B' is 19 per cent.

On the same basis it is, therefore, to be inferred that, had the other bridge companies been allowed to alter the specifications to the same extent as was done by the St. Lawrence Bridge Company their bids on the bridge would have been lessened in the same proportion, i.e., to $9,000,000 or to $9,500,000, instead of $12,000,000.

(n) The board's design has been completely worked out and the compression members tested with highly satisfactory results, whereas the sketches submitted by the St. Lawrence Bridge Company are only in the initial stage. Their compression members have not been tested; tests will be required to ascertain their value, and repeated changes in designs and new tests may be required before as good members as the board's may be obtained. (See letter number one of the St. Lawrence Bridge Company, quoted page 14 and 15 of my letter of December 10.)

It will, therefore, take a much longer time to make the shop drawings for the design of the St. Lawrence Bridge Company than for the board's design.

On December 13, 1910, I received a letter from the St. Lawrence Bridge Company inclosing copy of letter addressed to you dated November 28, 1910, in which they agree to make their plans, details and materials conform with the specifications of the board. They do not state, however, what the cost will be. It is, however, another proof that the plans submitted with their tenders were not made according to the requirements of the board and of the department (see 'e,' page 16 of my letter of December 10, 1910). I would add that if the specifications are to be followed, the use of a through traveller will bring in the erection serious difficulties that presented themselves in all plans and which were avoided by the use of a top traveller.

In any case I feel very much gratified that as a consequence of our discussions the St Lawrence Bridge Company has accepted the specifications of the board and that as a result a much stronger bridge has been secured for the country than the one which was originally proposed in their tenders.

Respectfully submitted,
(Sgd.) H. E. VAUTELET,
Chairman and Chief Engineer.

Hon. Geo. P. Graham,
Minister of Railways and Canals,
Ottawa, Ont.

These reports were in my hands, and the Chairman taking such a decided view one way and the majority of the members of the board having such decided opinions on the other, I believed it was a case in which action should be taken under the clause of the order in council appointing the board which said that where any disagreement arose, not more than two experts should be called in to decide the point in dispute. M. J. Butler, the former deputy-minister of the department, who was thoroughly conversant with the entire transaction from the beginning (and I may say Mr. Vautelet, as Chairman of the board, acquiesced in his appointment), and Mr. H. W. Hodge, an eminent engineer of New York, were named. These gentlemen met in Montreal. There were present Messrs. Modjeski, Macdonald, Butler and Hodge. Mr. Vautelet was ill at the time but the action that was taken can probably best be stated by reading the report of this enlarged board, which is as follows:

Montreal, February 8, 1911.

Sir,—In accordance with your letter of January 20, appointing Messrs. M. J. Butler and Henry W. Hodge to advise with the Board of Engineers, Quebec bridge, on the points of difference that have arisen in that board, we have the honour to report as follows:—

The board, with the exception of Mr. Vautelet, who is detained in his home by illness, met with the advisory engineers on February

6, and have been in session for the past three days, Mr. Macdonald acting as temporary Chairman.

We have examined the various tenders and general designs and the advisory engineers have read the written opinions of the members of the board, and in addition thereto, the opinion of Mr. Vautelet, as expressed in his letter to them dated February 2. They have also considered the verbal arguments of each member of the board, adjourning to Mr. Vautelet's residence for the purpose of conferring with him.

The only point of difference in the board is as to which specific design and tender should be recommended for acceptance; the board being divided between the official design and the design of the St. Lawrence Bridge Company.

None of the tenders on either of these two designs were made requiring modifications of the specifications, so that such alterations must be considered if either of these tenders are to be accepted.

The advisory engineers have not considered it within the province of their appointment to examine closely into the details of the two above mentioned designs, and all of us are of the opinion that consideration of details is a matter that must be carefully studied and worked out in the light of further tests yet to be made by the Board of Engineers.

From our examination of the two above mentioned general designs, we, the undersigned, agree that the design of the St. Lawrence Bridge Company is preferable for the following reasons:—

(a) The type of design offers greater safety to life and property during erection, as well as economy and rapidity in construction.

(b) The design contains the minimum number of secondary members and requires few, if any, temporary members during erection.

(c) The system of triangulation by dividing the web stresses reduces the members to more practical sections and simplifies the details of connections.

(d) The design economizes material, as shown by the calculated weights of the two designs.

(e) The general appearance of the structure is, in our opinion, improved.

We feel that in a work of such magnitude the question of design is of the first importance, and for the reasons given above we recommend the acceptance of design 'B' of the St. Lawrence Bridge Company, subject to certain modifications in general outline and detail, which we deem advisable and which will result in economy, and further improvement in appearance. The modifications of their design we have in mind will reduce the cost of the work by, at least, four dollars per ton and we recommend the acceptance of the tender of the St. Lawrence Bridge Company on their design 'B' at a price not exceeding 8·45 cents per pound (amounting in the calculated weight to $11,246,100) and at a corresponding reduction on their other pound price, if the board should decide to accept any features of their alternate tenders.

The lowest tender of the British Empire Bridge Company, when the additional price they give for complying with the splices required by the official design is added, amounts to $11,320,720.

While not called for by the advertisement, the St. Lawrence Bridge Company submitted among their tenders, one omitting the roadways, which at the reduction in their pound price above recommended, shows a cost of $8,650,000 on the figured weight, and we think this should be called to your attention, as the highways can now be omitted without changing our above recommendations or delaying the progress of this work.

We have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servants,
(Sgd.) M. J. BUTLER,
HENRY W. HODGE,
RALPH MODJESKI,
CHARLES MACDONALD,
Chairman pro tem.

Hon. Geo. P. Graham, LL.D., P.C.,
Minister of Railawys and Canals,
Ottawa, Ont.

Mr. Butler only acted in settling the difference that arose between the regular members of the board as between these two designs.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I would like to ask my hon. friend two questions there. The British Empire company's tender was for a bridge with roadways?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). And the tender on design B of the St. Lawrence company was for a bridge with roadways?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Were there separate tenders from these companies for the bridge without the roadway and for the bridge with the roadway, or was just one sum stated for the bridge, the design of which included roadways?

Mr. GRAHAM. The British Empire company tendered on the design with the roadway, and it was the only company that did not put in at least one alternative design. Among the alternative plans submitted by the St. Lawrence Bridge company, was one without the roadway. That was plan X. It was the only company that put in a tender showing that the bridge could be built without the roadways at that saving. Now, this board of engineers unanimously recommended the adoption of this design of the St. Lawrence Bridge company. Following that, I wrote letters to the St. Lawrence company asking them certain things, if they were ready to undertake the contract, and if their parent company would become parties to the contract, as we wanted all the capital that was behind any of the stockholders to be at our disposal, in case the bridge was not a success. In addition to that, I think we asked as a deposit, in the first place, $500,000, and afterwards a further sum, making in all, if I remember the

figures correctly, a cash deposit of $1,200,000. It was a very large deposit, and the contractors so expressed themselves; but the undertaking was so gigantic that the department and the government thought it advisable to ask for a very large deposit. As against that the contractors of course, get drawbacks on their contracts as they proceed with the work. Mr. Vautelet resigned his position on February 22. An order in council was passed on February 27, accepting his resignation as from February 22. The contract was signed on April 4, 1911. Mr. Charles N. Monsarratt, M.C., S.C.E., formerly chief bridge engineer of the Canadian Pacific railway, was appointed to succeed Mr. Vautelet, on May 6, 1911. Mr. Macdonald, according to the terms of his appointment, retired as soon as the contract was signed, and was succeeded by Mr C C. Schneider, C.E., of New York, who was appointed on May 15, 1911.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Did Mr. Vautelet, who resigned shortly after the final report of the four out of the five engineers was made, make any comments or any report, or express any opinion as to what was advised by the others?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think he did not make any further comment.

Now, the reason I have brought this matter to the attention of the House is that this was the largest undertaking of its kind ever conceived, it was surrounded with a great many difficulties, and the government were of the opinion, which seemed to be acquiesced in by this House on several occasions, that the safe way to carry on this work was to select a board of competent men, the best they could find, and place all the responsibility, because it was entirely of a technical character, in their hands. I may say that not so much as one stenographer was recommended by the government for that board. They selected their own staff from the messengers up, and recommended what their salaries should be, and no increase of salary which the board recommended was ever refused by the government; so there would be no excuse for the board saying that they had ever been interfered with. The board having accepted the responsibility of carrying on this great work, the government relied solely on them. Whether rightly or wrongly, every step taken from start to finish in connection with this work was taken on the responsibility of the board. I think no errors were committed, but if they were, the responsibility would rest on the technical men who accepted the responsibility. I think that they made no mistake, and that none will occur, and that they will carry the work to a success.

Mr. CURRIE. In the consideration of the plans for this bridge, did the question arise whether it should be of the cantalever type or of the suspension type? In New York, where they have great bridges, we find that they are of the suspension type.

Mr. GRAHAM. In New York there is no bridge that approaches this one. But that question was thoroughly threshed out and the board was unanimous for the cantalever principle. The government having decided to place the responsibility on the board, that responsibility was kept on the board all the time, and from beginning to end, in our connection with that great enterprise, no step was taken except on the advice, not only of a majority of the board, when the entire board did not agree, but on the advice of an enlarged board, and the final conclusion was upon the advice of four men to one.

I make this statement for the purpose of placing it on record, not merely for the benefit of the House, the members being fairly conversant with it, but for the benefit of the public, the financial men of England, and the contractors on this continent, and in Europe. The Canadian government, no matter what party is in power, I take it, endeavours to do its business with fairness to everybody, always keeping in mind that they are serving the Canadian people from first to last; and that was done with regard to this great work. In conclusion, I may say that I am not sorry, and have no apologies to offer, for being able, in following the advice of this board, so selected, to give this gigantic work to a Canadian firm, so that as far as possible, the money spent on it will be spent among the workmen of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to follow the hon. gentleman in any critique of his long statement upon a very complex and technical subject. I am not prepared to do that, either from a late reading of the circumstances outside or from a knowledge of the more technical and abstruse work of the contract itself and all that it involves in the plans and specifications. I think the hon. gentleman has done well in making the statement as full as he has, and entirely free from partisan bias. There are, however, two or three things that occur to my mind as a layman, and I will take the liberty of expressing them. In the first place, it would seem as though the board of engineers, after having approved of a design, and after having settled upon it as the official design, gave an option to the tenderers to tender either upon that or upon a design of their own; and, as it turned out, the St. Lawrence Company did not tender upon the official design.

Mr. GRAHAM. Every tenderer tendered on the chairman's design, the official design, first, and then they could put in an alternative.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The St. Lawrence Company tendered on the chairman's design, and then tendered on a design of its own. The British Empire Company did the same.

Mr. GRAHAM. The British Empire Company was the only company that did not take advantage of the opportunity to tender on its own design as well.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Then, in the end, design 'B' of the St. Lawrence Company was not the one that was finally accepted. Another design, 'X,' by the same company, was, after the extra engineers had been called in, recommended by them, and the suggestion was made that if the roadway was left out, the cost would be diminished by some $2,000,000; and the opinion of my hon. friend, which he gathered to be the view of the engineers, was that it would be better to have the roadway eliminated and to build the bridge simply for railway transport. What appears to me is this, that when neither the one design nor the other was taken upon what there seemed to have been an agreement, with the exception of the chairman of the board, and a decision was come to to eliminate the roadway, whether it would not have been fair, when the government had made that fundamental change, which would make a very great difference in the attitude of the tenderers, and which was introducing an entirely new element, to have allowed the British Empire Company to have tendered for a structure without the roadway. That was not done. In an immense affair of this kind, in which are interested eminent contractors of very high standing, whose goodwill it would be always well to have, and whose arrangements must be made with great financial security, and consequently with a very wide interest in their contract, when so fundamental a change was made as to eliminate the roadway and consequently one-fifth or one-fourth of the cost, it would have been fair to have allowed the other company to have amended its tender, or to have called for new tenders on the amended basis. But the main thing I want to impress on the House and the country is that, in the statement my hon. friend has made, he has uttered the severest condemnation I have ever heard passed by any hon. gentleman upon the action of his own government. What I mean is this. In his statement my hon. friend elaborated two things. One was the unprecedented nature of the work. No such work had ever been attempted in the world; no such work was at present being carried on anywhere; it was a stupendous work, unique; and he strongly emphasized the care, the attention, the absolute domination of the idea which possessed him that in such a stupendous work no effort in time or cost of scientific ability should be eliminated in getting the very best men to examine the problem and to devise from that examination the very best design and specification that could be had. No amount of money should stand in the way of that; no lapse of time was too long in order that that might be accomplished, to the end that the most stupendous work in the world in that form of construction should be conceived and set into operation by the very best engineering skill that could be had. The extreme levity and light-heartedness with which my hon. friend's government approached this most stupendous task stands out in relief against this elaborate and serious statement of my hon. friend. I do not suppose any great work was ever approached in a spirit of such carelessness, lack of consideration and utter abandonment of responsibility—certainly not in the history of Canada, and I doubt if in any other country, in regard to a work approaching this in magnitude. What was done? This most stupendous work was handed over to a small number of promoters and left in their hands. The legislation that made it possible for these promoters to work was passed through parliament between dark and daylight at the last end of a long and tired session. No supervision worthy of the name was given by that government, though its credit and its money and the reputation of the country was at the beck and call of the promoters.

I just call the attention of the House and the country to the condemnation, the severe condemnation, that my hon. friend has felt called upon to utter against the method, the practice, and, I think, the almost criminal negligence of the government of which he formed a part. The government was not content with putting this into the hands of promoters, heedless of the stupendous character of the construction, careless of everything, it would seem, but the carrying out of some petty design of promoters, but left it in their hands without supervision by the government itself, and when they had played with it and burned their fingers—as they were certain to do and should have been allowed to heal the burns themselves—the government which had been guilty of such levity and such criminal carelessness, made up to those promoters every dollar that they had put into it, and gave them much that they had never put into it, and interest upon all that was paid.

I hope the lesson is one which Canada will profit from in future. The country has paid dearly for its experience. And

it is a righteous retribution that a member of the same government which was guilty of such criminal negligence—to say nothing more—in the beginning of this stupendous transaction should be the one to pronounce here in the House his apologia, and at the same time his condemnation of the work of his predecessors.

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

SUPPLY

Militia and Defence—allowance active militia, $112,000.

Hon. SAM. HUGHES (Minister of Militia). In introducing the militia estimates, perhaps I may be permitted a word of general explanation. I have largely followed, as necessarily was the case, the estimates as prepared by my predecessor in office. In order to facilitate the discussion and give every member of the House the fullest opportunity of looking into the details of these estimates, I had a statement prepared giving the estimates with explanations, and a copy of this has been sent to every member of the House. On this first item, there is an increase of $2,000. This is due to a new corps having been formed and an increase in the establishment of other corps. Requests have come in from various parts of the country to increase these establishments and this has been done to this extent.

Mr. CARVELL. I do not know whether it is set forth in this memorandum or not, but I believe it is a fact that in this item is included the allowances made to the commandants of different regiments of infantry. Does the minister allow anything to the commanding officer for care of arms and accoutrements in places where there is an armoury with a caretaker in charge? If not, does not the hon. minister think that the commanding officer who becomes responsible for this property should have something in the way of an allowance, even though he does not have to do the actual work of cleaning and caretaking? I have been told by officers of the militia they are responsible for losses when stock is taken every year, even though the losses may be due to the negligence of the caretaker, and, as I understand it, the commanding officer has no way of getting his own out of the caretaker. He must make good to the government but, unfortunately, there is nobody to make good to him. I may be wrong in my understanding of the case, but if I am right, does not the hon. minister think that this state of affairs involves injustice?

Mr. FOSTER (N. Toronto).

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria, Ont.). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Carvell) has stated the case exactly. The allowance for care of arms varies from $40 for a small unit, to $170 for a field battery. Where there is an armoury provided by the government, only half the allowance is made. The commanding officer of a corps provided with a government armoury and caretaker receives no allowance, and most of the artillery corps and many others are now provided with caretakers. I heartily agree that the claim to consideration of the officer responsible who has to pay out of his own pocket for efficiency in these stores though, in many cases, he has no direct control of the caretaker, should be recognized. There has been no change in this item; we are taking it exactly as it has been. But I may say it is our intention, if we can get an officer in command of a district to recommend to us a proper caretaker—and our first requisite is that he shall be a soldier properly qualified—to appoint that man. We will have the officer in command, in more or less direct control of the caretaker. The matter of pay or allowance has not been considered, because we have not had time. I know from personal and other experience that there is a great deal of justice in the statement the hon. gentleman has made.

Mr. CARVELL. I am sorry the hon. minister has not taken time in some instances to make inquiries before he made dismissals of these caretakers. I wish to call attention to a case coming under my own observation. In the armoury in the town in which I live, ever since its construction it has been presided over by a gentleman who was a militiaman, a soldier, as my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes, Victoria, Ont.) says, and who later became an officer in the artillery.

I got from the Militia Department all sorts of criticism, in fact I was looked upon almost as an outlaw in military ethics, in recommending this gentleman as caretaker, I think they call him superintendent, of the 10th Field Battery. But I took the ground that the man who was responsible for the care of arms and accoutrements of the field battery ought to be a man who knew something about a field battery; I do not care whether he is an officer or not, he ought to have some knowledge of field batteries, and, therefore, he was appointed. But unfortunately he was a Liberal, and I think that one of the first official acts of my hon. friend was to remove that gentleman from his position. Now he says, we want a soldier. What have they got? A man who runs a billiard hall, and I do not know what else he does.

I think they sent him down to Kingston on some official business, but he didn't serve out his full time, and came back home in a week or ten days. And that is the man who takes care of the arms in the town of Woodstock. He has control of the arms and accoutrements of the Woodstock camp of the field battery, and of the engineering corps. Well, the engineering corps have only two or three old wagons, a few shovels and spades, and a few Ross rifles—they are all right of course. But let me point out that the government have just supplied the 10th Field Battery with new 18 pounder field guns, costing many thousands of dollars; and here is a man of the class I have described who is put in charge of them, a man who would not even fill out his time at Kingston, and the arms of the 10th Field Battery to-day are in the hands of a man, I won't say he is irresponsible, but I do not think he knows much about the care of arms. I sincerely hope my hon. friend will pause before he dismisses efficient officers and caretakers, and appoints men of this character to their places. I am sorry my hon. friend had not arrived at this laudable decision he now professes before he took the opportunity of dismissing a man from office who does know something about the business, and who has some interest in the affairs of the country.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The man who was dismissed was a very good man if he had attended to his business, but he made himself very offensive during the elections. However, I may say frankly that in several cases we have refused to accept applicants because they were not competent. I may say also without fear of offending any of my good friends, that I am making it a requirement now that the man who is recommended must always be fit for his business, and if I cannot get a good Tory I will take the best man I can get.

Mr. CARVELL. Will the minister say that this qualification shall be retroactive?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I go forwards, but not backwards.

Mr. MACDONALD. I am surprised to hear the minister say that one of the essential qualifications for such appointments is that the man must be a Tory.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The first essential is qualification; then, of course, we look to his politics.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend said a moment ago that the principle he was going to adopt was that if he can not find a good Tory, then he will look around and find somebody else. That is an unfortunate announcement for my hon. friend to make at the inception of his career. Everybody agrees that the Minister of Militia, above all others, should aim to keep the militia out of politics. There is not much to be gained in making appointments to the militia from a political standpoint. I do not think any political party would be advanced or injured if a man was appointed as caretaker who was not a supporter of the government.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). How would my hon. friend suggest I should proceed?

Mr. MACDONALD. I know my hon. friend has had very high aspirations in reference to this matter in the past, and I would suggest that he should proceed upon the advice of the commanding officers of the regiments in the different places where arms are to be looked after, and be guided by responsible people in the military service. I am sorry to hear from the minister that he proposes to administer his department in the manner he has indicated.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Outside of promotions of high officials, I have no hesitation in saying that as between two men, one qualified and the other unqualified, the qualified man being a Liberal and the unqualified one being a Tory, the Liberal will get the job. But other things being equal, both being qualified, the Tory will get the job. There is no use in denying it, that is the rule that both sides have followed, that is the rule my hon. friend would pursue, I am satisfied of that. But I will say this, that so far we have had a little trouble in appointing some of those men and finding they were not exactly qualified. I think in some instances we have even stretched our conscience in appointing Liberals.

Mr. CARVELL. Then we are to understand that there is to be politics in the militia in future?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). If my hon. friend chooses to call that politics, it is politics.

Mr. MACDONALD. It is unfortunate in a sense. Nobody questions that the patronage system obtains in this country in regard to every branch of the service. But my hon. friend has vociferously proclaimed in the past that there should be no politics. On many occasions hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House have urged that in the Militia Department the patronage system should be disregarded, and that only men who are suitable should be appointed to responsible positions.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). For official positions.

Mr. MACDONALD. I regard the appointment of a man who is the caretaker

of an armoury on political grounds as being too pettifogging to bother about. I am surprised to see my hon. friend descending to that.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I am sorry not to have won the esteem of my hon. friend. But these are not officers, these are men who have care of arms, men who are associated with the young fellows who come into the armoury. Take the case at Woodstock. My hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) will not deny that this particular caretaker was one of the best political agents in that community; he was in the drill hall on all occasions, and was thrown into the company of these young men and acted as a political agent among them. I give fair warning that any man who is appointed to such a position hereafter must leave politics aside. But so far as appointing a man to an office goes, other things being equal, I am not going to stand up here and pretend anything to the contrary; all things being equal the man who is appointed to the office will be a Tory. But in promotions in the militiary service there will be no politics.

Mr. NESBITT. If there was trouble in the country and the men were called out to take the field, would the minister look into their politics?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I am sorry that my hon. friend is not in the militia; if he were he would know that caretakers are not called out. They stay at home.

Mr. NESBITT. That may be a smart answer in the minister's opinion, but are they not liable to be called out like any other men?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Yes, the same as my hon. friend is, but not all of them could go.

Mr. NESBITT. I have no doubt that if I were called upon I would have to go and I would have no doubt that the caretaker would have to go also, with all due deference to my hon. friend. But what I asked him was if the men who are called out will be called out on political lines.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I never said so. The record of the Tory party in the past has been such as to show they would not be. If the hon. gentleman wishes to go into the matter, I do not think I need go any farther back than the expedition to South Africa, when the issues were not determined on the lines of fitness, but were determined largely on the lines of politics.

Mr. MACDONALD. I hope the minister is very clear about his position. As I understand it, when it comes to caretakers and officials of that kind, he is to apply the political rule while with regard to other branches of the service fitness is the qualification.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). No, fitness is the first qualification for a caretaker.

Mr. MACDONALD. Then why did you dismiss my friend from Carleton, N.B.?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Because he was an active partisan.

Mr. MACDONALD. But he was a good man.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). But he goes if he is just an active partisan, just the same if he had been a Tory.

Mr. MACDONALD. You do it to Tories as well as to Grits?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Certainly; the man who neglects his business for politics goes.

Mr. MACDONALD. Both?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Yes.

Annual drill, $1,730,000.

Mr. NESBITT. May I ask the minister for an explanation of the enormous increase here?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). If I had taken the estimates of my predecessor in office the amount this year would have been, not $1,730,000, but $2,200,000. I reduced that by the sum of $470,000. However, it is only fair to explain that the infantry corps for this year train for twelve days. The cavalry, artillery, engineers and all other corps train for sixteen days and there is a large increase in the sum required under that heading. The flat rate of fifty cents a day has been increased to seventy-five cents a day and the opportunity is given to the soldier to earn efficiency pay and perform other service thus increasing the sum to $1 per day. These items, figured up, make the total amount.

Mr. NESBITT. One dollar a day will be the maximum?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). One dollar a day will be the maximum. In that is also included a sum for transporting and maintaining cadet corps in camp. Therefore, although the sum of $1,730,000 is $470,000 less than if the original estimate had been maintained, it will still provide for the training of 40,000 cadets in camp, for four days' additional pay for the cavalry, artillery, and infantry, and, in addition to that, drilling the city corps. That is giving the city corps, who never have an opportunity of manoeuvering, a period of four or five days in camp, and, of course,

they will be paid for that also. I am not claiming credit for these changes. They were in the scheme prepared by my predecessor before I took office.

Mr. MACDONALD. Is not my hon. friend, in proposing to train the cadets in camp, taking a new step in that particular?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Not necessarily. Provision has always been made in the law for the training of cadets, but it has been for training in a company attached to the active militia, which I do not believe in. The consequence is that the cadets have never been in camp, as a great many parents do not want their children, owing to the fact that the recruiting was not always carried on as it should have been, to attend these camps of instruction with the ordinary active militia. The purpose is, now to have these young lads brought into camp separately and under the conditions which I have already explained.

Mr. MACDONALD. Where?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). In each county or riding headquarters. If my hon. friends will be good enough to send in a statement in each locality of where we could get good areas for the boys to drill on, I would be much obliged. This year the camps will be held in centres in each county.

Mr. MACDONALD. It is a question whether that policy is a good one or not. These cadet companies are the product of the Strathcona Trust, which contemplated that half of the money which was devoted to each province should be expended for physical training. Thirty-five per cent. of the amount which was devoted to each province, has been utilized for military training and 15 per cent. for rifle shooting. We have the Boy Scouts also, which is an independent organization, and I have heard it discussed with very great seriousness as to the wisdom of the militia department taking hold of this cadet movement to the extent to which they purpose doing by putting these boys into camp. There is the problem that my hon. friend suggests and the point occurs to one, as to whether the parents of the children who are getting this military training to-day under the provisions of the Strathcona Trust from their instructors and teachers at home, would care to allow them, at tender years, to go off and remain in camps under the method proposed here. It seems to me that the true purpose to be served by the expenditure contemplated by the Trust, would be better attained by allowing the young boys to get the military training given by the instructor at home, inculcate them withe a desire for militia work, and militia interests, and then, when they have reached the age when they can join the active militia, they will afford a very fair recruiting ground for the militia. But the fusion of the small boy into the militia directly at that early age, is quite a problem. I am not speaking in a captious way, but in the exercise of such judgment as I can apply to the problem and I must say that I cannot view the proposal favourably. I think the problem of taking the boys away from home—I do not care whether it is to the county town or some place else—and putting them into camp in the summer time, will not work out successfully. I think the results would be very much better if their teachers and instructors developed their interest in militia work by training them in the schools so that they might be brought into the militia in future years. This would result in larger additions to the militia than if, at an early age you proceed to drive and enforce the militia training and render entirely stale the experience which the young man would look forward to, when he got up to the age at which going to camp would be a real experience.

It is of course a question of policy, and for my part I am inclined to think that the expenditure the minister proposes, of $130,000 for that purpose, is not one which in the long run will be in the interests of the militia, or in the general interest of the country. I would like to hear the minister's justification, if he has any, for this change. We have a Boy Scout movement which is not dealt with by the minister and in which you have local interest and enthusiasm displayed by the young men in that branch of junior military work, and you have the cadet movement which is confined to the schools to which the young people go until they get to the age when they have developed some interest along military lines and would go into the militia as a matter of course. I doubt the wisdom of this vote.

Mr. CARVELL. I have given this matter a good deal of consideration, and I have arrived at somewhat the same conclusion as the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) although perhaps my views are a little more pronounced than his. I have read with a great deal of interest the memorandum sent out by the minister, in which he contrasts the 'positive' training with the 'negative' training and in which he shows that the negative or demoralizing training which the people of Canada are receiving is costing $127,000,000. I am not going to analyse that, but I may say that the militia, which my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald) has so much at heart is not the positive training for good that the minister thinks it is. I hope I will not be

taken as saying that I am entirely against a militia force, for I am not. I believe this country has to have a militia force of some kind, but I am afraid that we are being drawn into the vortex of militarism to an extent our fathers never dreamt of. The minister seems to think that all you have to do to fit a boy for going through the pearly gates is to put him in the militia at twelve years of age and keep him there until his habits are formed. Perhaps my experience in the militia is not along the same lines as that of the minister, but if I had a boy and he wanted to join the militia, I would feel much more responsibility in looking after the character and makeup of the officers and non-commissioned officers of the corps he intended joining, than I would if I were sending him to a school. I believe there are some young men who take their first drink of liquor in going to or in attending the military camps.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Has the hon. member a boy?

Mr. CARVELL. I have not. If I had one I would encourage him to join the militia, but I would be mighty careful as to what corps he joined. I cannot agree with the minister that joining the militia is the remedy for all the ills the human flesh is heir to, and I think he will find that it is not the temperance agent he imagines it is. We come now to the question as to whether this is a good policy. Surely the minister must consider that a boy of twelve years is pretty young to be taken away from his parents and sent into a camp of instruction, surrounded by evil influences as well as good. I will admit that if the minister could get the assistance of all the clergymen and all the W.C.T.U's. and all the other influences for good he speaks of in this memorandum, possibly he might work out the result he hopes for, but even then he would find some difficulty. Therefore, I think the hon. gentleman should hesitate before he launches out into the scheme of which he speaks, to take forty thousand boys between the ages of twelve years and sixteen years away from their homes and put them into those camps of military instruction. Of course, I give my hon. friend credit for seeing that there will be no canteens at these cadet camps. Now, the minister is asking parliament to grant the enormous sum of $8,312,850 for militia expenditure during the coming year, and I know his answer to me will be: Oh, well, that is only $200,000 or $300,000 more than your government intended to expend.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It is $500,000 less.

Mr. CARVELL. I thought the minister would say: You are another. I want to know if it has ever occurred to the hon. gentleman that out of this expenditure of over eight million dollars he is giving to the man who is going to shoulder the musket when trouble comes, the soldier of all ranks including non-commissioned officers, less than probably $800,000 in the way of pay. He is spending over eight million dollars for military purposes, and out of that he is spending $800,000 as pay to the men whom he wants to train. If you examine these items you will find that the hon. gentleman admits that the former government had proposed to increase the pay of the privates up to $1.50 a day and that he only intends to increase their pay up to $1 and even that is contingent on certain things. I want to point out to him one of the unfair features of this increase. As a matter of fact he only gives the private soldier seventy-five cents a day, but he provides that if it be his second year he is entitled to ten cents extra, and if after that he becomes what is called 'efficient' he gets fifteen cents a day more. The hon. gentleman says that in the infantry and cavalry the principal test for efficiency shall be skill in shooting, and that is all right. If you are going to have an efficiency test nothing could be fairer than the test of shooting because after all the only thing we can ever hope to teach our militia in this country is something along the lines of organization, and to learn how to shoot. But, how will the minister apply that efficiency test to the artillery, and to the engineers? It is very much easier to recruit men for the artillery than for the infantry. He will find less difficulty in getting men for the artillery and cavalry because they have horses, and men like to ride horses better than tramping around on foot, and I don't blame them. Therefore, I think there will be found discrimination in this direction. I know that discrimination has existed for some time, but I point out this difficulty to my hon. friend, and I ask him if he cannot get around it in some way. The minister is increasing this vote by $405,000, $130,000 of which goes to the cadet movement, but there is an increase of nearly $300,000 for the annual training, and the men, the soldier who is the backbone of the whole thing, the men who form ninety per cent of the whole organization of the militia force of Canada are going to get an increase in their pay to the magnificent extent of $30,000, just think of it, for the whole militia force of Canada. My hon. friend is increasing the pay of his general staff, who are very well paid already, by about 40 per cent of that.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). There is an increase of $400,000 in the pay of the men. Last year it amounted to $1,325,000; this year is it $1,730,000.

Mr. CARVELL. That includes fodder, horses and transport. To find out the real increase in the pay of the men, all my hon. friend has to do is to take 60,000 men and multiply that number by 10 or 15 cents a day. The great majority of the men have been getting from 75 cents to $1 a day under the old system. According to his own memorandum my hon. friend is only proposing to increase the pay by $30,000. Out of this $400,000, $130,000 goes to the cadets, $100,000 for four additional days, which means rations, forage, horses and everything else except the pay of the men, who get perhaps a pittance at the end. Then there is the training of all the field artillery, engineers and part of the cavalry at Petawawa; that takes $80,000, and that does not go to the men, but very largely to the railway companies. Then, he is going to take $20,000 for a larger permanent force at the Petawawa camp. I cannot understand this. I think that a force which receives a stated salary all the year round, and a regular allowance for rations, horses, forage, &c., should cost about the same no matter where they are. Then you have the magnificent sum of $30,000 for increasing the pay of the whole militia of Canada. I ask, is this fair? Would it not have been better to have carried out the policy which the late government intended to carry out, and increase the pay up to $1.50 a day, and be done with it? My hon. friend knows that he is not getting any great number of recruits of the right kind. You cannot get the farmers' sons, who are the backbone of any militia force, to leave the farm for 12 or 15 days for such small pay. If we are going to get any benefit from the $8,000,000 which we are spending on the militia, we ought to do something to get the very best men of the country trained, and you cannot get them unless you remunerate them, not so much for their own time, but for the wages they must pay for men to take their places on the farms, or at their places of business. If the minister will, even at this late date, get the consent of His Excellency, I am sure he will get the unanimous consent of parliament to give $1.50 a day to every man who attends camp. I hope he will take this into consideration.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If I remember well, some years ago Lord Strathcona made a certain gift to the Department of Militia, or to Canada, the object of which was the encouragement of drill among the boys at college or in the high schools. The money was to be divided among the several provinces. If I remember rightly, the province of Nova Scotia accepted the conditions of the gift. I would like to know from the hon. minister first, if other provinces have agreed to the conditions, and, secondly, how many boys are reported as taking part in the drills, and if officers are sent to drill them from the department at Ottawa or from the military quarters in the different provinces. I would ask my hon. friend also to take a note of a request which has been made to me by one of my old electors in the county of Gaspé, Mr. Letourneau, of Mont Louis. He is an old soldier who served at the military school in Quebec in the year 1870. If my hon. friend will pardon me, I will read that part of the letter which deals with the grant to be made to the veterans who took part in the Fenian raid.

It is not very relevant to the item under discussion, but my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes, Victoria, Ont.) will read that portion of the letter in 'Hansard,' and he might perhaps tell me later on what he intends to do in a similar case. Now, here is what this gentleman, writing to me on the 19th February, from Mont-Louis, county of Gaspé, Quebec, says:

On the 9th January, 1870 I entered the Military School at Quebec. My instructors were Captain Fitzgerald of the 9th British Regiment, the last regiment which helped to garrison Canada, Colonel Bagot, and Major Gagné. Colonel Bagot, who has since died in India, was the examiner and Major Gagné who has since died at Winnipeg was the French instructor. During that same winter we had the last Fenian troubles. Colonel Bagot expected to leave with his regiment at any moment, and he came to the school and asked for the names of those boys who were willing to accompany him. Out of 50 or 60 boys about one half gave their names, and agreed to join the force. I was one of those, but very few of them are living to-day. However the troubles having been repressed in a very short time it was not necessary for us to leave. Colonel Bagot came back to the military school, and made a long speech to the boys who had given their names, and Major Gagné repeated this speech in French. If my memory serves me right Colonel Duschenay was then employed at the militia office at Quebec.

The time was a little after confederation.

The names of those who offered their services must have been entered somewhere in the archives, and it seems to me that if the government is going to recompense the veterans I should be one of the number.

This gentleman explains further that he left the school in June 1870, and on the first of September following went to Rome to serve as a Papal Zouave. The writer of this letter, Mr. Louis Létourneau, is therefore an old soldier who was ready to serve his country, and he wants to know if, out of the grant that will be made to those who served in the Fenian raid, those who were ready to leave, but were not called

upon to do so, will be given a grant. These are the two questions I wanted to put to my hon. friend.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria, Ont.). I think the member for Rouville asked a question regarding the number of cadets.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, in the colleges, by provinces.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria, Ont.). I do not think I have them by provinces. I may say this much, however, to the credit of the province of Quebec: more than half of the organized cadets come from that province. It has been my privilege to inspect a number of these corps, and they are a most creditable organization. In connection with the training of teachers under the Strathcona Trust, I may say that all the provinces now have——

Mr. LEMIEUX. What is the amount of that trust?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria, Ont.). About $500,000 I think, but that is only a small item in the whole cost. Under the Strathcona Trust all the provinces have accepted and up to date Nova Scotia, being the province which first took it up, has 3,933 teachers regularly trained under that trust, the training being in physical and military drill. New Brunswick has 2,041 regularly trained teachers. Those are the two provinces which took up this training early. Prince Edward Island has 565 British Columbia 378, Quebec 12, outside of their cadets, Ontario 179, Manitoba 415, Saskatchewan 175, and Alberta, 283 teachers already trained under the Strathcona Trust. These teachers carry on their work in the schools at regular periods. Was that all the information the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) wanted?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I would like some statement in regard to the veterans.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria, Ont.). Of course my hon. friend would not ask me to express an opinion off-hand.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Not until the minister has read Mr. Létourneau's letter, which will appear in 'Hansard.'

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I will take the case up with the officers of the department. The provisions of the law, of course, have to be satisfied, that the veterans were called out on duty at the time, and if my good friend who made application enlisted in May, 1870, as he did according to the dates given, the chances are that his corps were ordered to the front, and he, as long as they were ordered to the front, although not present with the enemy, I think under the law is entitled to get the grant.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Before my hon. friend the minister passes to another subject, we have in Montreal, Quebec and some other cities in that province some independent corps who obtain old arms from the department for their organization. Does the minister exact from these corps that they should join the militia? Would it not be better that they should regularly form part of the militia force than remain independent corps?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The independent cadet corps are not liable to be called out for service.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Why should they not be in the militia force instead of being independent corps?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I do not know the details in regard to these independent corps, as the question has never arisen before, but I imagine they would not be expected to join the militia, being under age for one very sound reason. It is the first time I knew there were independent corps who were organized and not in the militia. I will give the matter my consideration.

Mr. CARVELL. Before the minister leaves that branch of the subject, will he state what is the character of the training which the teachers have received in New Brunswick? He states in his memorandum that there were in 1911-12 450 teachers already trained in New Brunswick. Would he give some idea as to the character and training they received? There are female teachers as well as male teachers, and the former would not be available to take to the camps of instruction.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). We hope all the male teachers will be. They are all invited to go into camp to get instruction. The matter is fully set out at pages 9 and 10 of the memorandum. The training under the Strathcona Trust is physical drill for the upbuilding of the physical body——

Mr. CARVELL. That is good.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Secondly, mental development accompanying it, and also a certain amount of the rudimentary military training. If the hon. member has not seen the syllabus, or the books, in connection with this matter, I would be very glad to send copies to him and to other members of the House. They will then see the exact nature of the training that has been carried on for some years under the auspices of the Strathcona Trust. Now, to come to the cadet corps training.

Mr. MACDONALD. Will the minister tell us fully what is his programme in regard to that?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Does the hon. member mean in regard to the Strathcona Trust or the cadets?

Mr. MACDONALD. They work together.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Australia has now under arms 75,000 cadets. The policy as enunciated by Lord Roberts many years ago when he started this movement in England, which antedates the Scout movement, was that the training of the militiamen of the country of the ages of 20 to 30 should be known by the boy of 12 to 13 years of age—that is, he should understand how to aim and carry a rifle on his shoulder, and so forth, and I am satisfied my hon. friend will agree with me in that.

All that the militia of the past knew in the way of forming fours, and so on, may be seen exemplified in any large public school in the Dominion where the children even much younger than twelve years of age, are trained in the regular hall of the school. It was my privilege to visit Chatham, Ontario, not long ago, where I saw upwards of 900 boys and girls from five to fifteen years, assembled in one hall perform these military evolutions just as correctly and far more systematically than I often seen half the same number of militiamen perform them on the parade grounds. In other words, the children of to-day are being correctly trained in all the schools in the simple military movements that are about all we learn in camp. The policy pursued in Great Britain, in Australia and elsewhere where this matter has been carried on for some time, is to train the boys in shooting. That is, the same principle is followed in training in military work as is carried on in teaching reading, writing and arithmetic. The young man who leaves off the learning of these things until he is twenty-one or upwards, can hardly be made proficient in them. There is no reason why a child of ten or twelve, should not readily grasp all the simple movements of military drill. I do not wish to reproach my hon. friend from Carleton for not having a boy; possibly I should sympathize with him, certainly I would not be harsh with him; but his fear is a good deal like that of the dear old maids, who, as we all know, are always the best posted in the management of children. These old maids and old bachelors are the people whom we find best able to advise us when it comes to a question of how the chidren should be brought up.

Mr. CARVELL. I do not come under the hon. gentleman's condemnation; I am not entirely without children.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Then I am sure the hon. gentleman will agree with me in the policy I lay down. If we wish children to be a success, whether boys or girls, we must trust them. No boy or girl ever attained high citizenship otherwise. If you want a boy to be a man, trust him. My experience in handling boys and men is that I have trusted the fellows and they have never betrayed the trust.

Now, as to liquor in camp, my experience is that the men in camp who are a disgrace to the service—and unfortunately there are many of them—do not learn in camp to drink liquor; they do not take liquor for the first time in camp. They are the men whom some careless officers, neglectful of their business, have picked up in the last day or two before they go to camp or have had them picked up by the bartenders and sent out as part of their command. These are the men who are a disgrace to the clean, decent fellows who go to camp. I do not wish to particularize my own regiment——

Mr. LEMIEUX. If I may be permitted, is it not forbidden to use liquor in camp?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The sale of liquor in camp is forbidden.

Mr. BELAND. Not the drinking?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). No. But liquor is not sold in camp. The abuse of liquor in camp is not very pronounced at any time according to my experience; I have not known many camps in which it has been much abused. But a man in uniform is seen drunk—he probably got his liquor down town—and the cry at once is raised, 'There is the soldier.' 'It is the camp that has done that.' But the same man at home would probably be intoxicated for hours as against minutes of intoxication in camp. Such a man is a disgrace to civilization, but it is not the camp that has made him so. The United States Military Engineering Corps has charge of all public works, appropriations for the rivers and harbours works of the United States. General McClellan, who was a member of that corps, making a speech at one of the annual gatherings, was able to state that, although hundreds of millions of dollars had been expended by the engineering corps, not a man had been unfaithful to his trust. And this good condition, he attributed largely to the military training instilled into these men as boys. The officer at the head of the Engineering Corps to-day is able to state that in the entire record of the Engineering Corps, made up of the best military engineers in the land, there has never been but one man who proved himself unfaithful to his trust, and never a dollar was required from them in the way of guarantee.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What is the regulation in the United States regarding the sale of liquor in camps?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I do not know. I have not been in any of the American camps.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The hon. gentleman does not propose any change in the regulations here?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). No, except so far as the cadet corps is concerned, in that case we provide that no liquor shall be admitted to the camp.

Mr. MACDONALD. The minister has been giving us a very interesting exhortation on military training in general, but, perhaps, it would be more interesting if he took up the different subjects categorically. I ventured at the beginning to ask him what was his justification for the diversion of the Strathcona Trust by providing that this money for cadet companies should be spent in cadet corps camps. I also asked with regard to the increased pay which my non. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell), referred to.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I obtained permission of the hon. member from Carleton (Mr. Carvell), to answer the member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), first. I have not forgotten the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald).

Mr. CARVELL. The first shall be last.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Yes, but not least. I was answering the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell). In the city of Toronto where for nearly forty years the boys have been trained from much younger than ten years, not a boy in that city who received the cadet training has ever appeared before the police court. Wherever the military training has been instilled into the boys, the record shows, the boy has some pride, some manhood, that might not be his otherwise. To put it in another way, such a boy may not be all right, but he is a better fellow than he would have been without the training. And men in the service who indulge in liquor, as referred to by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell), do not learn that in camp. I have no hesitation in making that statement. It has not been my experience to see that sort of thing carried on. If it is carried on, the officers who are in charge or responsible are unfit to wear the uniform of the corps to which they belong. As to the evil influences of camp life, I have never seen them. One would hear more improper language on the street corner of any country village than he hears in camp. There are more improper influences in the low bars of cities and towns than are to be found in all the camps of the Dominion. I have not observed these low influences in connection with the militia camps, and wherever such have existed it is because of men brought out by some careless captain to fill up his ranks at the last moment; and all that will be remedied, if it is possible to remedy it, at an early day.

Now the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) said something about the shooting. I am sorry I cannot agree with him about the pay. I would like to see them all paid good high wages. But the city corps of this country, and they are nearly as well set up as the country boys, give their time year after year drawing no money for it whatever; in other words, they put the money in the regimental fund and spend it on a field day or two during the year; but not a man of them draws a dollar for his own personal use throughout the year. It is my hope in a few years to see that carried out with the entire militia of the country. Now with regard to the shooting. The infantry and the cavalry are trained to shoot with a rifle. The artillery get their allowance for gun practice and it goes to the battery. But I agree with my hon. friend, I have never liked this provision of the pay. This year we are giving them 75 cents straight pay, instead of the 50 cents which was divided up for a number of things. My desire was to make it a straight pay of 75 cents a day, and let it go at that. That was my own personal desire, but others have thought differently. 75 cents a day with rations is not a bad pay for a young fellow who puts in a week or two.

Mr. NESBITT. On whose recommendation is the efficiency pay paid?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). That is paid on the test for shooting, it is on the record made at the target.

Mr. CARVELL. I never understood that any efficiency pay reached the members of an artillery corps on account of shooting. If there is, it is something I never heard of before.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It goes to the battery, and it is divided up among them.

Mr. CARVELL. It must be a late regulation.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I don't know anything about that, it goes to the battery. I do not know whether it is divided up among the men or used for general purposes, but it is their own money, and they spend it as they choose. Now

as to the Petawawa camp. The only large training area in the Dominion of Canada now is the Petawawa camp. Troops from all over the Dominion are brought there at great expense for training. It is our intention to have in every military division a similar training area, perhaps not so large, and we can pay for it. See what can be saved. Take the extra pay now spent in freight, and in bringing these men from their own distant province to Petawawa, and with that money we can fit a training area almost at a man's own door in every province, not only for selected corps, but for the entire troops, who may turn out for two or three days' manœuvers. Now I will come to my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), I have kept him for the last because, being my adviser, counsellor and friend, I will wind up with him. He has referred to the general policy of the cadet system. My idea is that the best way to create a militia is to train the youth of the country. I have absolute faith in a boy of ten, twelve and fifteen years of age, he is as capable of controlling himself, and in 999 cases out of 1,000, does control himself as well as a man. Who has not seen boy scouts, little lads of 6, 8, 9 years of age conducting themselves like men? I saw in the city of Toronto last year young lads coming from the county of Waterloo 50 or 70 miles away, camping along the roadside at night, with no guides, not having their parents with them, and yet they were keeping themselves perfectly straight. They conducted themselves like perfect gentlemen while they were coming to camp, and returning from the camp. Don't be afraid to trust the boys, and you will never have reason to regret it. When young lads of this age have got a practical experience, they will never forget it. Look at the boys' camps conducted all over Canada by the various schools and colleges. There is hardly a school that has not a boys' club, there is hardly a church or Christian association that has not a boys' club. They go at their own expense for three or four days in camp, and the result is a splendid upbuilding of the manhood of these boys. Why should we be afraid to trust the boys going to these camps? There is no danger that they will not be well looked after. I can tell my hon. friend that from every province in this Dominion I have offers from teachers and clergymen, from the Young Men's Christian Associations, from the Salvation Army, asking me if they can be of any service in the camps, and offering to give their time freely in order to help the lads along. More than that, the Women's Christian Associations in many cases are taking the matter up and propose looking after these lads in their own localities. I have no fear whatever for these camps. I am satisfied that a boy who is trained to act on his own responsibility can be trusted.

Mr. CARVELL. The hon. gentleman mentions offers that come from all these sources, are they for the purpose of encouraging the minister in the course he is taking, or is it because they are afraid of the consequences and are trying to minimize them as much as possible?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The men of the Young Men's Christian Association who are taking this matter up have only the desire to build up the manhood of the boys. Take Mr. Gartshore, of Toronto, take Colonel Langton, who have waited upon us and said, Your movement is the greatest thing that ever struck this country. One gentleman representing the cadet corps of a city in Quebec came to me and said: Will you give me a marquee to go into camp, I want to be out with my boys, I want to keep the boys from my school under my own eyes. I said, yes, I will give you a marquee. The Y.M.C.A. leaders have told me: We have 20 trained expert physical instructors, which we will add to your military instructors, and it will not cost you a cent. They are interested in the upbuilding of the youth. They do not go through the world fearing to trust the boys and fearing to trust the girls.

Mr. NESBITT. As I understand the minister, it is not his purpose to mix the cadet corps with the ordinary militia. May I ask him then under whose control the cadet corps will be?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). There will be officers appointed especially to look after them.

Mr. NESBITT. Will they have their own instructors?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). So far as possible. As I have said, we have already offers from Y.M.C.A.'s of Canada of 20 permanent instructors, and we have offers of assistance from the various schools and colleges of instructors for the cadet corps.

Mr. NESBITT. The instructor who has been with the boys at school knows them better and is more capable, if he is a capable instructor, of taking charge of them than any person else.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). That is right.

Mr. NESBITT. I have been a very warm supporter all my life of this cadet corps movement. But, I would warn the minister against making it a militant movement as some of the parents might object to their children taking part in a militia movement who would not object to them being

members of a cadet corps in connection with a school. It gives the boys a fine training and many of them become excellent militia officers in after life. As far as the cadet corps at home is concerned, the instructor there is a most capable man and it is a very great satisfaction not only to the city but to the surrounding country to observe the proficiency which these cadets display in drill. These boys are quite capable of going to camp if they are not mixed up with the regular militia. The Boy Scouts in our section of the country go off to camp with their instructor. He takes charge and generally the Y.M.C.A. sends somebody who assists him. If that policy is followed out I do not see what harm can come to these boys. I would not like to see militarism, or the expense of the militia increased in this country. I can tell the minister that most of the people are opposed to the militia expenditure increasing. I believe in bringing the militia into a condition of systematic service and I would support the minister in any movement he makes towards that end. At the same time I would advise him very strongly to keep a watchful eye on the expenditure. No matter what he may have to do let him keep the expenditure down. I see that the amount proposed to be expended for the training of the cadet corps is $130,000. This is not to provide pay for the individuals, but it is simply to pay their expenses, which is nothing but right. If camps are carefully surrounded with safeguards, if liquor of all kinds is kept out of them and if they are under the care of the instructors of the cadets who know the individuals, it appears to me that much good may come out of them. An important point in the training of a boy is to know something of his disposition and if this movement is watched carefully and not allowed to become too closely associated with militarism it ought to serve a good purpose.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The line as laid down by my hon. friend from Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) is exactly the line that I purpose pursuing. Where there is a cadet corps, if there is any instructor, it may be one of the boys themselves, or it may be one of their teachers, that officer is going to be brought out if we can get him. Although there has been no attempt to specially organize it yet we have heard of hundreds and thousands of teachers and instructors of the very character that my hon. friend speaks of who would be ready to take part in these camps. I heartily agree with my hon. friend when he says that the only way to manage these boys is to trust them. Take a military camp—if they are positively forbidden in blood and thunder terms to use liquor with all sorts of penalties to be imposed upon them if they violate the law, the chances are that the spirit that is dominant in humanity will find vent and it simply comes down to this that the more you attempt to repress them the more liable they are to break out. I could point to camps where men have been informed that liquor could be obtained in the town adjoining, but their attention was drawn to the fact that it could not be conceived to be possible that any young gentleman wearing the uniform of a British soldier and coming out of a decent home would be found hanging around such a place as a saloon. I could point to a camp where, out of 3,000 or 3,500 men only two were found to be drunk during the twelve days.

Mr. NESBITT. That largely depends on the officers in immediate touch with the men.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Certainly. My hon. friend spoke also of the boy scouts going to camp. If those camps can be carried out successfully this plan can also be carried out without any trouble. As to cutting down expenses, I might explain that we will drill over 100,000 men and boys. If my hon. friend will notice the militia statement, he will see that the expenses have been pretty well cut down, and I can assure the committee that the country will get a dollar's worth for every dollar that is voted, so long as I have any responsibility in connection with this matter. I might point out to my hon. friend that if we go on with these cadet camps, in three or four years we will have a large number of young men of from 14 to 16 years of age, who will be available for the militia. It should not be forgotten that the battle of Alma was won by boys under 17 years of age, that there were many boys in the squares at Waterloo, that Wolfe was a young man when he captured Quebec, and that Washington was a young man when he led the army across the Alleghennies. So that, it is evident that a man does not have to be very old, in order to make a good soldier. Those who are trained young, will learn quickly, and they will keep hold of what they have learned. These boys, in three or four years, will be able to take their places in the ranks of the militia. With these camp areas, the boys, in place of going out for a Thanksgiving holiday, would be only too glad, having their expenses paid, to go out for four or five days and manoeuvre over an area of ten or twelve square miles. In that way, they would learn more in a day than they would in six or eight weeks of hay-foot, straw-foot drill in the ordinary militia camp. My hon. friend from Oxford, said that he would endorse the proposal that these men should not have any connection with the militia. I propose to introduce a Bill to-morrow to prevent that very thing. At the present

time, under the law, these cadets may be brought out, but they must be brought out in connection with the active militia. I do not want that at all. I have very great respect for the active militia, but I want the boys to be brought out under a different method, so that, instead of being brought into camp and placed alongside of these men, some of whom have not the habits which we would like them to have, they shall go into camp apart from the active militia.

Mr. KAY. Would the minister state what part of this additional four days' training will be devoted to target practice, and also whether the men will have to qualify in shooting to earn efficiency pay?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I think this efficiency pay is for shooting. As to the additional four days' training, we will follow whatever syllabus is laid down by the officer in command of the camp.

Mr. KAY. The reason I asked the question was, that hitherto the militia man has been taken into camp for twelve days' training. He was required to qualify to get a high average at the butts in shooting before he could get his efficiency pay. He was only allowed one day's shooting at the butts. I maintain that it is very unfair to expect a man to learn to shoot accurately without giving him a chance to practise.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Quite right.

Mr. KAY. For that reason there has been a good deal of dissatisfaction and a great deal of dishonesty practised at the ranges.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). That is right.

Mr. KAY. I would be very sorry to see the efficiency pay dependent on a man's being able to shoot well.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kay), and I have objected in toto to the efficiency pay being given in the way it has been given. But, a great change has been made. What we have done to meet the views of my hon. friend (Mr. Kay) is this: Every soldier must take his aiming drill, then he must take his sub-target or practice with a miniature rifle, then he is permitted to fire once or twice or thrice in practice. I established that rule two years ago in my own camp, and I find that it now obtains all over the country. Under the present system, with two or three days' practice, nearly every boy can qualify for his efficiency pay. I think the experience last year was that the efficiency pay was honestly obtained and the shooting was fine. Under the former system the poor lads were brought into camp, a rifle was put in their hands, and, although perhaps they had never pulled a trigger before, they were told they had to make so many bullseyes out of so many shots or they would not get efficiency pay. The lads had no chance of getting efficiency pay under that system. That has been changed in the last two years, and I am satisfied that this year will see greater opportunities for the boys to practice before they are counted out of their efficiency pay.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Would the minister please inform me what arms of the militia service will train at Petawawa during the coming year Will there be any infantry corps trained there?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The Petawawa camp is largely for the permanent force and artillery and cavalry. I have not looked into the details, which I leave to the officers in charge, but I believe the intention is to bring as many of the artillery and cavalry and permanent corps there as possible.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Does the Minister of Militia not think that it would be advisable to have every branch in the service trained there, so that the infantry corps when they are not being drilled themselves could see the different other branches of the service in training?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I think that would be advisable.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I would submit that for the consideration of the Minister of Militia.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The view of my hon. friend (Mr. White) may possibly be carried out. It is the intention, in the case of the infantry from this district, to send them to Petawawa, but to bring them from all over the country would involve tremendous expense. There is no doubt great advantage in having all the different arms of the service in training together so that they may get an idea of what the conditions would be in active service.

Mr. CARVELL. Is the time occupied in travelling to and from camp included in the sixteen days' training?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The intention is that sixteen days shall be put in in camp.

Mr. CARVELL. The travelling would be extra?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Yes.

Mr. CARVELL. I cannot agree that it is good policy to take an artillery corps all the way from the maritime provinces to Petawawa.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I don't think so either.

Mr. CARVELL. I think that is an error of judgment.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I agree exactly on that; I don't want them to go.

Mr. CARVELL. Does the hon. gentleman realize what it means to take sixty or sixty-five horses and a hundred men, and all the equipment of a field battery nearly one thousand miles to a camp of instruction? Perhaps the battery with which I was once connected would like the jaunt, but the owners of the best horses would certainly not allow them to be transported to Petawawa unless the minister supplied palace horse cars.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Nothing is too good for Woodstock.

Mr. CARVELL. I do not think you can get the efficient training unless you have the four main branches of the service: engineers, artillery, cavalry, and infantry in a camp.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Don't you want the medical corps?

Mr. CARVELL. If all our militia men were the saints the minister thinks they are they would not require a medical man, but I think the services of the medical corps would be necessary in most camps. Why is it that the minister does not give the infantry the extra four days training, the same as the other branches of the service? I believe that the infantry would learn more in the additional four days than they would in the other nine. There must be a reason for that.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). There is no special reason except economy, and the fact that in the days before my hon. friend (Mr. Carvell), graced the militia with his presence in it, they used to go to camp for sixteen days, and it was found to be a failure. When, this year, it was proposed that the infantry should go to camp for sixteen days, the men in many localities raised objections, and as in the past we had got along with twelve days training, I thought I would not force it on the infantry for this year, and besides, to be frank, I wanted to economize, so as to justify as far as possible the cadet corps expenditure.

Mr. CARVELL. The minister has not explained why it is necessary to spend twenty thousand dollars extra to take a portion of the permanent corps to Petawawa.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It takes $140,000 or more to transport the troops to these camps.

Mr. CARVELL. It surely would not cost $20,000 extra to transport the permanent force.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The Chief of the General Staff has laid out this plan in conformity with the wishes of my predecessor, and I have not altered it in the slightest. The troops are being brought from all over the country in order that they may get the benefit of being drilled in great masses over a large area. The transport from Halifax will cost $3,000, from Toronto $2,000, from Kingston $1,000, from St. John $1,000, from Winnipeg $5,000, and horses and baggage $4,700 more.

Mr. CARVELL. The minister's memorandum at the bottom of page 5 says:

> Soldiers who have trained the previous year will receive ten cents a day additional, and those who are found 'efficient' in the particular arm of the service to which they belong will receive fifteen cents day efficiency pay.

Will that apply only to men who were in camp the previous year, or will it apply also to men who were in camp two years before and for some reasonable cause were not able to attend last year?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The intention is that it will be only for the men who drilled in the immediately preceding year, the object being to encourage them to attend the drill successively from year to year.

Mr. CARVELL. Then I am afraid that the minister will find that many men will be trained under different names from their own.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). That will be watched.

Mr. CARVELL. Is the policy still to be followed of compelling the commanding officers to have their recruiting done five or six days before going to camp, or are they to be allowed to recruit at any time before going into camp? In some portions of the country I know that this has been not only a hardship, but a regular farce, because, especially in rural corps, there are many men who do not know until the last hour whether they can go to camp or not. If you compelled them to enlist at least six days before going to camp, there are thousands of men all over Canada of the very class that we want to train, who will not be able to give a decided answer within that time. The result will be that the commanding officers will sometimes sign for the full complement of men six days before they go to camp, inserting the names of John Jones or John Smith, and at the last moment taking such men as they can get.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The list can now be filled to the day of going into

camp. At one of the camps a couple of years ago one young officer came with about 60 men; another came with only 10 or 12 men. The latter, being asked why he had not more men, blamed the service roll and the small pay. The other man, on being asked how he got so many men, said he always carried his service roll in his pocket, and a couple of nights after he returned from camp he would have a dance, and any one who enrolled in the militia was allowed to go there, and the young ladies were invited to come, and consequently he said every year he had four times the number of men required; he never failed to bring out a full company because he looked after the matter 365 days of the year.

Mr. MACDONALD. The hon. minister did not discuss to any great extent the question I ventured to raise in regard to the cadet corps. He has told us, on page 10 of his memorandum, that his system of military and physical training in the schools was first agreed upon under the provisions of the Strathcona Trust by the Militia Department and the Board of Education of the province of Nova Scotia in 1907. That system formed the nucleus of the system throughout the Dominion. Nova Scotia was the only province that had any teachers who were instructed and gave any instruction in the schools in 1907. Then came New Brunswick in 1910, and the other provinces, I understand, have only come in last year. Even with them all coming in my hon. friend says:

> This year the courses in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Ontario had to be materially reduced on account of lack of funds.

I presume that is because the funds of the Trust, supplemented by the grants of the provinces, are insufficient to enable these schools to be operated. If that is so, has the Board of the Strathcona Trust or has Lord Strathcona himself, any judgment with regard to the matter, or consented to any portion of the funds of the Trust being used to enable the schools to go to camp? If the scheme is a good one, it would appear to me that it would have been better for the minister first to have seen that an ample number of instructors were supplied to all the schools rather than to make what seems to be a doubtful experiment in taking the boys and girls to camp.

Then I would like the minister to tell me where the camps, which he proposes to inaugurate, are to be held. He said in a general way that they would be held in every county. My hon. friend will see that by a vote such as is proposed here, he cannot furnish sufficient facilities to hold the camp in every county in the Dominion in which these cadet corps may be. I would like him to give me full details in regard to all these matters.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. member will recollect that the estimates were not passed last year until very late, and that is the reason there were no funds available for carrying on the work, as referred to in the paragraph which he has read. The Strathcona Trust itself exercises no control, and does not attempt to exercise any, over the young lads throughout the country.

Mr. MACDONALD. Except to this extent, that the money is granted to that trust on certain conditions.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It is all done through the provincial institutions——

Mr. MACDONALD. Under a special agreement made with each province which sets out the details.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It is done by the executive councils for the Strathcona Trust of Canada, through the Militia Council of the Militia Department, in conjunction with the Minister of Education in each province.

Mr. MACDONALD. Does not the department seek the consent of the Minister of Education in each province to the proposition?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Why should that consent be asked? We do not ask the consent of the provincial authorities when we are calling out the men for the militia camps. This is a federal government.

Mr. MACDONALD. But my hon. friend misapprehends the situation. There exists in certain provinces of the Dominion —to a greater extent in some, and to a lesser extent in others—a system of instruction along military lines in schools, which is the result of the agreement that has been arrived at between the trustees of a trust inaugurated by Lord Strathcona and the various provincial governments. I have under my hands a form of agreement with one of the provinces which sets out in detail how this instruction is to be carried on. One of the stipulations in regard to the expenditure of money is, that 50 per cent be devoted to looking after the physical training of the boys. A certain proportion only is to be devoted to military training, and another portion to rifle snooting. Now that is the basis upon which this whole system of military instruction in the schools and amongst the cadets of the country has been built up.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Oh, no, the cadet system existed in the country long before the Strathcona Trust was formed.

Mr. MACDONALD. I know that, but I am speaking of the cadet corps in Nova Scotia as recently formed under the Strathcona Trust. Now, I submit, the minister should not say that this vote to take boys from the public schools and send them to camp, is one in regard to which the opinion of the educational authorities in each province should not be had. I think my hon. friend should have taken the precaution of consulting with the provinces who are expending money in looking after the education of these teachers before he decided on this policy.

Take the agreement between Nova Scotia and the Strathcona Trust. The teachers, who are officials of the Nova Scotia government, come under that agreement. They receive certain special grants from the province as the result of their attending and receiving military instruction, and so on. Now my hon. friend the Minister of Militia steps in and says: We are going to spend $130,000 in taking the boys and girls of the public schools to camp.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). No, we are not taking the girls.

Mr. MACDONALD. You are taking the lady teachers.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I am not aware of it.

Mr. MACDONALD. You said a little while ago that you were going to take the lady teachers to camp.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I must have been misunderstood. I never heard of that before.

Mr. MACDONALD. I certainly did understand the minister to say that a short time ago. But if it is not his intention that the lady teachers should go to camp, we will eliminate that feature from the discussion. My hon. friend then is proposing to take the boys from the public schools of the country.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The boys in the schools or out of the schools—every boy who wishes to come, in proportion to the number from each district, whether he does or does not attend school, whether he belongs to a regular cadet corps or does not.

Mr. MACDONALD. I question very much the wisdom of the minister's policy. He is departing from the well considered lines as laid down in the settlement which was, I think, agreed to by each one of the provinces in the Dominion this last year on the basis of this Strathcona Trust.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Not at all.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend proposes to disregard it.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Not at all.

Mr. MACDONALD. The minister says he is going to take cadets to camp no matter whether it conflicts with the idea of the Strathcona Trust or not.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Not at all.

Mr. MACDONALD. I submit that the Strathcona Trust proposition is one which was well considered, it has received the approval of each of the provincial governments, and the minister should follow the lines of that trust and carry out that policy. If he does so I am satisfied that the results which he discussed so eloquently which would follow from giving the advantage of a military training to the young of the country would accrue to a very much greater extent than if he follows other lines without regard to that trust.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). We are not departing in the slightest from the Strathcona Trust.

Mr. MACDONALD. You are ignoring it.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Not in the slightest, any more than we are ignoring any organization in the country over which we have no control. As a matter of fact the hon. member will be called upon I trust in a very short time to discuss the Strathcona Trust Cadet movement. This is a very different movement entirely. That is a matter in connection with the schools to which we are giving assistance in every way. We are giving our encouragement and the very best instructors we can get, just the same as with the military schools of the country. the hon. gentleman would be just as much justified in saying we were running counter to the military schools by having these camps of instruction. The two go hand-in-hand, in their proper spheres, and we are not interfering with them. If this were to be called the Boy Scout movement where would my hon. friend be?

Mr. MACDONALD. Are you taking the Boy Scouts into camp?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). 'A rose by any other name would smell as sweet.' You can call them junior militia if you like, call them anything, but I prefer to use the term which has been attached to this scout movement from time immemorial, long before the Stratchcona Trust was formed. It is a magnificent institution, which is not surpassed in any country in the world, and we are endorsing it to the fullest extent in our Militia policy.

Mr. MACDONALD. You are not asking the provincial authorities anything about this question.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). We do not consult the provincial authorities about the military camps, why should we do so in this case.

Mr. MACDONALD. But you have the cadet corps by reason of your agreement with the provincial authorities.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Not at all. These are not cadet corps, that is where the hon. member makes a mistake.

Mr. MACDONALD. Look at the agreement with the provincial government and you will find it.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. member is opposing this regularly organized cadet corps movement which will take the boys from localities where regularly organized cadet corps were never heard of, and where the Strathcona Trust has not yet reached. I hope the hon. member will see that. I know he wants to be fair and if by my explanations I can make the matter clear to him I will be very glad to do it. There are many sections of the country where young men do not go to school at all. These lads, between the ages prescribed, will be permitted to go to camp in proportion to the number volunteering from the district. I think we will see that point clearly. These are places where neither the cadet corps nor the Strathcona Trust exists, but if a boy happens to have been trained under the Strathcona Trust that will not prevent his coming to camp as a militiaman. We have in the ranks of our militiamen many young men who have been trained as cadets and they are among the best volunteers that we have.

Mr. MACDONALD. In view of the position the Minister is taking I will quote from the agreement made between the Strathcona Trust and the province of Nova Scotia to the following effect:

The Militia Department will draft a syllabus of the work required to be done by a school or college cadet corps in order to entitle a teacher to the annual bonus, and will conduct the necessary examinations. Until cadet corps possess in their officers qualified instructors, this work of instruction will be carried out by instructors detailed by the Militia Department, so far as practicable.

Now I say that in my province the cadet corps owe their existence very largely, if not exclusively, to the work that was done under the Strathcona Trust.

I know that there are cadet corps in other provinces which existed before the Strathcona Trust was organized. And when I say to my hon. friend that he should have consulted the provincial authorities that had to do with these questions before he decided to take the cadet corps, which are chiefly in the public schools, he will say that there are other cadet corps. I know there are. But I say that, as regards those provinces, where the cadet corps have been developed as the result of the Strathcona Trust, under an agreement similar to that I have in my hand, it was a serious thing for the minister to act without consultation with the provincial authorities in regard to this innovation, which he is introducing. If this movement is a good one, he might have made it a concerted movement and one that will not interfere with, but will enhance the value of the Strathcona Trust. His failure to do this may result in some provinces in danger of injury to what has been brought about by the Strathcona Trust.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald), insists on confusing the two things. The Strathcona Trust has nothing to do with that which is now before us. We are paying thousands and tens of thousands for instructors to train these teachers. But that is to assist the provinces. We are not calling upon the provinces to assist us in this. These are two distinct movements. You might properly call these organizations, scouts, or young engineers, or anything else. But the name 'cadet,' has been attached to these organizations of boys, and we have held to the name. But I do not see how the hon. member cannot see that there is no conflict whatever.

Mr. BELAND. I share the views of my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) in regard to the advisability of providing such an amount of $130,000 for the training of youths in camps during the summer. I understand that boys will be recruited for this training between the ages of twelve and sixteen. I quite understand that the minister is guided by his zeal and boundless enthusiasm in military organization. But I think this scheme is objectionable on many grounds, moral, economic and other. I do not object to providing substantial and sufficient sums for defence, either military or naval; I have given ample proof of that in the past. But I think that now the hon. minister is overdoing the thing. For myself, while taking the classical course in college, I received some military instruction from an instructor who used to come there. But I cannot refrain from saying that we should pause, we should stop and think, before launching upon this new project. This is a new departure, and I am not very sure that it is a wise one. It means this year an expenditure of $130,000. That may be a small amount relatively to the whole, but it will grow larger and larger every year. We

are spending now $8,000,000 a year for our militia. The hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) the other day said that we might offer $10,000,000 as a contribution to the British navy and also organize a Canadian navy, which would probably involve an expenditure of $5,000,000 more—say $15,000,000 for the navy and $8,000,000 for the militia. And this for a country that claims not to be a militarist country. And the minister states that we are training to-day about 60,000 men. That is quite a number for a country with a population of about 7,000,000. Apply the same proportion to countries with populations of sixty to eighty millions, and it would be a huge amount of training annually. The same principles do not apply to European countries that apply to Canada. We are not a militarist country. I really take very strong objection to training in camp youths of from twelve to fifteen years of age. I would very humbly suggest to the minister that he should allow this thing to stand for a year. Then, if he wishes, let him come back with the item next year and we will discuss it. In the meantime, we can see what the provincial authorities think of it and learn the feelings of the country generally. I think this is a fair proposition to make to the hon. minister. It seems to me that we are marching very fast in the direction of militarism. I urge the minister not to be carried away by his zeal and enthusiasm.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I am much surprised to hear the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Beland) speak as he has done considering the training he received as a cadet. But I realize that his words of to-day have not the ring of sincerity that usually characterizes his utterances, but he is only endeavouring to assist the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) out of the unfortunate dilemma into which he has got himself by confusing the cadet organization, which is largely a matter of physical drill and is under the control of the provinces, with the cadet organization which is intended, I have no hesitation in saying, to do away largely with the system of training the military as now carried on in this country. Let me point out at the outset that nobody will be allowed to go into camp under this system unless he has the written authority of his parents. Therefore, if my hon. friend has doubts as to the propriety of his children going into one of these camps, those children will be left at home. The system is purely voluntary. There is no ground for the dread with which the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) and the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Beland) regard these boys going into camp, because those camps will be conducted under proper conditions. The manhood of any country is built up by trust and not by restraint, not by keeping men in swaddling clothes or tied to apron strings Search the record of all lands and you always find that the boys who have become the real men of the country are those who have been trusted in their youth. I have yet to see the boy or youth who was fully trusted betray the trust reposed in him Our estimates are growing. But my hon friend from Beauce (Mr. Beland) sat here anticipating a position as minister of the Crown for a good many years, and saw the military estimates growing year by year, yet found no reason to stand up and, with lowering countenance, object to the increase. I have reduced the military estimates this year. And, taking out the items on capital account, the military estimates, considering the number of troops trained and the work done, are almost infinitely lower than they have been in the past five years. Yet now, for the first time, the hon. member grows apprehensive. But I know he is not very serious. I trust to have him take part in the camps this summer. Let him become a scout leader and lead his boys along the road to the camp. Let him look after his boys, and I am satisfied he will be much more favourable to the training of these boys in camp.

Let us instruct boys in a military education, the same as we instruct them in reading, writing and arithmetic. Do it when they are young, you cannot do it when they are old. I challenge all the military men in the country to show me one proficient military man who did not receive a military training in his boyhood. I am satisfied that the hon. gentleman himself, when he goes back home, will undertake to form a cadet corps in his neighbourhood.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend's versatility is so amusing that, as the proposition was not a serious one, you could hardly understand him discussing it in the way he does. I wish to register my protest against the proposition that we should vote $130,000 for the purpose of establishing cadet camps in this country, in utter disregard of the provisions of the Strathcona fund, and the efforts the trustees of that fund have made and the arrangements they have made with provincial governments. My hon. friend, in his memorandum, under the heading of the cadet corps, has gone into the thing very fully on pages 7 and 11. He shows that the cadet corps are the product of the schools under which the Strathcona Trust are expending the money. I say the minister is displaying a lack of care, and is imperilling the whole system that has been built up by the Strathcona fund.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The Strathcona trust has nothing whatever to do

with the cadet system. The Strathcona trustees work altogether with the schools. The two are entirely distinct.

Mr. KAY. The minister said a few moments ago that the infantry men had objected to the four days additional training.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Some of them.

Mr. KAY. May I ask if the cavalry men were anixous for the four days additional?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Most of the infantry reports say they are in favour of 16 days; so are the officers of the cavalry association. We have not heard from the rank and file yet.

Mr. KAY. It appears to me that this four days additional will mean a large decrease in the number of men who are willing to go out and be trained, it will also mean a great difficulty in getting officers. An officer's holidays, if he is in business, are only about two weeks. At present he is giving all his holidays to the militia service, and I do not think it will be possible for him to give to that service any more than the two weeks he is now given as holidays. As to the rank and file, they are drawn from among the farmers' sons. They are assembled between the 15th and the end of June, when work is comparatively slack. I do not think it will be possible to get them to give up three weeks of their time, because haying usually commences about that time.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The views of the hon. gentleman are my own views. In the old time I filled in 16 days in camp. But my predecessor and the officers of the force have been petitioning for this, the Cavalry Association and the Artillery Association have asked for it, and it was all cut and dried, I believe, nearly a year ago, that this should be done. I did not wish to step in and, with a wave of the hand, to cancel the arrangement, and run counter to the wishes of the department. Therefore, I let it go so far as the cavalry and artillery are concerned, because they seemed to want it. We will try it for one year. But it is not too late to change it yet.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). Before this item passes, I would like to put myself on record as being in sympathy with the words of apprehension which have been spoken by the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Beland). I am afraid, however, that anything I may say on this question will fall on unsympathetic ears in the person of my hon. friend the Minister of Militia (Mr. Hughes). Of course, it is natural that I should view things a little differently from him on this question, because, as he has pointed out, in a measure truthfully, an early training has a great deal to do with one's future thinking and attitude upon public questions. I spent a great many years at the university learning to save life, if possible; my hon. friend's profession, when it is practised, has a contrary effect. Now, I am not so sure but that when men are in an emergency they would just about as soon go to a doctor as to my hon. friend. It is one of the peculiarities of human life, one of the mysteries of the world, that when people go out and kill one another, they take means for restoring them in case they have not performed the operation successfully which they undertook when they went out to the field of battle. That is one of the peculiarities of the world, which I think is leading a large portion of the inhabitants of this country to look upon it with a little less enthusiasm than burns in the martial bosom of my hon. friend. I am not sure that the public of Canada do not sympathize more with me upon that question than with my hon. friend. In regard to these cadet corps, I am not sure that my hon. friend is historically correct. He knows much more about military matters than I do, and I think he challenged the House to produce cases of men becoming good soldiers who had not been trained in their youth. If he deigns to look at this point again, I would like him to tell me where Cromwell's army learned their soldiering. They were not trained soldiers, they had to meet trained soldiers, and in the end they succeeded better than the regularly trained men of the day. In Canada we have a number of men in the western provinces who use their guns, not in shooting one another, but who are good marksmen; and I am certain that without any cadet training, or without going into camps, numbers of these men, if occasion arose, would give a splendid account of themselves although they have not undergone this regular drill. There are cases in history of volunteers having proved better than regularly trained men. I think my hon. friend does not carry me on that point.

We have a great deal to do in this great country with a very small population. I view with apprehension the extreme enthusiasm of my hon. friend. His enthusiasm is leading to some good work in this way that he is devoting himself, with that tremendous energy of his, to his department, and he has been very courteous in sending out to us, along the line of the work that he is engaged in, full information in a way which is most commendable. I can only wish that he would devote his enthusiasm to saving men's lives instead of destroying them. Of course, that is the

fault of my early training. I do not think that the business of killing has taken hold of the Canadian people as it has of many of the nations of Europe and as it seems to have taken hold of my hon. friend. I am certain that there is a large sympathy with this line of thought. This seems an enormous sum of money—over 8 million dollars. I am going to anticipate a possible answer that has already been made. I must say as something of a party politician that I rose with some reluctance because I anticipated what the minister said in reply to another hon. member that there was not much protest in regard to the mounting militia expenditure during the time of the last government. But, that is not a fair criticism to apply to this cadet movement because this is a new thing. The appeal of my hon. friend from Beauce (Mr. Beland) is well worthy of consideration that we should go very carefully in this matter.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. gentleman has spent his life in saving people.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). I said I went to the university to learn how.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Most of us avoid the doctors; in fact, doctor's mistakes are always buried six feet underground and lawyer's six feet over ground. The hon. member referred to Cromwell's army. Now every man in Cromwell's army was skilled in the use of the quarter-staff. These young men were not only experienced musketeers but they were skilled in the use of the quarter-staff which became the sabre and the spear and that is the reason why the rank and file, achieved their victory over the cavaliers. The hon. gentleman speaks of western men. There is not a man in the west but has been trained to the saddle and trained to shoot, almost from the time of his birth. They are born cadets and that is the kind of knowledge that I am trying to inculcate here.

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONTINENTAL CAN COMPANY.

Further consideration in Committee of the Whole of Bill (No. 119), respecting certain patents of the Continental Can Company.—Mr. Fripp.

Mr. CARVELL. Yesterday, the Prime Minister himself asked that this Bill should stand for some reason, and in his absence now, it would be well to allow it to stand further until the right hon. gentleman can give his views upon it.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer).

Mr. FRIPP. The Prime Minister has no objection to this Bill, so far as I know. It stood because I was not here at the moment.

Mr. CARVELL. The reason given by the Prime Minister was that the Bill was objectionable in some respects, and he thought it should stand. I have no objection in opposing the Bill except that I think its principle is bad if not vicious, and I think the request of the Prime Minister should be complied with and the Bill allowed to stand.

Progress reported.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 155) to incorporate the British American Trust Company.—Mr. Blain.

Bill (No. 145) to ratify and confirm certain agreements between the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway Commission and the Grank Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Currie.

Bill (No. 146) respecting the Saskatchewan Central Railway Company.—Mr. Martin, Regina.

Bill (No. 147) for the relief of Isabella Helen Horncastle.—Mr. Clark, Red Deer.

Bill (No. 148) to incorporate International Guarantee Company.—Mr. McCraney.

Bill (No. 153) for the relief of George MacKay Sutherland.—Mr. MacNutt.

Bill (No. 154) to incorporate the Guarantee Life Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. MacNutt.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Militia and Defence—annual drill, $1,730,000.

Mr. G. BOYER (Vaudreuil) (Translation). Mr. Speaker, while addressing us this afternoon, the hon. minister said that his intention was to raise the soldiers' fee to .75 cents a day. I approve this measure for I know what difficulties are met with when taking in recruits as soldiers, every year, when camping time arrives. The insufficient indemnity paid until now has always been a sourse of annoyance which was very often a drawback in choosing desirable recruits from the different bodies. On the other hand, I notice that the hon. minister did not mention if the allocation was also to be increased for the horses. Presently, at the time of camping, the hiring price of a horse is $1 a day. Then the hon. minister knows as well as do the superior officers how hard it is for us to procure cavalry horses. Any way, the department knows all about this matter. The difficulty is still greater in the case of cities. It is acknowledged that the cavalry regiments of the cities can hardly reach the camps with their effective force. It is easier to find horses in the country, if the time for camp-

ing is before hay making time. But, if for some reason the drilling time is somewhat delayed, these difficulties become almost insurmountable, unless provided for with an augmentation as it was done at the time of the tercentenary feasts at Quebec when the indemnity was raised from $1 to $2. The existing indemnity rate of $1 is not inducing the farmers to hire their best horses when these are so much exposed to accidents of all kinds owing to bad weather and transportation. Should the pay be more liberal, the value of the horses would be superior and the soldiers' services more effective. Besides that, there are the indemnities in the case of accidents or wounds which do not cover the loss of the animal. There lies the clue to the greater difficulties that we have to meet with in the country when we want to hire good horses, and, that accounts for the fact that we often are supplied with a quality of horses far inferior to the real cavalry horses. Owing to these reasons, I would not be opposed to indemnity rate being raised by the hon. minister to $1.25 or even $1.50 a day. In certain localities of the country, it may be easier to secure cavalry horses for the present indemnity rate; but, in the part where I have the honour to command a cavalry squadron, it is not so. I again say that it would be a good policy on the part of the hon. minister to make the augmentation that I propose and that has anyhow been suggested by many others.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria, Ont.). I fully appreciate all that the hon. gentleman has said in regard to the small sum paid for horses taken by the young men to camp. They have to be exposed to all kinds of weather and to other unfavourable conditions; but year by year there is an improvement in the class of horses, and we hope that next year we shall be able materially to assist our friends all along the line. What my hon. friend says about the value of the horses taken to camp is true, and to meet that the department has raised the indemnity for a horse that is lost or injured from $125 to $175. The department is always ready to deal generously in the case of horses injured or killed in camp. The remarks which the hon. gentleman has made meet my hearty approval, and the matter will receive the consideration of the department.

Mr. BOYER. Mr. Speaker, the military regulations do not permit to enlist recruits under 18 years of age. Nevertheless, we have in the country strong young men under 18 years who are well built and would be splendid cavaliers. Last year, when I had to enlist cavaliers for the squadron which I command, I experienced some difficulty to find young men of 18 years and more because the majority of those whose age is in conformity with the regulations are busy on the farm. It would have been possible to fill in the number needed for the squadron with young men under 18 who are well developed, robust lads; for, after all, our aim is chiefly to get good cavaliers, and the young folks in the country commence very young to go on horseback. It is a sport for youngsters. The enlisting work would be far easier if we had the liberty to select our recruits among the oldest cadets, and even besides them, amongst the young men whose physical qualities, in the matter of development would make them suitable. I consider that the department should give the commanding officers of force more latitude as regards the field of action.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. member has referred to the fact that it is difficult at certain seasons of the year to recruit from men over the age of eighteen, and he has pointed out that to which I made reference this afternoon, that the young soldier is very often the best soldier. It has been my custom never to ask a young man his age, so long as he was large enough and manly enough to fill the uniform. On one occasion a young man who was a non-commissioned officer in charge of an outpost, was brought before his commanding officer, who asked him, 'how old are you?' 'Do you mean my official age, or my real age?' he asked, and he gave both. His official age was 21, his real age 17. When I commanded a regiment, my custom was to have a large contingent of young men in the service. At Rigaud college, my hon. friend has a very excellent cadet corps, and if he can make satisfactory arrangements to ensure that these young men will be looked after, I have no doubt that he can get a splendid lot of recruits from them.

Mr. BOYER. Does the hon. minister mean to say that we could ignore the regulation which exists to-day concerning the recruiting of young men which I have just spoken of?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I am only making suggestions, not laying down the law.

Mr. CARVELL. The minister says the department has always been very generous in paying claims for injuries to horses. My experience has been quite the reverse, and I hope he will take some trouble to look into the manner in which the department has been paying for damages to horses in the past. I think he will find that not only has the patience of the owner been exhausted before he has been paid, but he

has spent about half the amount the department has allowed him, before he has got it. I believe there is no matter coming before the Department of Militia and Defence, in which there is as much negligence as there is in paying these claims.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The matter has been up, and I am informed by the officers of the department, that in the great majority of such cases, under my predecessor, the claims have been settled before the troops left camp. Even where the injury is only apparent, the claim is settled in the most expeditious manner. Since I assumed office I have closed up several cases, and in every instance, the officers of the department were most anxious first to get at the facts and then to do ample justice to the man whose horse was concerned.

Mr. CARVELL. The fault is not in the district officers. It is quite true that when a horse is injured in camp there is always a board of inquiry, which makes a finding, but that finding is not carried out for months, or sometimes years. I do not want to name officials who have been derelict in their duty in this matter, but I can give the minister facts that are within my knowledge, of what has taken place within the last two years, and I can give him the names if necessary.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). A great many men in the volunteer force throughout the country think that they have no means of communicating with the department, or with their member of parliament. When the militia law was being passed, I took the ground that it should be made clear and distinct that every man who became a volunteer loses no right which he possesses as a citizen. While in camp or on duty he is subject to the King's Regulations and to the Army Act; but at other times he is as free as any other citizen. Therefore, there is nothing to prevent him communicating with a member of parliament or unofficially direct with myself, and if any communication of this kind is received by me, the district officer will be called on at once to make an explanation why the matter has not been attended to.

Mr. MACDONALD. Without going through the official channels?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). There is no need of that. This country would be worse than Russia if a volunteer could not communicate with his member of parliament or with the minister direct.

Mr. MACDONALD. What about discipline?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What right has an officer of a company to control the men of his company during the 350 days of the year that they are not under him in camp? That would be the worst sort of tyranny. A private can take any action against his officer, provided he is not on duty or in uniform, and the only recourse the officer would have against him would be in the civil courts of the country.

Mr. MACDONALD. That is a new theory.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It is not a new theory. It is the militia law of England, which has been in force for many generations. The citizen loses no privilege by becoming a volunteer. While on duty, of course, he does, but during any other hour of the year he is a free man.

The army officers on the British militia list were not free, they were subject to the King's Regulations and the Army Act throughout the year, because the great majority of them had served in the regular army, and were receiving allowances on that account; but the men of the militia force in England were never subject to the King's Regulations, and the Army Act except when on duty.

Mr. ROBB. This afternoon the minister made the statement that from his experience only those who received a military training in their teens made good soldiers. Now, the minister himself is a gallant soldier, he has given evidence of that in Canada and in Great Britain, and he is a fair man, and I ask him if he thinks his statement of this afternoon is not a little unfair to the farmers who in 1866 and 1870, left their ploughs and went out to take up arms to defend their country? Was his statement not a little unfair also to the men who accompanied him to South Africa and won honour and glory for Canada on the veldt.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I fail to see any unfairness. I want to tell my hon. friend a thing which perhaps he did not know, that the men who turned out in 1866 and 1870, could pick off black squirrels on the top of a maple tree with a rifle when they were ten years of age. That is in harmony with the very statement I was making. These young farmers like the young men from the west, are trained along those lines and I want to train all the boys of the country in the same way so that when they take a rifle in their hands they will be able to pick a squirrel off a tree or a wood-chuck off a stone pile.

Mr. MACDONALD. I want to know whether my hon. friend's doctrine in re-

gard to the rights of members of the force with respect to invoking the aid of the representative of their county in getting compensation when their horses have been killed or injured, is one which is confined merely to cases of that character, because a very dangerous line is drawn there. Does my hon. friend mean to say that if a question of discipline arises in a camp that the militia men affected must not go to the military authorities in the way as laid down in the military regulations, but must go to a member of parliament for his support, and that he can practically tell his superior officer that he does not need to pay any attention to him, but that he will get his member to bring the matter up in parliament? Surely the minister does not go that far?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I will say this much: If a soldier in camp loses his horse and the matter is reported upon by the board, the proper course has been followed, he will get justice. The case pointed out by the member for Carleton, which is I trust, a little overdrawn——

Mr. CARVELL. It is not overdrawn. I can tell the minister that I actually paid money out of my own pocket towards the settlement of these claims.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). In case a young man cannot get redress through the regular military channel, and in case red tape procedure would prevent him from taking proper action, I want to proclaim far and wide that when a young man doffs his uniform and returns to civilian life, he is a free man, and has a right to appeal to his member of parliament, or the Minister of Militia, or any other man he chooses, and there is no power under the law to say otherwise to him. Let my good friend, who is a lawyer, read up the law and he will admit that what I say is correct.

Mr. MACDONALD. The minister knows very well that there are a great many laws in the land which are more honoured in the breach than in the observance.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). But the law is clear.

Mr. MACDONALD. The minister knows that, and he knows very well the traditions that exist in the militia in this country. If the course suggested by the Minister of Militia to obtain a remedy is followed it will amount to a very grave breach of discipline. Because all that a man needs to do who has got a political pull is to tell his superior officer he can go hang. He can say that he will get his member to bring the matter up in the House and get after the officer. If the powers of the Militia Council, or whatever body has control of the militia of this country, are not adequate they ought to be made broader. The minister is really going too far.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I am sorry not to have won my hon. friend's approval because I have been sitting up nights trying to do that. What I say is that if a young man fails to obtain redress, after the matter has been brought up in camp and has gone through the legitimate military channel——

Mr. MACDONALD. He must do that first.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Certainly I have said so. In case he fails to get justice after having done that, I will give it to him. Justice is what we are most concerned with, that is what these young men want, and I will see that they get it.

Mr. CARVELL. The minister is now laying down a new law.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). No. Not a new law.

Mr. CARVELL. If a young man takes the matter up in a proper manner in camp and a board is convened and finds that the horse for which claim was brought is not injured, and the young man comes here—accompanied by the veterinary who said he was satisfied the horse was injured—will my hon. friend allow him to urge his claim through a political or business channel, or let it go back to the board?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I must correct my hon. friend. I am not a lawyer, although I have two distinguished lawyers questioning me at the present time, and I am much surprised to hear one of those lawyers admitting there is a law on the statute-book, while the other says that I am laying down a new law. I am not laying down a new law, the law is there on the statute-book of Canada.

Mr. CARVELL. A new interpretation of the law sometimes has the effect of a new law.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). There is no new interpretation. This has been the practice for many years and I cannot grasp the point of the hon. gentleman's argument about a political channel. I can assure him that if justice has been denied there no red tape will be allowed to stand in the way. If any new evidence can be adduced it will be brought before a new board which will settle the matter whether it goes through an official or non-official channel.

Mr. CARVELL. Then I understand the claimant will not get redress from the min-

ister or through parliament, until the matter has been settled by the board.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Not much.

Mr. ROBB. The minister is laying down the regulations. Suppose a horse takes the distemper in camp and when it returns home gives the distemper to other horses, have the owners any claim against the department?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I will refer the hon. gentleman to the legal lights on his own side.

Mr. KAY. I can support the statements of the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) as to the delay in paying for horses that are injured. I know of several cases that occured in the last camp that were not settled for three or four months, in fact I had several applications made to me in that connection during the last election.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Not before the election?

Mr. KAY. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Then I can assure my hon. friend that it is a most serious reflection on my predecessor in office, a more serious reflection than I would make concerning him myself. I gave the department every credit for settling these claims expeditiously, and I am sorry to hear they were not.

Mr. HENDERSON. I certainly think there should be no red tape about the settlement of claims of this kind. In my part of the country the farmers freely loan their horses to the Missauga troop, and frequently the horses are returned injured and practically almost useless. I will cite a case which I think occurred about two years ago. A farmer lent his horse and it was returned to him injured. He made application for compensation through what he thought was the regular military channel, and was awarded $21, I believe. He was not satisfied with that and I think returned the cheque to the late Minister of Militia. I took the matter up with the department and it resulted in $130 being allowed for the horse. My recommendation in cases of that kind is to go direct to the department and get redress, because I find that the regular military channel for settling these claims does not seem to comprehend the value of a horse, or what the farmer is really entitled to. Besides I do not like the delays that occur in cases of the kind. My experience has been that the best thing is to go direct to the minister, and I have done so on different occasions.

And I would say for the former Minister of Militia that he was very fair; he did not hesitate to take the matter up himself and adjudicate upon it. Of course, I was particular to furnish him with statutory declarations and other evidence as to the facts. Then the award was made and the money paid. I think that is the proper way to proceed. When a farmer is good enough to loan his horse to a trooper and the horse is returned having caught the distemper and being made useless for the time, or injured, it is the duty of the government to give redress at once, so that next year when the troopers want to borrow horses they can get them. Otherwise the farmers will be very chary of allowing their horses to be used in this way. I trust a system will be adopted by which the farmers will not be put to extra trouble, but will get redress at once.

Mr. MACDONALD. I do not know whether it is under this vote that my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes, Victoria), made a purchase of automobiles. Some curious statements are made in regard to his action in making that purchase. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will be good enough to explain for what purpose he purchased these machines and whether they were bought by tender?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Any question the hon. member wishes to ask I shall only be too pleased to answer. I am not responsible for rumours. I have not time to read the papers, so know nothing of what the rumours are—and care less. I purchased twelve automobiles for the department. Our officers on their tours of inspection, travelling by train or stage, have to wait and often lose a great deal of time. They have to engage livery rigs to reach stations where they can take trains. We find that their time is more than five-sixths lost. We figured it up and had the advice of experts upon it. The cost of automobile travelling may be higher, by 50 per cent than the same work done by rail and stage, but we estimate that we shall do more than twice as much work. The world is going on and the department is not going to allow the little sentiment that is attempted to be created among farmers regarding automobiles to stand in the way of the effectiveness of its work. I hope our opponents will go on trying to arouse that sentiment, for the farmers appreciate automobiles, and many of them have them and know how they save time, which means money. So, the anxiety of certain gentlemen for the welfare of the farmers over these automobiles will be misplaced. We are going to do twice the work for half the money. As to the tendering, it is impossible to tender for automobiles.

Mr. MACDONALD. How much did they cost?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). They cost $850 each, with extra tires and fittings.

Mr. MACDONALD. Does not the statute require you to call for tenders for a purchase so large?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Not at all. I consulted fifty different agents describing to each what I wanted. If I had taken the assurance of each of these as to the best machines, I should have had fifty different machines at the cost of, from $1,000, to $8,000. But I could only buy 12. I bought the machine that I knew personally and that was recommended by three separate agents of different companies, after I had explained the purpose for which we wanted them. They are the cheapest in the market and recognized the world over as being the best cheap, handy, strong machine. There are eighty thousand of them made every year. We can take these machines and throw them away at the end of the year and have money in our pockets for our purposes over buying expensive machines. We do not want to have our men travel in too great luxury, but we want to give them facilities for their work.

Mr. MACDONALD. Where are you going to use them?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The district officer in every district will have one for his own inspection work. Take the hon. gentleman's own county. Though that county is as well furnished with railways as any in the Dominion, I suppose, still if the officer has to visit Stellarton, Westville, Pictou, Trenton, New Glasgow, and must go by train or livery, he is sure to lose time. And in the ordinary county that is not so well served by railways, the officer will be able to save half his time.

Mr. MACDONALD. Do you employ chauffeurs?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). At the present time the officer is entitled to a servant, and he will take the place.

Mr. CARVELL. All this sounds very nice coming from the Minister of Militia. He has been telling us many nice things this afternoon, and no one so far seems to have felt like telling him the truth. But the truth is that what the minister has just been saying is absolute nonsense at least so far as it applies to the province of New Brunswick. When the minister tells me that the inspecting officer in New Brunswick is going to save the cost of an automobile even if the cost is only $1,000 in one year or ten years, I tell him that he is talking simple nonsense, I have no milder words to use.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I did not say that he would save the cost of an automobile in a year. I said we were going to save half the time——

Mr. CARVELL. The hon. gentleman is hedging now. But now, let me show him the position. In the first place, there is not a militia officer in Canada that works—I think I am safe in saying it—more than two hours a day, and I think that in putting it at that I am making a big allowance. They do not have the work to do. Take the militia officers of the Headquarters Staff, why they are walking over one another. They are busy renting more rooms to find places in which to stay.

Mr. EDWARDS. How long has that been going on??

Mr. CARVELL. Too long. For eight or nine years.

Mr. EDWARDS. It is the first time you have mentioned it.

Mr. CARVELL. It may be. It is not the first time I have thought of it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CARVELL. My hon. friends mav laugh. But I want to tell them that they will realize the position we have been in, sitting behind this general staff for the last six or eight years. They will be as sick of it as we are. We have had our fill and plenty of this general staff. I want to tell the hon. minister again that there is not a militia officer in Canada who does inspecting work, who works more than two months out of the year at the business. A man can start out on inspection work in New Brunswick—and I know what I am talking about—and taking the regular conveyances, he can inspect every regimental and company armoury in the province and he could not find two months work in it. More than that, he cannot find opportunity to use his automobile for more than two months out of the year. This is simply a means of increasing the perquisites of the general staff and district officers in different parts of the country. I have not criticised the minister severely so far. But when he gets up and tells us that it is necessary in the interest of economy, and in order to facilitate the inspection of the armouries to buy automobiles for these people, I think it time that somebody should tell him the truth. I am not appealing to the farmers in this matter. Many of our farmers have automobiles, and many others would like to have them. The farmers have no prejudice against automobiles.

But they do have a prejudice against men receiving the salaries that these men are receiving, and giving very little service for it, and then to go and buy them automobiles to ride around in.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I am surprised to hear my hon. friend get up and slate his leader and his colleagues who have been so long in office; while the hon. gen-

tleman, who knew these things were going on all these years, sat dumb as an oyster.

Mr. CARVELL. We never got to the point of buying automobiles.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). When the hon. gentleman talks about there being no work for these officers to do in New Brunswick, he does not know what he is talking about, he is talking nonsense. Let me remind him of the units scattered over his own province, scattered over miles and miles of territory, where the officers have to make long drives, and hang around the stations waiting for the trains, hours at a time, both days and nights. Every cadet corps, every rifle association has to be inspected. The staff officer for that purpose in New Brunswick has to work night and day, and does his duty as well as any other officer in the Dominion of Canada. I want to tell my hon. friend from Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) that if he has had in the past cause of complaint he is not going to have that cause of complaint very long, because I can assure him that if there are staff officers who have been loafing around doing only two hours work in the day, that will soon be put a stop to. The hon. gentleman has been condoning it, but no hon. gentleman on the government side will tolerate, as he has tolerated, any such conduct on the part of officers who have so little to do, and if there is no work for them to do, they will be disposed of. I think the hon. gentleman, who is himself a soldier, should not be casting reflections upon the force, seeing he has failed in the past in having these wrongs remedied.

Mr. CARVELL. I protested in the past, perhaps not as strongly as I ought to have done, but I protested all these years. Notwithstanding the extracts from the report of General French which the hon. gentleman is going to fall back upon, I may tell him that we have got too much militarism in this country. My hon. friend talks about what they are going to do here, in one of these numerous memoranda that he distributes among the members to prove that he is not increasing the cost of the militia to the country. I find here a most astounding statement that the people of Canada spend to-day on sheer gold lace militarism one-third as much as they are paying in Germany, which is supposed to be the most military-ridden country in the world. Just think of it! I figured out that the people of Canada are paying 34 per cent as much as they are paying in Germany per capita, one-quarter as much as they are paying in Great Britain, one-quarter as much as they are paying in France, and 57 per cent of what they are paying in Italy. It is a remarkable statement, and the people of this country may well pause and consider where we are going. It is bad enough to add half a million dollars, as my hon. friend is doing this year, but when it comes to buying automobiles for these $3,000, $4,000 and $5,000 a year officers to ride around in, I think it is straining the people's patience to the breaking point.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Would the hon. gentleman have them go by foot? As to the comparison with Germany and other nations, let me point out that Canada to-day has a very large area with a very small population, while Germany has a very small area with a very large population, which of course affects the pro rata of expenditure. But as Canada fills up, the cost per head will naturally decrease.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). It is said that the best literary critics are men who never wrote a book, and the best musical critics are men who cannot tell one note from another I do not profess to be a military critic, but I think I do know something of public opinion throughout the country on this subject. There is a general impression prevailing in the rural districts that there is proportionately too much spent on militarism. The Minister of Militia is so filled with the spirit of militarism that he really cannot see beyond his environment. To him militarism is like grace to a Christian, he cannot have too much of it. When one considers that for arts, agriculture and statistics, we are only providing about $2,000,000 in the main estimates, and for militia something over $8,000,000, four times as much, without taking into consideration another million dollars or so for armouries and drill halls, and one thing and another, one is driven to the conviction that it is time to call a halt. Besides, this great sum does not include what is to be spent on the navy. When they compare what is spent on militarism with the amount spent on agriculture, I think the farmers are well justified in entertaining a feeling of great dissatisfaction. I know this thing has been going on for years. I do not say the present administration is alone responsble for it. But it is so that this feeling of dissatisfaction been prevalent for years. I was glad to hear my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) express the sentiments he did. I know these sentiments obtain largely on the other side of the House as well as on this side. In fact. I have heard some of the hon. gentlemen opposite express the opinion that there is too much money spent on militarism. Now, the Minister of Militia says that he must purhcase automobiles for his officers. They may effect a saving, as he has pointed out, it may be that the services of his officers may be utilized to

better advantage by providing this luxury. But the country will not look at it in that way. The country will regard these automobiles as a means of procuring joy-rides for these officers, to go around the country with gilt braid on their coats, as the swells of the land. I do not think there is much dissatisfaction against the ordinary soldier, but it is against the expensive staff officers, the pageantry that we see on the outside, that the dissatisfaction exists. Now as to the cadet corps, no doubt it is a good thing to give boys a military training. It is a good thing to subject them to proper discipline, but that is not the whole thing. There seems to be a spirit prevailing in the militia department that if we can organize all the boys into cadet corps we can dispense with clergymen, churches, schools and everything else of that sort. You see abundant evidence of that in this pamphlet. It makes mention of the cost of the negative army as it is called in that pamphlet or advance memoranda; it talks of the amount spent in keeping up reformatories, the administration of justice, and the expenditure on rum and tobacco, as if a military training was going to do away with all these things. I think the idea of cadet corps is a good one, but I do not think it is a good thing to send them off to camp to give them a training, when you might give them the same training at home in schools and colleges.

Give them training, if you will, in the common schools and colleges, give them this training under the influence of their own homes. I do not approve of the policy of making it too easy for the boys to go to camp miles away from their homes. The minister says that they are not obliged to go if they do not want to and that they will not be permitted to go unless the permission of their parents is obtained. That is all very true, but you know very well that boys are curious and full of the spirit of adventure and perhaps the father will be soft and easy and allow the child to go. The minister says that the best way is to put boys upon their honour, and he gave us a lecture upon how to deal with boys. I am not in a position to give a lecture on that subject, but I think there is a good deal of truth in the old homely saying: Spare the rod and spoil the child. That truth has to be acted upon to a certain extent and while the idea of putting a boy upon his honour may be all right to a limited extent it is not as effective as the command of the father or mother.

Mr. EDWARDS. You believe in militarism in the home then?

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). No, that is not militarism. The home life and discipline have a sweetening effect that militarism does not possess at all. As I said before, I do not not know anything about militarism.

Mr. CURRIE. Anybody could see that.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). That is very true, but I rose for the purpose of giving expression to the opinion of the country. Ninety per cent of the people in the rural districts feel that there is too much militarism going on. I am not blaming the present administration for that; the same thing happened to a large extent under the late administration and hon. gentlemen opposite, when they sat on this side of the House, said that if it had not been so late in the session when the estimates were going through they would have brought up and given expression to that very same opinion. But now with a still further increase with such innovations as automobiles for the officers and drill in camp for boys of tender age, it is time to call a halt and do so in no uncertain sound. There seems to be a disposition to say nothing in criticism of the militia as if it were something sacrilegious to say anything that was not most respectful of it. I think the militia ought to be criticised and it is open to criticism just as much as any other branch of the service.

Mr. EDWARDS. I think it would only be fair that members on this side of the House should permit hon. gentlemen opposite to get rid of the views which they have had bottled up for the last ten years and which are beginning to effervesce at such a rate that the cork has flown out of the bottle. They want to express now what has been on their minds for a long time and which they have not had an opportunity to express before. The hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) says that he has thought this thing for six or eight years. Therefore, we ought to be fair and give the hon. gentleman an opportunity to express here to-night what he has had bottled up for the past eight years. We have learned from the hon. member for Carleton to-night that in the past men have had horses injured in camp and that they have received no proper compensation for the loss which they have sustained in that way. We have not heard one word from the hon. gentleman in all these years so far as that is concerned. In all these years there has been in his mind very serious objection to the spending of from $6,000,000 to $8,000,000 a year on the militia, yet not one word of criticism has he seen fit to offer in this House. I found some difficulty in getting certain claims redressed for injuries done to horses in my county until

the present government came in and I am pleased to say that I have succeeded in getting claims fixed up which have stood in abeyance for a considerable length of time. I want to repeat to-night what I said when I was on the other side of the House and that is that I do not think that the amount of money spent in this country for militia and defence is out of all proportion to the amount of money that is spent, for instance, upon agriculture. I said that on the other side of the House and I repeat that statement from this side of the House to-night. That is still my opinion. I think there is plenty of room for curtailing expenditure along that line. There has been a greate deal of room for it in years past and I am glad to see that the present hon. Minister of of Militia (Mr. Huhges) is making a cut in the neighbourhood of half a million dollars as compared with the estimates of last year.

Mr. CARVELL. He has made an increase over last year.

Mr. EDWARDS. No, that is the statement that he has made.

Mr. CARVELL. If my hon. friend will look at page 48 of the estimates he will find that the minister demands an increase of $191,000 and there are other items that can be figured up beyond that and we will get the supplementaries for the next session of parliament.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). As prepared by this government my estimates are nearly half a million less than the estimates which I found had been prepared by the former government.

Mr. CARVELL. That may be so.

Mr. EDWARDS. Then, as I understand I think this is a step in the right direction. I do not think that you can find fault with these hon. gentlemen for criticising these estimates, but I think it would come with better grace from them if they had given a little of this criticism in years gone by instead of reserving it all for the present occasion.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska). (Translation). Mr. Chairman, I cannot let this resolution pass without expressing my deep surprise at the stand taken by the hon. member coming from my province, and who sits o nthe other side of the House. I expected on their part virulent protest against the item asked by the hon. member the Minister of Militia, and I was far from thinking that he would meet his request with an approbatory silence.

I have taken part in the now famous Drummond-Arthabaska in 1910. I have heard during that election many of these hon. members, criticising the expenses incurred by the government, for the annual camps of the Canadian militia.

I have heard them make violent appeals and state that the government were spending hundreds of thousands of dollers sending young men—I apologize to the House for using the expression, but it was the one they used—to get drunk in the camps at Lévis, Three Rivers and St. Johns.

I am exceedingly surprised to see that to-day, when an additional expenditure of $130,000 is proposed, not for the annual drill of the ordinary militia, but towards the training of school boys, ten or twelve years old, who, as stated by the minister, will be turned into as many soldiers. I am, I repeat it, exceedingly surprised that not a word of protest is forthcoming from hon. members on the other side.

Evidently, in regard to this question, as in regard to several others, which have come up since the opening of this session, it is the faction represented in the Cabinet by the hon. Minister of Militia, which has won the day over the other faction represented by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) and the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier). The bellicose views of my hon. friend the Minister of Militia have prevailed over the peaceful teachings of the hon. Minister of Public Works and his supporters.

In the course of the last electoral contest, when the establishment of a Canadian navy was being denounced so passionately in the province of Quebec, I remember hearing the hon. member for I'Islet (Mr. Paquet) state in fervid tones that the government had written a bloody page in the annals of our country. I wonder what the hon. member and his friends think of the page which the hon. Minister of Militia is about to write just now in our annals. As a matter of fact, what the Minister of Militia is anxious to accomplish through this resolution is, as I have stated, to convert into soldiers all the school children in the country. The proof of it, Mr. Chairman, is in the manifest, a copy of which the hon. minister, has caused to be handed to every hon. member and in which his object is clearly set forth:

> If the nation is to learn to shoot this must be taught to the boys. If this movement is handled by a capable and diplomatic staff working hand in hand with the educational authorities it will mean that every boy in the country will learn to shoot and drill, and without arousing the prejudices of the people universal training of the youth of the country will be obtained.

Mr. Chairman, if that radical departure in our military organizations had been proposed by the late government, you know as well as I do, what denunciations would have been heard in our old province of Quebec. The bugbear of militarism would have been exposed, and to my mind with some measure of justification.

As for me, I agree with those hon. gentlemen who have taken a stand against this new system of enrolling all our young men under the flag of militarism.

Our population is not enormous enough, our country's development has not reached such a point as to justify such an extravagant expenditure for military purposes. In brief the requirements of our agriculture are too great to allow our government to divert from its proper use such a considerable amount.

I also object to that part of the estimates providing for the purchase of automobiles for officers in the militia. Such an expenditure will not meet with the approval of the people. My hon. friend is quite enthusiastic when military requirements are being dealt with; but surely he does not wish his officers to wage war in autos. I do not think the Canadian people will approve of such extravagant expenditure. I take strong exception to the new policy expounded by the Minister of Militia and I appeal to my hon. friends on the other side, especially those representing Quebec constituents if they were serious, to join with me and bring their influence to bear on the minister, so that he will cut down his estimates to a reasonable figure.

Mr. E. PAQUET (L'Islet). (Translation) Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to address the House on this question, but I see my hon. friend from Kamouraska has suddenly become greatly concerned with the interest of the farming class. However, the hon. member, in the course of last session did not find a word of criticism to utter in connection with the report of General French. That officer was sent to Canada to completely reorganize our militia. His conclusions are towards increasing the expenditure in this connection. According to General French, there should be, in the first place, a body of 100,000 men and then a reserve of 100,000 more. That report was brought down and laid on the table of the House, and the hon. member had not a word of reproof for the right hon. gentleman who was then leader of the House. During the campaign in Drummond-Arthabaska, I pointed out that while only one million was spent in aid of agriculture, six millions were being expended on the militia. While not approving entirely the increased expenditure on the militia, I must congratulate the government on having given their first thought to the farming community, and framing a policy which will ensure the improvement of our national highways and at the same time, bring about the agricultural progress of Canada.

Mr. VERVILLE. I wish all the members of the House had as much knowledge of militarism as I have, which is none at all. The hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Paquet) takes great pride in the present government for what they have done for the agricultural classes and the improvements of country roads, but so far I have not seen them do anything for the labouring people of Canada.

An hon. MEMBER. What about the automobiles.

Mr. VERVILLE. The government did not give the labouring people any automobiles. I cannot blame the government for buying those automobiles, because, as I understand it, the wars of the future will be so conducted that the rank and file will be placed in front to be killed and the gentlemen with the automobiles can run away. I say, Sir, that any province that will allow a system of education of its children in militarism, by taking a child ten or twelve years old and teaching him how to handle a gun and shoot his fellow-man, ought to be censured by this parliament or any other parliament. I am sure that you will find a vast majority of the fathers and mothers of this country against any such proposal. I claim that the children in the schools are learning too fast how to kill their fellow-men, and that it would be much better for the government of Canada and much better for the country, if, instead of giving a penny a month to the Labour Department, they would spend more money on it and less on guns. It would be much better for the government of this country to educate the children in economics than to teach them how to shoot. Now then, it might be said that I make this statement now and I did not make it when the Liberals were in power, but I want to tell hon. gentlemen that I have always stood with the labouring people of this country in condemnation of this system. In the name of one million heads of families whose children will be wanted for this service, I protest against the promulgation of the doctrine of militarism.

Mr. BURNHAM. It is acknowledged the world over that the expenditure of money in training people to kill each other is prima facie absurd. I should not like for my part the impression to go abroad in

the newspapers, especially the Liberal newspapers, that the Conservatives were in favour of spending these sums of money on the military, while our good friends the Liberals were in favour of everything going on as quietly as possible. We admit beyond peradventure that the world as it is is all wrong. We could save vast sums of money if nobody would die, and great remedies could be applied instantly if we had the power of applying them, but we have not. I would ask the hon. gentleman from Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville), who has expressed such admirable sentiments, if he will remember that it has taken us one thousand years to recover from the fact that Rome was not fit to hold off the barbarians. If in A.D. 476 the Western Empire of Rome had been trained in a military way instead of humbugging in other ways as she did she would have preserved the learning of the west, and preserved the power of the west, and we would not have had the Lombards, the Visigoths, the Ostrogoths and the Vandals, and all the rest of them destroying the learning that had been accumulated for a thousand years. We must have some common sense in this matter. Let me remind the hon. gentleman (Mr. Verville) that we are not training our sons or our daughters either to shoot each other; we are training them to hit a mark, and if it should so chance that some one insists upon being shot because they are going to take away that which belongs to us, then we will shoot them, but that is only an incident. There are benefits in a military training which everybody will concede. It makes the young chap erect, well set-up, and it teaches him discipline, which nine times out of ten he does not learn at home. It is a grave mistake for any one to suppose that all the expenditure of money, under the conditions that exist in the world to-day, for the purposes of self-defence, is wasted, because it is not. Ten minutes' study of history will show that if the ancient empire of Rome had been able to defend herself we would have been two thousand years ahead of where we are now, instead of being two thousand years behind. Then, with regard to the automobiles; I am not much of a soldier myself, I would not kill a chicken if I could help it, but I have followed the question sufficiently to know that the automobile is the most economical means of handling a transport service in all the armies of the world. The Americans, the Australians, the Germans, the French, the English, all have automobiles attached to their military forces, and why should we not be up to date? Do we want to lag behind? Certainly not. Everybody admits, and that is the point I want to make, that expenditure in a military way is something that is to be regretted, but it is something that has to be done.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I am surprised to find that my hon. friend from Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) who in his youth was trained as a cadet, and who has all the appearance of a bold soldier laddie, stand up here and show his lack of appreciation of the tact of the gentleman who had the honour of defeating him and his friends in the contest in Drummond-Arthabaska. What are the facts? In 1896 the Liberal-Conservative party had brought in a small appropriation of three million dollars for rifles with which to arm the troops in expectation of a war in which Britain and France would be engaged on one side against other continental powers. These hon. gentlemen opposite then pursued the same policy as they are evidently laying out to pursue to-day. Let me tell these gentlemen that I welcome their appeal to prejudices on every platform and in every riding in the Dominion. In 1896 they went through the province of Quebec telling the people that if these rifles were bought by the Conservatives their sons would be disembowelled.

An hon. MEMBER. Who said that?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The Liberals said it in the province of Quebec in 1896.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Do the hon. gentlemen opposite deny it?

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska). Yes.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Then it was that the Liberals appealed to the mothers of the province of Quebec not to let their sons fight for the empire in all parts of the world. That appeal had its effect, but time rolled on and Drummond and Arthabaska fell vacant and the Liberal-Conservative party——

An hon. MEMBER. Kept out of the county.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I have not the slightest doubt they did it and I say: God bless them for giving back to these gentlemen opposite the same medicine as they themselves administered in 1896. We have evidence that both sides did it in the Drummond-Arthabaska election, and these gentlemen opposite were hoisted on their own petard.

Then came on the last Dominion elections and the people of the province of Quebec and the people of other provinces resisted the appeals to prejudices made by the Liberals, and they placed the Right Hon. R. L. Borden where he now stands

at the head of a splendid majority, a united majority, as the gentlemen opposite have found to their cost. I want to tell these gentlemen opposite that they are not talking by the book when they say that the farmers do not want their sons to go to these cadet camps. We have the evidence in our possession that not only the people of the cities, but the country people as well in every part of the Dominion—in the province of Quebec more than anywhere else—are anxious to have their children go to these camps. I am pleased beyond measure to see the line these gentlemen opposite are taking, because from their own view point they are making a fatal mistake. I was more than surprised to find our good friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville), who poses as the champion of labour in this country, taking the stand he did. Let me point out to him that in a country where the labour leaders are honest, where the labour leaders are not afraid to stand up for what they think is right, in Australia, where a labour government is in power, a cadet system has been established and 75 per cent of the cadets are armed and well drilled and trained to shoot. In Australia, every man and boy from the age of ten years up must be by law trained to be a soldier. That is not militarism. Militarism is where a class created in the community holds control of the military power so as to dominate the rest of the people, but when you get a whole people trained for the defence of their country, it is the very antithesis of militarism.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Don't look at me in that way.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I believe that at heart the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) is right, but unfortunately he has been keeping such bad company that he hardly knows where he is at himself. Discipline does not mean oppression; military training means honour, culture, upbuilding, training the youth to keep his head erect, and training him to keep his head erect is training him to keep his character right. The records of all countries show that where young men are trained in military work they are improved mentally, morally and physically. As an asset to a nation, outside of any question of the defence of the country, it is well to train the youth of the country in military discipline.

When the nation is in danger and its men are untrained, what is the consequence? They take to the woods and leave their wives, their mothers, their sisters, their daughters and their sweethearts to the tender mercies of the invaders. There is a record in every land where the men have been untrained. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen who have nothing to gain but a little cheap popularity, to criticise the defence of the nation. Too long, I fear, have the militia estimates of this country gone through with the suspicion that everything was not right in them. I want our militia estimates to be subject to the fullest criticism, and I have taken pains to have full information regarding them sent to every locality in Canada, so that the people will know where their money has gone and what it has gone for. I want the people to know the exact condition of affairs, and I am confident that they will say: We do not believe in militarism, but we do believe in defending our homes. They will say: Patriotism and loyalty are splendid things, but loyalty untrained is worse than cowardice. It means that you have the spirit to resist aggression, but not the training to do it. Loyalty untrained is useless. A loyal regiment untrained is worse than baggage. A lot of loyal fellows carrying rifles means only so much cost to the nation; they are not fit to fight in any way. It means more than that; the expense is greater, the danger is greater. A few men trained in a nation are worth a whole regiment of untrained loyal men. The days of standing armies have gone, because they would have to be so large that it would be impossible to pay for them, and the people dread them. The old Saxon days have returned, when the whole nation must be armed; and the cheapest way to secure this is by training the youth of the land to handle a rifle just as we teach them to read and write and cipher. I was surprised to see the so-called labour leader in Canada taking the position he did, when the true labour leaders of Australia insist on every man in that country being trained to be a soldier, and on every boy over ten years of age—not optional, as I make it, on the part of their parents whether they shall go to camp or not—but forced to be trained in military work, forced to take a rifle and practice target shooting, forced to give their time and to some extent their means in developing themselves for the defence of their country.

Mr. CARVELL. One would almost think, in listening to the impassioned appeal of the Minister of Militia, that the suggestion made by one of his war lords at the conference which was held here before Christmas, that conscription should be established in this country, had made an impression on the mind of the minister. I hope the day will never come when we shall have conscription in Canada and every man will be forced into the army to be a trained soldier. What do we want an army for? We are not living in France or in Germany, or in Russia, or in Australia.

My hon. friend does not tell us why they are training their people in Australia and New Zealand. He knows why there is excitement in Australia and New Zealand that can never affect Canada.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Why.

Mr. CARVELL. He knows that it is because of the fear of an oriental invasion. He knows that the people want to keep those countries white men's countries. He knows that is why they are expending so much money on military organization and on navies, and I do not think he could conceive it as possible that those conditions could arise in Canada for generations to come. You would almost think, from what the minister has said, that if you have enough militarism in Canada, you can abolish all the churches in the land and people's souls will be saved by the militia and not by the grace of God. I am not trying to raise race against race or creed against creed. I believe in the militia to a certain extent. I believe we need it to help the police to enforce the civil law and to maintain peace and order; but more than that we do not need, and any money that is spent for more than that is money spent in vain, and would be very much better used for other purposes. My hon. friend talks about defending our homes, our wives, sisters and sweethearts, and all that tommyrot. He knows there is no danger of invasion. He talks about trained men and says that loyal men not trained are worse than baggage in an army. He knows that more than 50 per cent of the men who went from Canada to South Africa were not members of the militia and probably never had been. I know that is true of those who went from the maritime provinces. And when these men were under arms one month, you could not tell the difference between those who were trained and those who were not trained. If you are going to train the militia of Canada to be of any use, all you want to do is to give them the rudiments of shooting. The training of forming fours and so on is useless. Imagine forming fours on the African veldt. I admit that if you teach a young man to be a good shot, and he is ever required to defend his country, or even to go to foreign wars, he has an education which will make him a good soldier. I think the great trouble with my hon. friend and with his general staff is that they spend too much money on fuss and feathers and gold lace and not enough to teach young men how to shoot. I want to point out to the hon. member for Peterborough that these automobiles are not for transport, but for taking the staff on junketing tours. Let the minister give more money to the rifle clubs. I am not blaming my hon. friend for this; those who were running the militia matters in the other government were just as bad; but I find that in the great province of Ontario they give to the rifle associations the magnificent sum of $2,000, while they increase the pay of the general staff by thousands every year, and in the province of New Brunswick they give to the rifle associations the magnificent sum of $1,300.

Besides this they give a little every year to different rifle associations all over the country. Put together all the money that you pay to the militiamen, all the money you pay in rifle practice, all the money you pay that fits a man to be a soldier, and you have not spent a million dollars in the whole of Canada, but you are spending $8,000,000 in fuss and feathers and gold lace. I want the minister to get down to earth and look this matter in the face as a pure matter of business. If the minister has got enough knowledge of military matters, and I think as far as the present party is concerned he is the right man in the right place, he will talk business instead of talking hot air as he has been doing.

Mr. WILCOX. One of the principles of our system of party government that I do admire is that our committees are non-political, that we are there permitted to express views at variance with the views held on our own side of the House, and that in so doing we are not in any way disassociating ourselves from our own party. I desire to make a reference or two with respect to the order which has been given by the Minister of Militia for twelve automobiles. It would have been the greatest possible pleasure for me to have supported this contract, or order, if in my judgment I considered it proper. But from the facts, as they have been submitted to me, I am not exactly satisfied with the negotiations in connection with this order, so far as I understand them. I recognize that my hon. friend the Minister of Militia is a highly qualified man to fill with dignity, the position which he now occupies. He is a warrior, but I have a recollection at this time of other men who preceded him that were warriors. I think of Samson, way back in the old dispensation, who killed 5,000 Philistines with the jawbone of an ass. He was tempted and he fell.

Mr. MACDONALD. Is there any fear of that with the minister?

Mr. WILCOX. I fear that my hon. friend was tempted by an agent in his own constituency and he fell.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is very serious.

Mr. LEMIEUX. A spade is a spade.

Mr. WILCOX. A spade is a spade and a club is a club. I have made it my practice since I have entered public life, and

long before, to always have the courage of my convictions. I do not believe that this thing is proper and I do not intend to support it, although, as I said before, it would give me the greatest possible pleasure to do so because it is placing an $11,000 contract with a manufacturing concern within the limits of my own constituency.

Mr. KNOWLES. It is a contract given to Grits though.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is the matter?

Mr. WILCOX. Give me time to make my statement. There may be an excuse for my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes, Victoria), in making this mistake. I do not pretend to say that it was deliberate on his part, because I can see the ghost of Sir Frederick Borden in this matter. The principles which have been adopted in this and other departments of the government for the last fifteen years, in my judgment are clearly manifest in this transaction. I received a letter a few days ago from a gentleman in Walkerville and desire to place an extract or two from that letter upon the pages of 'Hansard':

Walkerville, March 6, 1912.

Oliver H. J. Wilcox, Esq., M.P.,
House of Commons, Ottawa, Ont.

My dear Mr. Wilcox,—It has been mentioned to me that you are using your influence towards a reconsideration of the order recently given by the Department of Militia and Defence to the Ford Motor Company, of Walkerville, the idea being to have the order placed with a concern established outside your constituency.

I was at a loss to know, Mr. Chairman, where that information came from for up to that time I had made no reference to it whatever, but I learned from a party of gentlemen, one of them an ex-member of this House from Port Perry, where the agent who read this order hailed from, that when he got that order from the minister he started for Walkerville, or communicated with Walkerville, and told the motor company to keep the member for Essex quiet.

Mr. McKENZIE. He reckoned without his host.

Mr. MACDONALD. How was he going to do it?

Mr. WILCOX. It is pretty hard to do it, because I am not convinced that this is a proper transaction. I desire to place another communication upon 'Hansard.' I want my statement with respect to this matter to be absolutely clear, not so much for the benefit of the members of this House, but for the benefit of my own constituents. In answer to the communication, an extract from which I gave to the House a moment or two ago, I wrote as follows on March 8:

I have received your favour of March the 6th, and I beg to say in reply that I consider the only satisfactory feature in connection with the order given by the Minister of Militia to your agents for twelve automobiles to which you have referred, is the fact that these cars are manufactured in the constituency which I am at present trying honestly to represent. That fact alone may prevent me from opposing the transaction and the item will appear in the supplementary estimates to meet the expenditure.

In approaching the subject I absolutely deny that upon any occasion or at any time I have exerted an influence to have the order cancelled and placed with a firm outside my constituency.

This matter was brought to my attention by a series of questions placed on the order paper by the Hon. Charles Murphy, and in view of the well established custom there was no excuse whatever that I should not have been consulted so that I might have been acquainted with the facts, but I was not.

However, that is not here nor there so far as you are concerned; I will settle this point with the minister.

The next objection is that it has not been established to my satisfaction, and I can tell you to the satisfaction of all the members that have spoken to me upon the subject, the necessity of purchasing automobiles at the country's expense for a few staff officers and generals that are now drawing salaries ranging from $3,000 to $6,000 a year with expenses. While we are absolutely in accord with making all reasonable appropriations for the purposes of militia, and it is the prevailing opinion here that it is the colonels, the majors, the captains and the privates that are entitled to consideration, personally, I consider it neither sound public policy nor good common sense.

The objection is that the law strictly forbids a minister of the Crown to enter into a contract with an individual, firm or corporation for a greater amount than $5,000 without calling for tenders, and in this case the minister did not consult his colleagues nor even the representative of the constituency.

From the Hon. Charles Murphy's question, I learned that the order was given to the Ford Motor Company for twelve touring cars at the cost of $11,419.20. That would be $951.60 each. I have received a telegram from Windsor which gives me the information that the standard price for this class of car fully equipped is $800 f.o.b., Walkerville, so that the minister, without consultation with his colleagues, without consultation of the representative of the constituency, without application for tenders as required by law, has given to some person $1,219.20 in excess of what should be paid.

In the light of these facts I am unable to see upon what ground this deal can be justified or defended when it is brought up in this House by the opposition, and I am inclined to the view that if the facts as they were presented to me are true, and that if this gets into politics there are two parties that will not be benefited by a discussion of it; one is the Minister of Militia and the other is the Ford Motor Company of Walkerville.

Now, in conclusion, I am always open to conviction, and if you or your company can give me a satisfactory explanation of my objections, I will be just as enthusiastically in favour of the proposal as I am now opposed to it. If the minister had not approached me in room 16 in the presence of our members and we had some argument it would not have become the subject of so much discussion here as it is; and I may say that I have so far not taken any position that would jeopardize the interests of your company. I was not complaining because the contract had not been given, but the advisability of purchasing these machines for the purpose the minister has in mind is questionable, and the method which he has adopted in securing them has not been met with favour by many of his supporters, and I absolutely refuse to support that which I believe to be wrong. But, as you have been good enough to communicate with me. I will make no further reference to it with the hope that you may be able to give me a satisfactory explanation.

I remain, dear sir,

Truly yours,
OLIVER WILCOX.

That communication was forwarded by me to a shareholder of the firm. I received a reply. But there is an interesting piece of history here that does not satisfy me. This agent went to Walkerville, or directed a communication to Walkerville, or telegraphed to Walkerville, or in whatever way he let that company know, I was not satisfied with that transaction. He gave that intelligence to Mr. Gordon McGregor, the manager, as I am informed, who happens to be a Liberal. Instead of Mr. McGregor communicating with me, he impressed that knowledge on a shareholder who happened to be on the other side of politics and a friend of mine. This is my information. He wrote to me and answered that communication in which I stated my objections. On March 15, 1912, one of the stockholders of the Ford Automobile Company wrote to me as follows:—

Dear Mr. Wilcox,—I received your kind favour of 8th inst. and contents carefully noted. I thank you very much for so carefully giving me such full detail, and I must confess that your arguments are sound.

But I have here a communication that was directed by the president of this company, in which he attempts to explain some of the objections I had to the order. He said:

Mr. WILCOX

Dear Sir,—Answering the questions which you have put to me, and which I assume are indirectly questions that have come from Mr. Wilcox regarding the order that was given by the Department of Militia and Defence, from information we have received indirectly in regard to this matter, we are led to believe that Mr. Wilcox has failed in placing this order with another concern, with the Reo concern. In this we might be mistaken, and it might be the Hupmobile or the M. and F. or Flanders, as these concerns are located in his constituency.

Let me say I never asked for that order to be given to any firm in my constituency; and in my firm judgment such an order or contract as that should be given upon tender, with opportunity allowed to all the various companies in this country to file their tenders. Now, with regard to the increase of price, Mr. McGregor says:

Regarding the price which has been paid us for these automobiles, $951.60, as you will note, the advertised price of our car is $850 f.o.b., Walkerville. But for this purpose there have been a lot of extras added in order to have the cars complete and in order to avoid the necessity of continually purchasing extras. For instance, the cars are specified with traction treads, which add an extra of $3,020 to our list for the set. There is also one extra traction tread casing, $1.25; 4 Dunlop tubes, $24.20; one top envelope, $5; one jack, $2. In addition to that there is a muffler cut-out, a tire envelope and a set of tire holders. I have not before me the exact prices of these, but you can easily see that the price for a car with all these extras which have been specified would be more than $951.60. . .

So far as opposition from the Liberal side of the House is concerned, we don't think there will be any opposition and if Mr. Wilcox can indicate that there is any possibility of any coming up we will be very glad to take the matter up with some of the members on the Liberal side of the House.

He says he has forwarded me a copy of the special list; but not one of these items which he has mentioned in this communication is on this special list. Therefore, I take it, these extras which are referred to belong to the standard car which was sold for $850. In my judgment, as I said before, this contract should be let by public tender. It is with the greatest regret that I rise to oppose this order, and if a motion is made in this House against it, I should support the motion.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I regret exceedingly the line of action my hon. friend has chosen to take. I have to say about the contract, that stands on its own merits. But knowing that the Ford machine was made in the hon. gentleman's riding, I thought I would please him by telling him that we had purchased for the department these 12 machines. What was his first remark? 'Can't you put in a word with that concern to help me?'

I said, 'Certainly I will do so.' Accordingly I promptly notified the agent to that effect, that my hon. friend was in favour of the purchase. The next day he came to me and said, 'Why, the head of that concern is a confounded Grit named McGregor; during the election he placarded his shop all over with appeals to his men to vote against me, and all that sort of thing.' I said 'It makes no difference if the head of the firm is a Grit, the company is largely Conservative, and the men are always intelligent enough to vote Conservative. Then he asked me why I didn't get some other machine, and he mentioned two or three others with agencies in Walkerville that I had never heard of before. He said, 'It would be far better for me if you would cancel the order and put it with some other concern.' I need not go any further.

Mr. MACDONALD. Did the hon. gentleman desire the purchase to be put up to tender?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). You cannot get tenders for automobiles. He never asked me to invite tenders. I found then that my hon. friend misunderstood the situation entirely, he thought his was the only concern in Canada that was making automobiles, and that I should have got them from his riding. I thought I was doing the hon. gentleman a kindness in giving him the information. I have given him the facts of the case, and from that time to this I have had nothing more to do with it. I will only add that when I found he was dissatisfied I told him one day what I thought about it, and I think he understood my position pretty well. From this very concern, when we tried to get them down we got a notification that if we ordered 100 machines they would not be sold for one cent less than we are giving for these machines. I do not know whether Mr. McGregor is a Grit or not, and I do not care. But I do know that the workingmen in any establishment in Canada would be largely Conservative. There are the facts of the case, and they cannot be contradicted.

Mr. WILCOX. The question is whether the minister has taken the proper course. If he has, and if the price was in excess of the value of these machines, as I believe it was, then it is an improper expenditure; if not, then it is a proper expenditure. I have always had a high regard for the Minister of Militia and Defence. I dislike to offer any criticism of his official conduct, but I want to say to him that he is the only minister of the Crown that does not consult me upon matters pertaining to my constituency. I saw in one of the Canadian newspapers an item last year taken I think from one of the English papers which seemed to set forth one of the weaknesses of my hon. friend. The paper said that during the coronation proceedings in England he was invited to a place upon the platform with King George, and immediately he stepped upon the platform he spread all over it and there was not room on it for the King. Now I want to say to him that he is not going to spread all over North Essex on matters which affect the people of that constituency, which they have to pay for, without letting me know something about it. If he does not consult me I will consult him on the floor of parliament.

Mr. MACDONALD. Would the minister tell me out of what vote he has purchased these automobiles?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Out of the stores vote.

Mr. MACDONALD. Was there a balance of last year in existence?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). They are all paid for, and are to be delivered at various points all over Canada.

Mr. MACDONALD. Who was the person to whom the order was given, spoken of by the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Wilcox)?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I think they are delivered through an agent in Toronto. I have driven a Ford automobile, and know what it is. I am surprised at the line of action my hon. friend has taken. I did not know what he meant when he said it would be much more to his advantage if I bought from another concern.

Mr. MACDONALD. Had the member for North Essex called the attention of the minister to what he has stated to the committee to-night, that these automobiles were purchased at a cost of almost $100 a piece more than the price he indicated they could be purchased for?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. gentleman has given all the figures in the list, showing at what price they were purchased.

Mr. MACDONALD. The hon. minister said that he had gone through the price list, and his opinion was that the price was $100 more than what they could have been purchased at.

Mr. WILCOX. Mr. McGregor, the president, sent me the previous list, and upon that list not one of those items appeared as extras which he states in his communication were extras. Therefore, I spoke of these items as belonging to the machine?

Mr. MACDONALD. And about $100 too much was paid for the machine?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The standard price was $850; they will cost $951.21.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Were these machines contracted for from the manufacturers or through an agent? The reason I ask is that we all know that the agent's commission on the sale of automobiles is a fairly good one, running all the way from 15 to 25 per cent, and if an ordinary commission was paid in this case the agent would have received a very handsome sum of money—$1,100 or $1,200.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). We wanted to get the machines direct, but we were informed that it would be absolutely impossible. No company would sell except through an agent in the locality where the purchase is made. That is the way the machines were bought. As far as the extras are concerned, I may say that the tires are a special kind of traction tires, I believe, and these and the other attachments are got so that in case these machines were away and anything went wrong they would have the equipment with them. I am very anxious that this whole matter shall be thoroughly investigated. I have just given the facts as they occurred. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wilcox) made no objection whatever when I first drew his attention to it. I thought I had paid him a compliment in that I had purchased the machines in his riding. His first question was that I should put in a friendly word with the firm for him in order to help him, and then one or two days later he came to me and said: See here, that fellow McGregor is an awful Grit, and you will have to cancel the order and give it to some other person.

Mr. MACDONALD. What was the politics of the agent from whom my hon. friend purchased the automobiles?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I think he is a Grit. I never asked a man for a vote in my life, but I think this man is a Liberal.

Mr. MACDONALD. What is his name?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). His name is Williams.

Mr. KNOWLES. I would like to ask the minister whether he inquired of any other firm if he could get the machines direct and thus avoid the payment of the agent's commission? I know that in my own town eleven men got together and purchased machines. The machines came to them and they got them at net cost or at the same price as they would have cost an agent. If you multiplied the commission eleven or twelve times it would amount to a very considerable sum, and therefore I would ask the minister if he inquired of other firms in order to ascertain if it was possible to save that expense?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Yes, and I may say that there were other firms that paid as high as $500 commission on a machine. If you took a hundred machines from this firm it would not make any difference; you would still have to pay the commission.

Mr. KNOWLES. Will the minister bring down the correspondence with other firms?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I did not say that we had correspondence; I said that we consulted with other firms.

Mr. KNOWLES. With the firms?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). We consulted the agents.

Mr. KNOWLES. The minister knows that the agent has not the authority to say whether the firm will grant a better price or not.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The company will not deal except through an agent.

Mr. KNOWLES. I question that statement. I say that the company will deal with people who will take a certain number of machines.

Mr. CARVELL. I do not think we want to take any part in the little family quarrel on the other side as to whether the minister should or should not have bought Ford cars. But, the minister is in error when he says that the company will not sell at less than catalogue prices if you take a large number. I do not know what the Ford Company will do——

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It is not only the Ford Company, but others.

Mr. CARVELL—but in the last three weeks I have received a letter from the Cadillac Company agreeing to sell machines to three persons at the special agent's discount, and I presume that what the Cadillac Company will do other companies will do. We have no fault to find with the Ford car, but what we say is that the minister has no right to buy automobiles for the general staff to go junketing around the country with.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The minister, while he was on this side of the House, condemned the payment of commissions to middlemen upon purchases by the government. I would like to know from the minister if he intends, when he makes purchases for the Militia Department, to pay a commission to the middlemen?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). There has been no commisison paid to the middleman.

Mr. MACDONALD. The hon. member for North Essex says there has been.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understand the minister admits that the purchase was made through an agent, and this agent, no doubt, has got a pretty handsome commission out of it.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. gentleman should be a judge of commissions.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understand there is no question about it. I know something about automobiles, and I know that they allow the agents very handsome commissions. My hon. friend makes the excuse that the company would not sell except through an agent. That may be the case with the Ford Company. The Ford Company is one of the most reputable companies in Canada, and I am not going to say whether the minister got these automobiles as cheaply as he could have got them, but, while I am upon my feet, I have one word to say in praise of the minister. I think he deserves great credit for refusing to be bulldozed by the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Wilcox). That gentleman spoke as if he ran the constituency. He says, indeed, that the Minister of Militia is the only minister that does not consult him and defer to his wishes in this constituency. We had here not long ago the spectacle of the Minister of Customs being obliged to listen to the remarks of the hon. member for North Essex in the House when he said that he had succeeded in having officials dismissed, and that he was not going to remain still until he had other men dismissed who had taken any part whatever in the election or had expressed political views. That is a wrong position for the hon. member for North Essex to take.

Mr. WILCOX. I did not take any such position. I realize my position in this House, and in my constituency, and as a young member I have tried to conduct myself in the manner in which I believe every hon. member should conduct himself, and for which I think I should be given credit. I have tried to act as a young member of this House in such a way as to commend my course to the favourable judgment of the older men in this House, but in so far as matters with respect to my own constituency are concerned, I have only desired to be consulted in so far as I have a right to be consulted, having regard to the principle of government which we have established in this country. If I am not the representative of the constituency I might as well go home. If I have certain rights and privileges under our constitutional form of government, I feel that I would not be doing my duty to the people of my constituency if I did not exercise what I believe to be my rights in their behalf.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does not the hon. gentleman remember that not a great while ago he made a threat in this House that he was going to have certain officials dismissed and that he spoke as if he had charge of the Department of Customs? That did not strike me as being exactly the right position for a private member, although an influential member of the House and a supporter of the government, to take. Then the Minister of Militia and Defence has stated, and it has not been denied by the hon. gentleman, that the great objection which he raised to the purchase of these automobiles was that the manager of this company, Mr. McGregor, happened to be a Liberal. I think the hon. gentleman had no right to object simply for the reason that the minister should have exercised his best judgment in making the purchase of these automobiles.

Mr. WILCOX. I cannot allow the statement of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) to go unchallenged.

I recognize my hon. friend to be a very acute and shrewd politician, and the motive which actuated him to make the statement he has just made is to enable him to play a little game of politics up in North Essex. I cannot allow that statement to go unchallenged. I want to say again that I did not, and I do not now, and I do not intend in the future, to bulldoze anybody in this House. But as a free representative of a free people I intend to exercise in this parliament the right which I have under the constitution. As to the reference about Mr. McGregor being a Liberal, I have evidence from a shareholder in the firm that Mr. McGregor never took any part in politics. It does not make any difference whether he did or not so far as I am concerned. I realize that the system of government we have in this country, is a party system, and that human ingenuity has never devised a better system of government than the party system, and I have absolutely no hard feelings towards a Liberal. If this matter is regular and right, all right. I have stated my position clearly to the House, and to the country, and to my constituents and upon that position I will stand or fall.

Mr. MACDONALD. Will the minister bring down to-morrow all the papers in connection with the purchase.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). We will bring down all the papers.

Mr. McCREA. No doubt the minister is a first-class Minister of Militia, but he is a bad purchasing agent. I know that some time ago the Ford Motor Company would

give agent's commission to any man buying four cars or over, and that the commission was twenty per cent. The catalogue price on that machine is $850 and it would appear that the Minister of Militia not only paid the catalogue price but something over one hundred dollars per machine above the catalogue price. That is not very good generalship in a business transaction.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. gentleman (Mr. McCrea) is stating what is absolutely contrary to the fact. The letter which the hon. gentleman read here shows that the machines were sold for less than the catalogue price.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Not at all.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Excuse me. The machine was sold less than the catalogue price when you consider the extras.

Mr. McCREA. I had the agency of the Ford Motor car and I know that was their system of doing business two years ago and I don't believe they have changed it since. Any person buying four cars or over got the agent's commission which is twenty per cent, and on the catalogue the price of that car this year is $850.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). That is right.

Mr. McCREA. And you paid something over $951.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). We got extras.

Mr. McCREA. I am not making any accusation, but I repeat that while the hon. gentleman may be a good military man, he is a bad purchasing agent.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). I happen to know something about how the Ford company sell these cars. I know of a case where four or five persons wished to get a car at wholesale prices, and they communicated with the Ford Motor company, but they could not get the discount. They got over that by one of their number taking the agency for that town, and he entered into a contract that he would sell at least four motor cars and he got the benefit of the discount and the price to the purchasers was correspondingly less. The fact is, that the Ford company would not sell, except through their agent, and all this talk we have been hearing in years gone by, about middlemen's profits and buying from middlemen, is much on a par with this case; there is really nothing in the matter at all, if the facts are inquired into.

Mr. KNOWLES. I have a question to ask of the Minister of Militia, and of the leader of the government. On the 28th of February, I read in this House, a letter written by the Minister of Militia and sent to the city clerk of Moosejaw. That letter accused the gentlemen who compose the city council of Moosejaw of being blundering folk and other things. I want to ask if there has been any letter addressed to the Prime Minister by the city council or any other body in Moosejaw, complaining of that letter and asking that there be an apology.

Mr. BORDEN. There was a letter written to me, with regard to the incident. I cannot recall the precise terms of it. I answered the letter at the time.

Mr. KNOWLES. Does the right hon. gentleman remember whether an apology was asked for, from the Minister of Militia?

Mr. BORDEN. I have no recollection of that.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Now that the subject is brought up, I might suggest to my hon. friend that he might suggest to the city council of Moosejaw, that an apology is due to the Minister of Militia. I have had very courteous and gentlemanly correspondence from the Board of Trade of Moosejaw, who are evidently gentlemen.

Mr. KNOWLES. I cannot allow that to go without a word. The city council of Moosejaw is just as reputable a body of men as can be found anywhere, and the Minister of Militia should give some reason for making that statement in regard to the city council of the city in which I reside. He has spoken of them in his letter as being a blundering body and has intimated to them as clearly as he could that he does not want to bother with having further conversation with them, and he states here in the House that one reason he does not want to take the matter up with them is that they are Grits—wherever he got that information I do not know. I say that the city council of Moosejaw deserves more courteous treatment from a minister of the Crown. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that the city of Moosejaw gave his party a very substantial majority at the last election, and let me tell him further that if he and the others who are under the Prime Minister will continue writing letters like that, I question if there will be much more appreciation of the Conservative party in that city. I appeal to my right hon. friend and I protest against a minister of the Crown writing such letters to the city council of Moosejaw and making such remarks about them. My hon. friend and myself have extended courteous and friendly treatment to each other for the years we

have been in this Chamber, but I never heard of a minister of the Crown before making such entirely uncalled for remarks about a representative body. I hope the Prime Minister will see that that sort of thing is discontinued.

Military camps, $75,000.

Mr. MACDONALD. How many camps will there be for the cadet corps this summer?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The present intention is that in almost all localities there will be camps where the friends can visit the cadets. The officers commanding divisions have been asked to send in reports and probably there will be a camp for every county or riding or for some given area.

This item is increased owing to the fact that there are more cadet corps established under the Strathcona Trust.

Clothing and necessaries—for the entire, militia, including the permanent force, $450,000.

Mr. CARVELL. Does the minister really expect during the coming fiscal year to get along on the amount he asks for in this estimate, or does he anticipate a supplementary estimate to make up the deficiency?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I am afraid that something extra will be required, and that there will have to be a supplementary estimate.

Mr. CARVELL. That is what I feared. My hon. friend stated before dinner that he was not increasing the cost of the militia this year. As I stated, he admits that he is increasing it by $191,000, and I believe that it will be found that he is increasing it by half a million dollars. My hon. friend is not without guile in the manner in which he has made up his estimates. I want to call attention to a particularly bright operation of the mind of my hon. friend in making up these estimates. A guilty conscience needs no accuser, and when my hon. friend sent out his famous pamphlet justifying the military expenditure of this country, and showing that it is a positive agency for good against all the agencies for bad, that is a tacit admission that there is something wrong, and he is trying to explain away or to educate the public mind to receive the real facts when they come. We find in all these items connected with the fuss and feathers and show, something which goes to the glorification of my hon. friend. that there are increases while all the co-called decreases are on the hard business end of the transaction . You find a decrease of $25,000 in clothing and necessaries. My hon. friend admits now that will have to be made up in the supplementaries. You find a decrease of $75,000 in customs dues. In all probability they will be the same as last year, if not more. He then provides for a decrease of $55,000 in the engineer services, which I understand means the construction of targets, butts and rifle ranges. I prophesy that just as much money will be spent on that service this year as ever. Then, there is a reduction of $4,150 on the Royal Military College. If you add all these together you have an estimated reduction of $234.500. But there will not be a reduction. Practically all that money will have to be expended. Then you have an admitted over-expenditure as compared with last year of $191,000, and in last year's estimates there was $155,000 for the coronation contingent, which was exceptional. If you add these three sums together, you have an admitted increase of the militia expenditure of this year over that of last year of $580,000. Is this a reduction of the cost of militarism in this country, or was I right when I said that we were drifting more than ever into the vortex of militarism? I want my hon. friend to think of this. I know that he is a militarist, but a few jolts such as he has received to-night will set even him thinking.

Militia and Defence—customs dues, $125,000.

Mr. CARVELL. On what basis does the minister estimate a reduction of $75,000?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It is estimated that there will be fewer deliveries of orders from the old country. The expenditure for 1911-12 will be heavy, but that for 1912-13 will not be heavy, and the deliveries on the old contracts are all made.

Mr. MACDONALD. Is my hon. friend importing heavy guns this year?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). There are some to be delivered this year which were ordered two or three years ago.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would like to know what items are embraced in the amount of $173,850, of appropriations which are stated to be not required for 1912-13. It is by deducting that amount from the total expenditure that my hon. friend makes the increase only $191,000. If he leaves that out, the total increase will be $364,850.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The amount of $173,850 is made up of $155,000 for the coronation, and $18,150 not required.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was expended last year.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I know, we put that in here.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, but it is put in differently. My hon. friend will see that the effect of putting it in that way is to reduce his increase of expenditure from $364,350 down to $191,000. I cannot for the life of me see why my hon. friend should have put in that $173,000, and then have used those figures in order to show that the actual ordinary expenditure this year is not as the figures show, some $350,000 odd dollars more than was the ordinary expenditure last year.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I am doing simply what the ex-Minister of Public Works did in his own department again and again. The Auditor General requires it to be so published.

Mr. McKENZIE. I would like to know from the minister, if it would not be giving away any military secrets, whether he is placing any new guns in the batteries in the Citadel at Halifax.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). If the hon. gentleman would be good enough to come to the department I will show him all the details in connection with the matter. I can say, however, that I have not given any order for any guns at Halifax.

Mr. McKENZIE. For the security of this country we ought to have the very best guns placed in those batteries, and if they are not there now they should be put there and no criticism will be offered from this side.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). If the hon. gentleman will be good enough to come down to the department I will be glad to show him what is proposed in regard to Halifax.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The minister says that there appears in the estimates of the Department of Public Works an amount which was utilized the previous year for some special purpose, and for which there was not a similar appropriation in the current year, and it was used in order to show a decrease. That is not the case. If my hon. friend will take the estimates for this year of the Department of Public Works he will find that although the appropriation is not required, or added in the column of the previous year, yet the alleged decrease is not shown in any of the columns. Neither is it shown in the estimates of the Department of Railways and Canals. I do not know if it is shown in the estimates of any other department, but it seems to be specially shown in the Department of Militia and Defence, and my hon. friend will see that it conveys an entirely erroneous impression. It is calculated to give the idea to the House and to the country that there has only been an increase of $191,000 upon the ordinary militia expenditure, whereas the hon. gentleman knows the increase is $364,350.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Will the hon-gentlemen tell the House that every time the estimates for the Department of Public Works were prepared, they were not prepared in the way I state? If he does he does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think I stated that the amount did appear, but it is not carried out into a column showing decreases.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Neither is this.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If my hon. friend will look at the militia items on page 48 he will see that the appropriations not required for 1912-13 are carried out to a special column under the heading of decrease, and that amount is added in, in order to show a decrease. You do not find that in the estimates of the Public Works Department, or in the estimates for the Railways and Canals Department, and I doubt whether you will find it in any other department. It is only the Militia Department that has adopted that plan. Why has there been a different rule followed in regard to the Militia Department from what has been adopted in the case of the other departments referred to?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). On all matters we find a decrease for 1912-13 in the Public Works estimates.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, but you do not find the amount carried into a column as showing a decrease. If my hon. friend looks at it he will see the difference.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I do not see any difference whatever.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If he had left that out of the column showing a decrease, the actual increase upon the ordinary expenditure would be $364,350, whereas it is shown in this column as being only $191,000.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Will my hon. friend explain how we could add up the estimates for 1911-12, and make it $8,121,850, and subtract from $8,312,850, the appropriations required for 1912-13, without getting anything else than $191,000. That was done in the case of the Public Works estimates last year, and the same thing was done in every estimate that was ever brought down. The point the hon. gentleman is making, is not well taken. All he has to do is to subtract the total estimates of one year from the total estimate of the previous year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. gentleman will turn to Public Works of Ontario, he will find in the column of 1911-12, the ap-

propriation not required for 1912-13. Those refer to Public Works which have been completed, and therefore they no longer appear will not appear in the estimates of 1912-13. The point I wish to make is this: The actual increase upon the ordinary expenditure is $364,350, and in order to reduce it down to $191,000, the hon. gentleman has added in two or three items in regard to services which are past and gone, which ought not to appear, which could not appear during the present years.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Does the ex-Minister of Public Works say that an expenditure of $155,000 should be kept out of these estimates? The hon. gentleman will find in his own department for last year, 1911-12, the sums to be voted, and the sums to be voted for 1912-13, and then he will find set apart on the right hand, the increase and decrease in separate columns. Will the hon. gentleman tell me how he could take the total figures for 1911-12 and subtract them from the estimates required for 1912-13, and get any other sum than $191,000. He cannot do it. He knows that the law requires the amount to be there, and the Auditor General requires it there and it is figured up in that way.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. gentleman will take the appropriations for harbours and rivers, he will find there is no column showing a decrease.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Dare we leave out that sum of $155,000 in preparing our estimates? I ask the hon. gentleman that question.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What I say is, that the effect of dealing with the details of the Militia department differently from what you deal with the details of the department of Public Works, is to convey to the committee an entirely erroneous impression.

Mr. SHARPE (North Ontario). The hon. gentleman has not answered the minister's question.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But does not my hon. (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) see that in the details of the Militia Department he has a column showing increases and decreases which does not appear in the details of the Department of Public Works. He is entirely in error in the statement he makes, and does not he see that the comparison made misleads one who reads these accounts.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). No, but I am determined that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) shall not mislead the House. The details are given here for one year and for another year, and the increases are shown and the decreases are shown. If you subtract one from the other you get the right figures. That is what is required by the law, and any child can make the subtraction.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the Public Works, there is no column showing decreases——

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). There is a total for each year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Let me ask the hon. minister this question, apart from what I say in regard to this column showing increases and decreases, is not this true?—that upon the ordinary expenditure for military purposes, as between the coming year and the year that will close on the 31st of this month, there is an actual increase of $634,350?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). No. If the hon. gentleman will turn to page 4, I will convict him out of his own mouth. Item XVII is 'Public Works—Income, $18,614,-030.71, for 1911-12; and $14,515,380 for 1912-13; authorized by statute, $15,000; total, $14,530,380, a decrease of $4,083,-650.71'. There is the very thing that the hon. gentleman claims is not done. We have done the same thing in Militia and Defence except that instead of having separate columns we put both in one column and indicate increase or decrease with a plus or a minus sign. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) should know what the law requires.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend persists in misunderstanding me. I say that in all departments, the Auditor General puts in the amount for the previous year and the amount for the coming year in separate columns. But in the case of the Public Works, when you come to the details, the amount of appropriations not required for the present year is not carried into the column and added to the decrease. You will not find that in the detail of the Public Works or the Railways and Canals. Why the Auditor General has allowed it to be put in the Militia Department and possibly some others I do not know.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). But I have just shown the hon. gentleman that I do find it in the Public Works.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not in the details. At the bottom of each section appears 'appropriations not required for 1912-13.' In Public Works these amounts are not carried out into the column showing decrease, but in the Militia and Defence they are.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Will the hon. gentleman show how it should be done to comply with the law?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Do it as it is done in the case of the Public Works. If the hon. gentleman will look at page 58, he will see at the end of the Nova Scotia votes, a line 'appropriations not required for 1912-13.'

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. gentleman is dealing with the details, and we do not want that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is the details that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) is at now?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). No. If the hon. gentleman will turn to the militia votes and wipe out the increases and decreases—take that away entirely——

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend will not add to the regularity of the debate by interrupting.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Well, go on.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am speaking of Public Works for Nova Scotia, and you will find there the line that I have just quoted. That means that these services have been performed, and there is no necessity for further appropriations for them. Now, see what was done in the Militia. There is a column which we do not find in Public Works, and the column shows the decreases as compared with the previous year. And there is added to these decreases the total of these appropriations not required for 1912-13, including such extra services as the expenses of the coronation. It comes to this, and the hon. minister will not deny it, that upon the ordinary expenses of the coming year, as compared with the ordinary expenses of the year about closing, the expenditure is $364,350 greater instead of about $190,000 as one would suppose on looking at this column of decreases.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Does not the hon. gentleman see that in the coming year there may be items—for instance, we are building a drill-shed here. Suppose this drill-shed cost $10,000 last year; this should be put in and ear-marked, because it will not be used for another year. The fact is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley), is in a hole and is trying to argue himself out of it. I have shown him that on page 4 he will see the thing exactly, except that we, instead of having it in two columns have it in one with the plus or minus sign. The law requires it, the Auditor General demands it, and we observe the law. If the hon. gentleman did not observe the law when a minister I am not responsible for it; I am sorry to say that that is true of many of the things that were done under the late government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But the Minister of Finance is doing exactly the same thing with respect to the Public Works for the coming year as was done last year. He has not added the appropriation that was not required in the column of decreases.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). If the hon. gentleman will turn to page 78 he will find the same thing is done as is done in the case of Militia and Defence.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is the lighthouse and coast service.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It is absolutely in accordance with the instructions of the Minister of Finance.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Why does not he do it in the case of public works?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It is done in the case of public works.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I refer him again to page 45——

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend knows——

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I have the floor, and the hon. gentleman will excuse me; it is my turn. On page 77 and 78 he will find the same thing.

Grants to associations and bands, $58,000.

Mr. KAY. Would the minister tell us if there is any truth in the report published in the 'Free Press' to-night that the government are leaving Rockliffe and buying a lot of land on Lake Deschènes for rifle purposes?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The matter is under consideration. We are not in a position to give any details yet.

Mr. KAY. Would the minister state what is the reason for leaving Rockliffe?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It was found necessary to acquire certain additional lands at Rockliffe, some 200 acres. We found the price asked was enormous, amounting to about $150,000, and it was also found that the ranges would be comparatively inadequate. A number of officers of the department were looking elsewhere to see if we could get a better area. I would not like to say too much about it at the present time, I have gone as far as I can in the matter.

Mr. KAY. Has any option been taken on the property?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD. Who is acting for the government?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Colonel Biggar has charge of the matter.

Mr. MACDONALD. Who is the real estate agent?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Colonel Biggar does all the buying.

Mr. MACDONALD. Have you come to any decision yet as to where you are going?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Not finally decided.

Mr. CARVELL. This item refers to grants to associations and bands. I want my hon. friend to consider the advisability of increasing this item. I have always felt that perhaps one of the greatest pleasures of militiamen is the possession of a good band, I believe a good band is a good recruiting agent. One of the great difficulties of militia organizations is to keep up their band. The hon. gentleman knows that the officers all over the country have to contribute of their own substance, they are asking the municipalities to contribute, and have to get up entertainments to keep up a military band. I think I am safe in saying that once in about five years they go to pieces and have to be re-organized. I think the hon. gentleman might well take out of the millions he is spending a greater sum to assist the bands, and it would be more profitably expended than the money he is spending, for instance, on automobiles.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I have now found the vulnerable point in my hon. friend, he is a lover of music. I have great pleasure in saying to him that his views and mine are in exact harmony, and I will be only too glad to meet his views.

Mr. MACDONALD. What subsidies will my hon. friend give to the pipers?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It is always a pleasure for me to hear pipe music, although most people dislike it.

Mr. GRAHAM. The minister says his views are in accord with those of my hon. friend from Carleton, N.B., (Mr. Carvell). As my hon. friend from Carleton, N.B., says, it is a difficult thing, particularly in a small place where they don't get many encouragements, for the militia associations to keep up a band. In the town of Brockville we have what is called the 41st Regimental band, I think one of the best bands in the Dominion of Canada. We all contribute a little to keep up this band. Not only is it a splendid thing for the town, but it is a real assistance in recruiting the regiment. I represented to the former Minister of Militia that as these bands were composed of young men, who gave their time freely and with very little pay they might well be more liberally supported by the government without a big drain on the treasury. The young men in these bands are usually mechanics who work hard in the day time, and spend their evenings in practice. In addition to that, they are not ordinary men, because they must have a good deal of musical ability. I think no better addition to the expenditure could be made than to encourage these bands. I hope the minister, in his supplementary estimates, will put in an amount for the encouragement of regimental bands.

Mr. LALOR. And to encourage country bands generally.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I heartily agree with what the hon. gentlemen have said about that. Any one who ever commanded a regiment knows that it is quite an expense to officers and men to keep it up.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Do the grants go to the leaders of these regimental bands?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I do not know the details. The grant is made to the band, sometimes as much as $150. However, I will be delighted to meet the wishes of the hon. gentlemen, and I have requested my department to put an item in the estimates for that purpose for another year. I hope now that the hon. gentleman for Carleton, N.B., (Mr. Carvell) and his friends will allow the rest of these items to go through with a sweep.

Mr. MACDONALD. Don't forget the pipers.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Certainly not. I count the pipers as musicians.

Mr. MACDONALD. What do you pay the pipe band?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The 59th Glengarry had a very nice band a few years ago. They received a band allowance.

Mr. MACDONALD. Both of these Highland regiments have regular bands and then they have the pipes. I do not think there has been a special grant in that case. Where there has been a grant it has simply gone for the band itself and not for the pipe music. I would like the minister to take that into consideration.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). There is one important matter that has not been touched on, and that is that the band men have to pay a high duty on instruments coming into this country. Officers of the Highland and other regiments who cannot get their uniforms made in this country have to pay very high duties. I have been endeavouring to make an arrangement on the old basis so that these things will come in free of duty, but the present Minister of Customs, like his predecessor, is invulnerable,

and I have been seriously considering whether I should not put a vote in the estimates to pay the customs duty on that class of articles, in addition to the guns, etc., which we import. In bringing in these instruments the boys have to pay the duty out of their own pockets.

Mr. CARVELL. I think that in the past the band instruments for purely regimental bands have been allowed in free of duty; at least that was the law years ago.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Yes, but that has all been changed.

Mr. MACDONALD. I would support the minister if he would give us more music and less automobiles.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). No, we will have 24 more automobiles next year.

Mr. KAY. Would the minister state whether there is any provision made for giving the cadets rifle practice in their camps?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). That is the intention.

Mr. KAY. I wish to make a suggestion with regard to the annual training, and that is that the officers be compelled to take the rifle practice.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It is now optional with the officers to take rifle practice.

Mr. KAY. I think not.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I think that an officer can take it if he chooses. Above all things an officer should not only be able to teach his men, but to show his men how to shoot. I will look into the matter and let the hon. gentleman know, and if it is not the case I will promise him that it will be the case.

Mr. KAY. In the last four years in the camp at Farnham the officers have been refused rifle shooting.

Mr. CARVELL. There is another matter that I want to bring to the attention of the minister specifically, and that is the grant to these rifle associations. I have stated here to-night, and I wish to reiterate, that in my opinion the only real benefit we get from this expenditure is in the efficiency achieved by the men in rifle shooting. We only spend $58,000 on bands and associations altogether. In my opinion, the only real training which the militia enjoy is in rifle shooting. That is the important thing, and while we are spending some money in teaching these men how to shoot at camps of instruction, and possibly also spending some money at the different rifle clubs, it strikes me that in order to keep up the interest in rifle shooting you have to have regular associations, and in that way the men become proficient to some extent. The object of every rifle club and of all training in the militia is to qualify a man to be an expert shot. You may say that the man does not go there for the money he gets, but notwithstanding that, we must remember that many of the best shots in the country are not wealthy men, but that as a rule they are poor men and the men who would have the greatest interest in rifle shooting are the men who really feel that the prizes they can win mean something to them. They are an inducement to the rich man as well as to the poor man. When you consider the enormous amount of money we are spending on the militia you will, I am sure, agree that we can afford to increase the grant to encourage rifle shooting. I do not know whether we have increased the amount in the last 25 years or not.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Very little.

Mr. CARVELL. Very little, if any. A great many years ago when I was younger, I took an interest in rifle shooting and used to attend the meeting of the provincial rifle association. My recollection is that the association received $1,300. However, with the increase of the militia estimates from $3,000,000 to $8,000,000 there has not been a proportionate increase in the branch of education which really should be encouraged, and that is rifle shooting. I think the minister might very well increase the grant even if he has to cut down something else.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I was the father of a proposal, and now it is coming back to me, and I am asked to carry into practice the theory which I advanced while in opposition long years ago. At the present time the great meeting in Canada for competition in rifle shooting is the Dominion of Canada Rifle Association meeting. It is absolutely impossible for men to come here from a distance and compete. The people of Ottawa, Brockville, Kingston, and others living in places within easy distance of the ranges enjoy a great advantage over those who live at a distance. The chance of winning the King's prize at Bisley is the hope of every rifleman in Canada and, while I appreciate the assistance given by the provincial rifle associations to rifle shots to come here and take part, those who live in the maritime and the western provinces are handicapped as compared with those who live in Ontario and Quebec. The proposition I have made is that we should pay the transportation expenses of one man who has never won a prize in the Dominion Rifle Association matches from each corps. I think that would encourage the boys to practise at home and to compete for the privilege

of coming to Ottawa. Let the government pay the transport only, not the entrance fee, of one man from every unit, even from the most remote part of Canada, to Ottawa. If my hon. friends have any suggestions to make in that regard I will be glad to hear them.

Mr. SHARPE (North Ontario). I think that the idea of my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence is a good one, and I also think that the suggestion of the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) is along the right lines, because the ultimate object of the training which is given in the militia is to produce good shots. I would like to see the minister allow the captains of the companies to nominate one or two shots, and give them their transport to the annual meeting of the provincial associations.

Mr. CARVELL. I am afraid you would have trouble there. Each man must work his own way to the meeting.

Mr. SHARPE (North Ontario). I do not think so. Most of the men who attend the association meeting are pot hunters. You cannot get men to go to the association meeting and compete with good shots. If the minister would allow the officers to nominate two, three, or four men and give them transport to the provincial association meeting it would give a great impetus to the shooting, and the best men then could come down to Ottawa, after having gone to the meeting of the provincial association, at the expense of the department. That would produce a great deal of interest in rifle shooting, it would encourage young shots and not pot hunters, and it would be a move upon right lines.

Mr. CARVELL. At this late hour I do not propose to discuss the question in all its details. The idea of the minister, I think, is a good one. But I am afraid that if he allowed these men to be appointed or selected by the commanding officer there might be a charge of partiality. I would prefer to let each man win his own spurs in his own corps. That is a matter of detail. I have no doubt the minister will be able to work out something.

Mr. MORPHY. At the annual camp in London two years ago, the Militia department placed in the hands of the men the Ross rifle, and told them to shoot with it. At that time the regulation was, that the men would be paid the increase for efficiency in shooting and as the men were absolutely unacquainted with this rifle, the result was miserable shooting, and widespread discontent with the department and criticism of it by the men. That extended through the whole western district of Ontario, because the men thought it was a trick of the government to take from them the pay they would otherwise have earned, in addition to the miserable pittance they receive. I cannot conceive that any government would descend to such a practice, nor do I make such a charge against the late government, but the result of it was, that the men fell away from the regiments, in pique and anger. I would ask the Minister of Militia to bear that incident in mind. I believe that mainly because of it, the 28th regiment did not go into the annual instruction camp last year, and owing to the widespread discontent that prevailed, because of the incident, it has had the effect of practically killing the regiment. It seems to me that the Minister of Militia would be well advised to make a note of that. Then, with regard to regimental bands, I may say that the 28th regiment's band has been dead for years, and the regiment has to depend for its music on the Grand Trunk band, of the City of Stratford. The Wellington regiment the 30th once had a splendid band, but its headquarters are now fifty-five miles away from the regimental headquarters. I mention this, so as to impress upon the minister that if the regiments are going to have bands, they should be regimental bands at headquarters. For my own part, I feel that whether through intent or not, the regimental service of this country has fallen to a very low standard, and I think something should be done. After listening to the remarks made by hon. gentlemen on both sides, I have come to the conclusion that there is no way in this country of developing the militia service other than through the training of the young men of the country in the schools and colleges of the Dominion. You cannot get men in this country to go out for seventy-five cents and a dollar a day and wear out a pair of four dollar boots in the dews of the morning, for fun and pleasure. You have to recognize that times have changed. There has been a good deal said about automobiles to-night. I think the whole department wants to be shaken up, and if the minister will use an automobile for himself instead of giving it to his officials, and go over the ground in one of these machines, he might be doing a great service to the country.

Mr. MACDONALD. What is the attitude of the National Rifle Association with regard to the sights on the Ross rifle?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I heard unofficially, that the Dominion Rifle Association had communicated with the National Rifle Association, and that the latter have

agreed to violate their own law and accept certain sights (the Birmingham Small Arms company's sights, etc., made in the old land, is attached to the Ross rifle), they break their rule in that the mode of attachment disfigures to a certain extent the woodwork. I am not expressing any opinion on the matter one way or the other. I am waiting further information.

Mr. MACDONALD. I hope the minister will not agree to any such proposition.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I have nothing to do with that.

Mr. MACDONALD. I hope he will not agree to it in so far as his consent is concerned. There is no reason why the Sutherland Rifle sight should not be used attached to the Ross rifle as it is. The theory upon which the objection is based is that as it is attached the difficulty is it would interfere in actual warfare with the use of the rifle, but that seems ridiculous when they substitute for that method an attachment on the side, which manifestly would be of no value whatever in warfare as it would be broken off and lost immediately. The policy of the department has been to encourage this Canadian industry which manufactures sights in Canada, and I hope the minister will carry out the position he indicated he would take when we discussed this question before.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The minister is not in the habit of changing very readily.

Mr. NESBITT. Is anything done to encourage rifle clubs in the country?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The regulations give the rifle clubs one dollar per member up to forty members besides one hundred rounds of ammunition.

Mr. McKENZIE. In my county we have an excellent regiment but there is no band in connection with it. There are however some very excellent bands in the county and if the minister engages bands to accompany the regiment to camp I can tell him that he can easily find a very excellent band in my county. I hope the minister will make some arrangement with the colonel of the 94th to give the regiment a band when they are going into camp.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The regulations provide that no man can wear a uniform in camp unless he is sworn in for three years, and that applies to the band. Of course, in case a bandsman should not be able to return the following year, I have never known a commanding officer so short-sighted as to force that man out. In many cases the band is not really part and parcel of the regiment, although it is supposed to be. The proper plan would be for the band in my hon. friend's town to regard itself as part of the regiment, and they would soon discover that the people would recognize them as the 94th band which would be a help to them in getting engagements. The regulation with regard to the band rests with the officers of the regiment.

Headquarters and district staff, $183,000.

Mr. CARVELL. What is the cause of the increase in this vote?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). There is an increase under General French's report. I am ready to justify that report and to give satisfactory reasons for this whole staff expenditure, which has been gradually growing in the last four or five years. At first I was very much opposed to it, but during the last four or five years I have come round. We have, by arrangement between the colonies and the empire, an Imperial general staff, and Canada has the advantage of having, in every division and district, an Imperial staff officer from the old country, who is loaned to us for two years, in order to train up our men. These officers were not getting the pay which appertained to the same rank and position in the old country; in other words, they were losing money by coming to Canada; and there is an increase of $300 each to ten of these men, to make the pay the same as that of the corresponding rank in the old country. Otherwise we could not expect them to remain.

Mr. CARVELL. I must tell my hon. friend that that information is not satisfactory to me and it will not be satisfactory to the country. The sooner we admit that this general staff has reached unreasonable proportions, the better it will be for all concerned. No man need tell me that it it necessary to have 61 permanent officers, at an average of $3,318 each, to look after merely the routine affairs of the militia in Canada, and that does not include the $21,600 authorized by statute for the military members of the Militia Council. There is something wrong in the general principle. A general staff as proposed by General French may be all right in England, where they keep an army to fight; but we keep one merely for the purpose of assisting the civil authorities to maintain order in case of necessity, and to provide a nucleus that may be necessary in times of trouble. Look at the utter ridiculousness of the whole proposition. Here are officials, who are paid fabulous salaries for the amount of work they are doing, receiving this year an increase amounting to more than one-third of the increase to the 60,000 citizen soldiers of Canada. There is no use of my hon. friend telling me that this is a complicated question. This is not common sense, and I hope my hon. friend will be able to give a better reason next year.

Mr. TOBIN. I am somewhat surprised to see these increases in the expenditures of the Militia Department over what they were last year without hearing from our good friends on the other side, especially from the province of Quebec. During the election in Drummond and Arthabaska, I was in that part of the province, and there the Minister of Public Works, with tears in his eyes, told the farmers what a bad government we had in Ottawa, especially since Sir Wilfrid Laurier went into power in 1896, because he had doubled and trebled the expenditure in the Militia Department. He said the Minister of Agriculture was spending only about 15 cents per head in the interests of the farmers, while the Laurier government was spending on the militia $1.50 a head, and still they were going to build a navy which would cost this country fifty or sixty million dollars. I do not see the Minister of Public Works in his seat to-night; nor do I see my intelligent young friend, the member for Nicolet (Mr. Lamarche). He was one of the men I happened to meet on the public platform in Drummond and Arthabaska. I have a great deal of respect for my hon. friend the Minister of Militia, because I think he is honest and takes a great interest in the militia of this country. But during the last election what did these hon. gentlemen say in the province of Quebec? They said: They were not going to have Sam Hughes and Dr. Sproule. Is Mr. Borden going to surround himself with these Orangemen who appeal to race and religion in the province of Ontario? We would never belong to such a party, a party that voted for the Autonomy Bills which took separate schools from the French minority in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. That is the language we heard. I am sorry the Minister of Public Works is not in his seat to-night, because no man in this Dominion has made more appeals to race and religion or has created such feeling among our young French-Canadians, among our young French priests, that they feel that the English-speaking Protestants of Ontario want to do away with our religion. That is the way they talk to the young men in the district of Quebec; I did not know what work the Postmaster General did in the province of Quebec; I did not meet him on the public platform; but I have read his paper, 'L'Evenement.' Hon. gentlemen have read that paper and they know what appeals our opponents have been making in the province of Quebec. Now these hon. gentlemen come here and tell us that we must forget everything, and that we must not speak about race or religion. But, Mr. Chairman, the Liberal members from Quebec never appealed to race or religion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. TOBIN. Hon. gentlemen on the other side may laugh, but I represent a county, the population of which to the extent of 75 or 80 per cent are French speaking people. Five per cent of the balance are probably English-speaking Catholics, and the remainder are English-speaking Protestants. Well the votes of 75 per cent of the English-speaking Protestants go to the present member for Richmond and Wolfe because he does not make racial or religious appeals.

Mr. BENNETT (Simcoe). Oh, oh.

Mr. TOBIN. The hon. member may laugh, but we know him of old. I will say, as my leader always says to that hon. gentleman, that we do not pay any attention to him. We have got to that stage with the hon. gentleman, and I am sure I shall not pay any attention to him to-night.

Mr. BRADBURY. We have had enough of this kind of stuff in the House, and I appeal to the Chairman for his ruling.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the hon member for Richmond and Wolfe is wandering a little from the item under discussion, and I take the liberty of drawing his attention to the fact.

Mr. TOBIN. I bow to your ruling, Mr. Chairman, and will confine myself to the subject under discussion.

Mr. BENNETT (Simcoe). I made your leader sit up last night did I not?

Mr. TOBIN. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that the right hon. leader of the opposition is known too well throughout this country for the people to pay any heed to anything the hon. member for East Simcoe may say concerning him. As far as the province of Quebec is concerned, the leader of the opposition stands with the people to-day as he has never stood before. Now let me tell the Minister of Militia that the farmers of this country will ask how it is the Militia Department can buy automobiles. It is really too bad for us to have got to that stage in this country, when the public moneys could be expended to far better advantage. I would like to see the minister cut the item for automobiles out. I do not blame him for paying 20 per cent or probably $3,000 more than he should have paid. I know him too well to think that he would desire to make a dollar out of any transaction, but let me tell him that the farmers of Canada object to paying for such expenditures as this. Why does not the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Paquet), who has been denouncing the militia in the province of Quebec, get up in this House and oppose these items?

Mr. SHARPE (N. Ontario). Why did you not offer any opposition to them before?

Mr. TOBIN. This is the first time, as far as I know, that the Militia Department has proposed any expenditures for automobiles.

Mr. SHARPE (N. Ontario). Is the automobile item the only one you object to?

Mr. TOBIN. I object to this one and to other items also. You know, Mr. Chairman, what denunciations of militia expenditures were made by hon. gentlemen opposite who came from the province of Quebec, when they sat to the Speaker's left. I am sure also that you, Mr. Chairman, if you were not in the Chair to-night, would be asking the present Minister of Militia not to increase that expenditure.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I want to thank the hon. gentleman for giving me the explanation of why I am so very popular in the province of Quebec. As long as my opponents roundly condemn me I am happy, and from what the hon. member says I have been denounced from one end of the province of Quebec to the other.

Mr. TOBIN. Yes, by your own friends.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). When my Liberal friends or my Tory friends meet me I am happy to receive them with open arms. I am satisfied that the attempts to arouse prejudice in the province of Quebec against ministers from the province of Ontario are simply taken by the people of that province, no matter how enthusiastically and earnestly those attempts are urged from the platform, with a grain of salt, and very little attention is paid to them.

Mr. TOBIN. I would like the present Minister of Militia, when he said he did not blame the Nationalist ministers on account of making appeals to race and religion in the county of Drummond and Arthabaska, to have been present at one of those meetings and heard the language used regarding himself, as well as regarding the Liberal party. I can assure him that had he been there he would not have felt very well satisfied.

Maintenance of military properties, $89,000.

Mr. H. BOULAY (Rimouski) (Translation): Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe is not entirely in accord with the facts when he states that we raised the race and creed cry during the election in Drummond and Arthabaska. I say that, on the contrary, that policy was followed by himself and his friends. From 1896 to 1911, they constantly appealed to sectional and racial prejudices. We had to fight them for fifteen years on that ground.

Mr. TOBIN. Mr. Chairman, I think that the hon. gentleman is out of order; he is quite astray from the item under discussion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must say that the hon. gentleman is answering the remarks made by the previous speaker. Once the door is open it is pretty hard for me to close it. I hope that every member will keep to the item under discussion.

Mr. BOULAY (Translation): I regret that the hon. member for Richmond should have taken such a stand. He stated, among other things, that we had vowed that never Messrs. Hughes and Sproule would be members of the government. I never said anything to that effect in my constituency. I deny outright having ever said anything of the kind. I had no business to say so, for this very good reason that I knew I would not be called upon to lead the government of the country.

These gentlemen have their opinion as I have mine, and these opinions are entitled to respect. As far as the militia expenses are concerned, I agree with the objections raised against those expenses. The policy upon which we have made the last election in 1911 was partly on the reduction of the expenses for the militia. We specially objected to the establishment of the naval service, and we said also that the expenses for the militia were too high. We said that in 1896 the Liberal-Conservative party was expending only $1,500,000 for the militia, whereas in 1911, under a Liberal government, those expenses were of $7,000,000. As far as I am concerned, I am quite willing to take the responsibility of my pre-election statement and to renew them before the House. Those expenses are too high and, were the hon. Minister of Militia ready to reduce them, I would surely give him my hearty support.

I say as I already said in my county, that the militia appropriations are too high as compared with what we give to the agriculture. Neither can I approve the item for automobiles. I fail to see their usefulness in the military service. I am quite willing to condemn now such a policy, the same as I did during the last elections, according to our programme. I do not deny what I said then, and I say that the hon. minister should reduce this expense.

Mr. TOBIN. Will the hon. minister allow me to put a question?

If I understood him right, he thinks that the expenses for the militia are too high.

Mr. BOULAY (Translation). Yes, they are too high; and they were thus been increased under the Liberal government. I am ready to condemn such an expense, even when it is made by the present government.

Mr. TOBIN. The hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Boulay), has admitted that he was against the increase of the expenditure for militia. He also admits that during the last election in Rimouski he used that against the government. And my hon. friend has only to go back to 'Hansard,' to his speech of last Tuesday night, and that will bear out what I said as to the language he used about the Speaker of this House:

Ordinance, Arms, Lands and Equipment, $1,300,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. I desire information with regard to the proposed armoury for Moncton. A year or so ago an officer of the Department of Public Works and an officer of the Militia Department from Halifax were sent to select a site, which was afterwards expropriated for the purpose of an armoury. I do not know in what position the matter is now. I hope progress is being made, and that the construction of the armoury will be expedited.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I do not know the details of this case, but there have been a number of cases in which armouries were erected that were found not to be satisfactory. It might be they had no place for the officers to meet, or perhaps no place for the cadet corps or the boy scouts; no place to hold a fat-stock show or an automobile show or other public exhibition for which such buildings may be properly used.

Mr. CARVELL. Surely the hon. gentleman is not going to allow fat-stock shows in the armouries?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). They did before my time, and I hope they will again.

Mr. CARVELL. I succeeded in having a fat-stock show in the armoury in my town and I was nearly excommunicated from the military church on account of it. I thought it was a very proper proceeding.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I think so too.

Mr. CARVELL. I said: before you drive your stock there, put sawdust on the floor.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). That is right.

Mr. CARVELL. There was a lot of talk about it. They wanted to insure the place for $50,000 or $60,000 for the week of the show. But that was not done. It seems to me that as these armouries are built with public money they should be used for every thing that will not interfere with the use for which they were first intended.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Hear, hear.

Mr. CARVELL. That is one point on which the minister and I agree. Another point is the Ross rifle. When this vote is expended how many rifles will there be belonging to the militia of Canada, supposed to be in good condition and brought up to date?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I am informed that there will be about 95,000, but I have not the exact figures here.

Mr. EMMERSON. I may say to the minister that the official who came from Halifax, took into consideration the question of sufficient room, and in selecting the site he had all these matters in view. I think the minister will find there is ample room, that the site is one that will do the department great credit. I bring that matter up to remind the minister of the conditions that prevail and ask him to have inquiry made and to see that action is taken to utilize the site.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I desire to have this question of the use of drill halls understood. I am not a crank on this subject, and I do not want to waste a dollar of public money. I am sincere and enthusiastic in looking upon the training of the militia and of the cadets as one of the best things for the country, and I know that the heart of the country is with me in that. These drill halls are going to cost money. But I have been experimenting with all sorts of plans and discussing the matter with architects and others, and I am satisfied that we are now in the position—it was due to the action of my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie), who drew my attention to a building in his town that was being used for an armoury—to provide these buildings much more cheaply than formerly. These are not extravagant buildings. For a country village with one company, room would be provided; where there are two companies the building will be suitable. When it comes to a city the size of Moncton, I believe that the place should have a suitable armoury. It is due to such a city from the government of this country, and the armoury should be a place that could be used by the scouts, the cadets, and the militia. Also philanthropic organizations and others should be allowed to use it—anything for the development of the people so long as it does not rival other buildings. That is the rule we have established. The public own these buildings, and the public should have an opportunity to use them.

Mr. LALOR. What are we to understand the minister to mean when he says that the public should have the use of these buildings? It seemed to be the policy of the late government, so far as my county was concerned, to allow the use of the drill halls for skating rinks. And if the drill hall

was not properly located for a skating rink, it was up to the hotel man or anybody else who happened to require the building for a skating rink, to have it moved so that it would be well located for that business. I visited a pretty good-sized town in my county a few years ago just before the militia was called out to camp. The captain of the local company took me around to the drill hall, owned, as the Minister of Militia says, by the people of Canada, and showed me this drill hall which had been used as a skating rink all winter and which had two feet of slush in it so that the militia could not use it for a drill at all. To say that the public should have the use of these buildings is all right so far as agriculture and other purposes are concerned. But I think it a mistake that the drill halls of the country should be used as the late government allowed them to be used—and I speak by the book—allowing them to be turned into skating rinks.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). That is not a public use.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Could not the hon. gentleman utilize a portion of this vote for the purpose of taking care of some of the old forts in different parts of the country? I have in mind more especially Fort Howe, in the city of St. John, which is now completely neglected. The attention of my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) has been called to it. The former Minister of Militia had an examination and survey made of the grounds with a view to making some improvements. The cost of making improvements would be trifling, but they would be of great advantage to the city. Had the former Minister of Militia remained in office, I think he would have carried out these improvements. If the amount cannot be taken from this appropriation, perhaps the minister would think of providing for it in the supplementaries.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). In conformity with the hon. gentleman's request, I took the matter up with the Council. There is no secret about it. There was a most hearty response from every member in the Cabinet. Whether there will be an item in the supplementary estimates, I am not in a position to say, as the hon. gentleman knows. But I can assure him that his suggestions were most favourably received. Not only St. John, but every other place in the country will be brought to notice. A lot of things have been saddled upon the Minister of Militia that do not properly belong to him. I think that item would more properly come under the Battlefields Commission, and if the matter can be so arranged, they should assume the responsibility of carrying it out.

Mr. LALOR.

Mr. McKENZIE. I wish to call the attention of the minister to the armoury in the town of Baddeck, in the county of Victoria, the headquarters of the 94th regiment of Highlanders. The armoury is a small one, and I have been trying for years to get it enlarged, and also to get a drill shed built, in connection with it. Last year I succeeded in getting the Minister of Militia to send an officer from Halifax down there to make a report upon the condition of the armoury, and what could be done with a view of enlarging it with the addition of a drill hall. I also asked him to make a report upon obtaining a rifle range at that point for the 94th. I wrote to the present minister in the early part of this session inquiring for the report of that officer, but I have not yet received a reply. I want to point out to the minister that the town of Baddeck is rather a fashionable place of resort for Americans in the summer time, it is a beautiful spot on the Bras d'Or lakes, and we would like our military buildings to look up to date. The building at Baddeck is a low set one thrown into a field, with nothing around it to suggest that it is a military building. I hope the officer has made a favourable report in regard to the rifle range, and that the minister will proceed to act upon it.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I have no recollection of the details of the case. I remember my hon. friend asking me for a report on the matter, and I sent to Halifax for it, but it has not yet come to hand. However, I will make inquiries and find out. Nothing is too good for the old 94th.

Mr. CARROLL. I would like to bring to the attention of the minister the condition of the armoury in the city of Sydney. There is a military property there now, I do not know whether it is at the present time the property of the Dominion government, or of the Imperial government. We have a regiment at Sydney, which is a thriving town of over 20,000 inhabitants. There are many young men who are much interested in military affairs, both cavalry and infantry, and they wanted me to bring to the attention of the minister, the fact that an armoury and drill shed are required in Sydney. There are some buildings to which the military people of Sydney have access, but they are on ground which a few years ago, belonged to the Imperial government. I would like the minister to investigate this matter. I would also ask him to tell me if there has been an application from Sydney for a rifle range, and what success the application has met with.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Speaking from memory, there is some application about a rifle range in Sydney. The rifle men of Sydney have provided a range of their own; I do not remember whether they want us to take that over or to buy a better range. I shall send down a man to report. I can assure my hon. friend that all applications of that sort have my hearty sympathy. I am prepared at any time to come down to the House and face all adverse criticisms for the erection of these drill halls all over the country. I believe they are very necessary in the interest of the country.

Mr. CARROLL. There will be no adverse criticism of the minister from the people of Sydney.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Inverness). I would ask the minister if anything has been done with regard to erecting an armoury in the town of Inverness? Last year I made an application to the late minister, and he sent an engineer down to report. I have seen the report. It appears that a certain site was recommended by this engineer, but I have received no further information. I would ask the minister if it is his intention to erect this armoury in the town of Inverness. It is as necessary there as in any other part of the country. He will find as good militia material in the county of Inverness as he can find in any other place in Canada.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Judging by the appearance of the hon. gentleman and his friends from that part of the country, it seems to be inhabited by a splendid race. I do not know the details about Inverness. I think an application has been made for an armoury. It would not take over $15,000 for a company armoury, and it would come out of this vote.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Inverness). I wish to emphasize the fact that an application has been made. The town of Inverness is a growing mining town, with a population of about 4,000.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). There are a great many hon. gentlemen who are anxious to get these drill halls and armouries and to get the militia force in proper shape. There are, however, hon. gentlemen who feel called upon to oppose the militia expenditure, but let me call attention to the fact that if we look over the items we could cut down by millions expenditures which are not anything like as essential as the expenditures for drill halls and for the upkeep of the militia. I will ask these hon. gentlemen to look with a pleasant eye upon these expenditures and I am satisfied that they will see their way clear to give their assistance to the legitimate desire for the erection of drill halls all over the country. It may be said that there is an adverse public opinion in the country, but I would say that that so-called adverse public opinion is something which is not real. I am satisfied that so long as the public are assured that these expenditures are being legitimately carried out they will approve of this determination to have drill halls erected in every part of the country.

Mr. LALOR. I sincerely hope that the Minister of Militia will be sympathetic with the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who are now pleading for drill halls and armouries. We have had some little experience in connection with that. I remember that, when I sat on the other side of the House, I pleaded session after session for a public building in my own town and I never got the sympathetic ear of a minister sitting upon this side to any demands that I might make in that respect. I hope that the Minister of Militia and the Minister of Public Works, who now are sitting upon this side of the House, will have more sympathy with those gentlemen who are now sitting on the other side of the House than they have had with us when they were sitting on this side of the House and that the Minister of Militia and other ministers will use their judgment in putting up buildings, not in little places of 800 or 900 inhabitants, as those hon. gentlemen did but will look to those places which have been suffering for a great many years and have been penalized because they sent a Conservative to parliament.

Salaries and wages, $168,000.

Mr. CARVELL. I notice here that, for the rank and file of caretakers, $1.50 a day is allowed, and that the chief caretakers of the large armouries receive as high as $3 per day. Would the minister tell me how he distinguishes between the ordinary armouries and the larger ones?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I am informed that the chief caretakers are employed in large places where there are two or three different regiments or batteries, and that is where the extra charges come in.

Schools of instruction, $100,000.

Mr. CARVELL. Even at this late hour I think the minister will pardon me if I make one or two brief remarks in connection with these schools of instruction. I am pleased to see that he is increasing this amount and I hope he will, if necessary, increase it to a much greater extent than he is doing at the present time.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I am bringing these schools to the doors of the people in place of requiring the people to go to them.

Mr. CARVELL. That is what I am coming at. You never can get the average militia officer to go to the central school at Kingston or any other place. We have been trying that ever since the inauguration of this system of training. Once in a while there is a man who is an enthusiast and has plenty of money who will go, but I am safe in saying that perhaps the greatest detriment to the militia is the rich man's son. The man who is able to get a commission because he has some money or because he is rich is the most useless piece of furniture that you can have in a regiment.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is not personal to any of us. You cannot offend any of us in that way.

Mr. CARVELL. I can tell the minister, and I know that he must have met it in his own experience that there are dozens of young men who have accepted commissions, and who have been compelled to allow these commissions to lapse simply because they could not afford the time to go to the schools of instruction. In my own constituency there are bright young men who would be a credit to any commission, but they are trying to earn their own living and the only policy is to bring the instructor to the officer even if you have only three or four officers to bring him to. In the last three or four months, officers —I do not say the general staff—but men very high up in the headquarters staff, have discouraged the formation of these schools, and have told officers in the maritime provinces that they cannot send men down there to hold these schools, but that they must send their officers to Kingston. I presume that possibly if a man went to Kingston and took the three months course, where he would be in contact with the regulars, he might perhaps get a better training than he could get at home, but if you cannot get your officer to go there is it not better to send the instructor to him? That raises another question, and I hope the hon. minister will not think I am unduly criticising him if I find fault with the class of instruction which is given in the artillery and engineer's courses. To-day the education of the engineer officer is a strictly technical, mathematical proposition. An officer who had received his artillery training fifteen years ago would not know by the language what they were talking about to-day if he went to school and attempted to take a course, or if he went before a battery or a company of engineers and attempted to instruct them, especially in artillery. A man who is not abreast of the higher mathematics, geometry and trigonometry, is not in a position to understand what they are talking about. I will give an illustration. Not long ago I visited a camp of instruction in Canada and I found an artillery officer, a sergeant, who had been sent down to instruct the brigade in field artillery. He was engaged in range taking, he went through a certain formula, and he announced that the range was so much. I happened to be there as an interested onlooker, and I told him he was wrong. He said: I am right, and I said: You are wrong, because you are violating one of the principles of mathematics, which is that the two sides of a triangle together are greater than the third side. I got him to go over his formula again, and he found that he was wrong. This instructor did not know whether he was right or wrong. I realize the difficulty my hon. friend will have in getting men who are mathematical scholars, but if he is going to make the engineers and artillery work what it should be in this country and which can only be made possible by the efficient education which they should receive, and without which they might as well stay at home, because if they came into actual hostilities they would only be massacred, he cannot afford to spare money to give this proper education to the officers.

I hope the minister will see that the education is taken by the officer, and above all that the right kind of education is so taken. An ordinary drill sergeant sent around the country cannot instruct officers on these technical questions. Within the last week I have been trying to get a school in my own town, and I was practically told that I must have a brigade and a certain number of officers and non-commissioned officers, and my reply to the minister was that if you had to get a class of twenty or thirty in some of these localities you would not have a class at all. If you are going to have the militia of any value as a force you have to spend money in the proper way, and I am speaking from experience. If the minister would send his instructors to organize the schools wherever he could get three or four officers together there would be much more value obtained for the money.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Carvell) on the question of the schools, and the first act I did after becoming Minister of Militia was to try to carry out his idea. We have seventy of the best non-commissioned officers on the force going all over the country this winter. The technical education relates to engineers and to artillery, and is the kind of education the staff officers of the old country are giving to our officers and non-commissioned officers throughout Canada. In Quebec there is Major Robert-

son who cannot be surpassed in the whole world for the value of the higher class technical education he imparts. Those gentlemen are ready to go into country places and wherever they can get a couple of officers together give them instruction.

Mr. KAY. Where is the Webb infantry equipment made, and who is converting the back-sights on the ten thousand Ross rifles?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The contract for the latter was given last year, I think, to the Sutherland Rifle-Sight Company in New Glasgow. The Webb equipment is bought in England through the war office, at war office prices.

Some resolutions reported.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 163) for the relief of Edith Harriet Duffy.—Mr. Goodeve.

Bill (No. 162) for the relief of William Alexander Hunt Jenkins.—Mr. Goodeve.

Bill (No. 161) respecting the Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Railway Company.—Mr. Goodeve.

Bill (No. 158) to incorporate the Grand Lodge of the Loyal Order of Moose in the Dominion of Canada.—Mr. Goodeve.

Bill (No. 157) respecting the Subsidiary High Court of the Ancient Order of Foresters in the Dominion of Canada.—Mr. Goodeve.

Bill (No. 164) for the relief of John Angus Kennedy.—Mr. McCoig.

FIRST AND SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 159) respecting the Mexico Northwestern Transportation Company, Limited, and to change its name to the Mexico Northwestern Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Sharpe (Ontario).

Bill (No. 160) respecting the Alabama Traction, Light and Power Company, Limited.—Mr. Sharpe (Ontario).

On motion of Mr. Hughes (Victoria), House adjourned at 12.50 a.m. Wednesday.

INDEX

FIRST SESSION—TWELFTH PARLIAMENT, 1911-1912.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following :—1°, 2° 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading ; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist ; *, without remarks or debate ; Accts., Accounts; Adjn., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned ; Amt., Amendment ; Amts., Amendments ; Amalg., Amalgamation ; Ans., Answer ; Ass.; Assurance ; B., Bill ; B.C., British Columbia ; Can., Canada or Canadian ; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway ; Com., Committee ; Co., Company ; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence ; Consd., Consider' Consdn., Consideration ; Cor., Correspondence ; Deb., Debate ; Dept., Department ; Depts., Departments Div., Division ; Dom., Dominion ; Govt., Government ; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General ; Hse., House ; H. of C., House of Commons ; Incorp., Incorporation ; Ins., Insurance ; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway ; Man., Manitoba ; Mess., Message ; M., Motion ; m., moved ; Neg., Negatived ; N.B., New Brunswick ; N.W.T., Northwest Territories ; N.S., Nova Scotia ; O.C., Order in Council ; Ont., Ontario ; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island ; P.O., Post Office ; Par., Paragraph ; Prop., Proposed ; Q., Quebec ; Ques., Question ; Recom., Recommit ; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference ; Rep., Report, Reported ; Reps., Reports ; Res., Resolution ; Ret., Return ; Ry., Railway ; Rys., Railways ; Sel., Select ; Sen., Senate ; Sp. Special ; Stmnt., Statement ; Sup., Supply ; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary ; Wthdn., Withdrawn ; Wthdrl., Withdrawal ; Y.N., Yeas and Nays ; Names in Italics and parentheses are those of the mover.

ACHIM, Mr. H., *Labelle.*

C.N.R. and Carillon & Grenville Co.'s (B. 42) 1°*, 970 (i).

La Compagnie du Chemin de fer de Colonisation du Nord (B. 45) 1°*, 970 (i).

AIKINS, Mr. J. A. M., *Brandon.*

Address, The, on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 94 (i).

Civil Service Increases since 1900 (M. for ret.*) 561 (i).

Cockshutt Plough Co.'s Prices, &c. (remarks) 855 (i).

Denny, James, Relief (B. 112) 1°*, 3630 (ii).

Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2186, 2318, 2773, 3795 (ii).

Hudson Bay Ry., Copy of Cor. *re* Construction, &c. (M. for papers) 1213, 1264 (i).

Hudson Bay Ports, Surveys, &c. *re* Navigation (Ques.) 3943 (ii).

—— (M. for reps.*) 3756 (ii).

Immigration Policy *re* Mar. Provs., on Prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2124 (ii).

Live Stock Records Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 6029 (iv).

Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4313 (iii); in Com. 4605; on Amt. (Mr. Mondou) 4663 (iii).

Methodist Church (B. 133) 1°*, 4975 (iii).

Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2722; in Com., 2949 (ii).

AIKINS, Mr. J. A. M.—*Con.*

Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6429 (iv).

Wadge, Thomas Patent Relief (B. 16) 1°*, 643 (i); in Com., 2859, 2983 (ii).

AMES, Mr. H. B., *Montreal, St. Antoine.*

Canada-Australia Trade (M. for papers*) 582 (i).

Continental Can. Co.'s Patent Relief B. 119 (Mr. Fripp) in Com., 5207 (iii).

Freight Rates on Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3225 (ii).

Juvenile Delinquents Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 940 (i).

Montreal Central Terminal Co.'s. (B. 49) 1°*, 970 (i).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Retention of (Ques.) 2062 (ii).

N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3130 (ii).

Private Bills, Suspension of Rules (remarks) 5902 (iv).

Public Accounts Com., 6th Rep.: M. to conc., 6062 (iv).

Railway Bills, Senate Amendments (remarks) 6550 (iv).

Rambaut, Thos. D., Patent Relief (B. 84) 1°*, 970, 1862 (i); in Com., 2855, 2985, 3280, 3479 (ii).

—— Patent Relief B. 84, on Order for Com., 3332 (ii).

AMES, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—
Labour Dept., (Gazette) 1491 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2643; in Com., 2930, 2945, 3021 (ii).
Trade Relations between W. Indies, Australia and Canada, on M. (Mr. Pugsley) to Com. of Sup., 1981 (ii).
Universal Eyesight Co.'s incorp. B. 126 (Mr. McLean) in Com., 5909 (iv).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. A., *North York.*
Aurora Public Building, Papers, Reports, &c. (M. for copies*) 561 (i).
Newmarket Canal, Commission *re* Investigation (remarks) 1319 (i).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E., *East Lambton.*
Cable Rates, Res. (M.) to withdraw, 3448 (ii).
See 'Parcel Post.'
Dairying Industry in Canada, Complaints *re* Weighing, &c., on M. (Mr. Edwards) to Com. of Sup., 5725 (i).
Hydro-Electric Commission, Power for Govt. Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3289 (ii).
Newspaper Postage, Opinion of P.M.G. *re* Regulations (Ques.) 2291 (ii).
Parcel Post Extension, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 2348, 2352 (ii).
Parcel Post, Rural Mail Delivery, &c.: on M. for Sup., 4082 (iii).
——— Reply to Amt. (Mr. Lemieux) 4109 (iii).
Postal Regulations, Commission *re* Investigation (prop. res.) 2251 (ii).
——— (remarks) on M. to take in Mondays, 2376 (ii).
Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 105 (Mr. Pelletier) on M. for 2°, 3352 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Canals, Welland (surveys) 5790 (iv).

ARTHURS, Mr. J., *Parry Sound.*
N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3432 (ii).
Powassan Postmaster, Change *re* (M. for cor.*) 2459 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Labour Gazette (Gazette) 1486 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2934 (ii).

BAKER, Mr. G. H., *Brome.*
Central Ry. Co. of Canada (B. 44) 1°*, 970 (i).
Customs Smuggling Case by M. P., Par. in Montreal 'Star' (Ques.) 2072 (ii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3949 (ii).

BAKER, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*
Trust and Loan Co. of Canada (B. 108) 1°*, 3449 (ii).

BARKER, Mr. S., *East Hamilton.*
Dom. Guarantee Co.'s (B. 29) 1°*, 795 (i).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com. (amt.) 6576 (iv).
Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s (B. 47) 1°*, 970 (i).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1635 (i).
N. T. Ry. (P. C. judgment) B. 95 (Mr. White) on M. for 2°, 3070 (ii).
Ottawa and Lake McGregor Ry. incorp. (B. 192) 1° m., 6495 (iv).
Railway Bills, Senate Amendments (remarks) 6550 (iv).
Revillon Frères Trading Co.'s incorp. (B. 114) 1°*, 3828 (ii); in Com., 5202 (iii).
Union Bank of Canada (B. 57) 1°*, 970 (i).

BARNARD, Mr. G. H., *Victoria, B. C.*
Fisheries Protection Service on Pacific Coast, on M. (Mr. Clements) for Papers, 2471 (ii).
Labour Conditions, Emplymt. of Orientals in B.C. (remarks) 177 (i).
Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co. (B. 73) 1°*, 1410 (i).

BARRETTE, Mr. J. A., *Berthier.*
Berthier-en-Haut Post Office, Purchase, Repairs, &c. (M. for papers*) 1409 (i).
Keewatin Separate Schools, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 3149 (ii), 4240 (iii).
Sorel Marine Yards, Inquiry *re* Administration of (Ques.) 974 (i).

BEATTIE, Mr. T., *London.*
Battlefields Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5301 (iii).
Cockshutt Plough Co., Prices *re* (remarks) 817 (i).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6262 (iv).
London Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1542 (i).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1665 (i).
Petroleum, Crude, and Refined, Quantity imported yearly since 1902 (Ques.) 730 (i).
Rainy River Radial Ry. Co.'s (B. 121) 1°*, 4457 (iii); in Com., 5198 (iii).
Speaker, Dep., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to appoint, 523 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Post Office (promotions) 6280 (iv).
Immigration (regulations) 3913 (ii).
Wells, Edna Relief (B. 102) 1°*, 3049 (ii).

BEATTIE, Mr. T.—*Con.*
Wills, Annie Greek Relief (B. 173) 1°*, 5680 (iv).

BELAND, Hon. H., *Beauce.*
Asbestos Importations, Total Value, &c. (M. for ret.) 1590, 1817 (i).
Boucher, Mr. O. F., Pet. *re* Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 975 (i).
Canada and Gulf Terminal Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6306 (iv).
Cattle Quarantine at Beauceville, Res. from Chamber of Commerce, 4984 (iii).
Civil Service (mail clerks) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 4784 (iii).
Dalaire, L. P., Dismissal of (Ques.) 2454 (ii).
Duchaine, Pierre, Dismissal of (Ques.) 2454 (ii).
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amt. B. (Mr. Monk) in Com. on Res., 6057 (iv).
Farly, Mrs., Postmistress at St. Gabriel de Brandon, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 2579 (ii).
G. T. Ry. Assiniboine River Bridge Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 6061 (iv).
Henry, Norbert, Contract *re* Mails between Scott Junction and Station (Ques.) 975 (i). *See* 'Scott.'
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3727 (ii).
Jacques, Leander, Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3339 (ii).
Judges Act (additional) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5408 (iii); in Com. on Res., 5959 (iv).
Lacombe, J. A., Dismissal from St. Sebastian P. O., Inquiry *re* (Ques.) 974 (i).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6618 (iv).
Levis Dry Dock, Inquiry for Ret., 6492 (iv).
Man. Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 3°, 4925 (amt.) 4934; Neg. (Y. 52; N. 108) 4972 (iii).
—— on Voting *re* M. for 3°, 4984 (iii).
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6305 (iv).
Quebec Dry Dock, Construction *re* (Ques.) 4260 (iii).
—— (M. for reps., &c.*) 4263 (iii). *See* 'Lewis.'
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6305 (iv).
St. Charles and Huron River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6308 (iv).
Scott Junction Mail Contract, Cancellation *re* (M. for cor.*) 2459 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture (animals health) 6477; (census) 6462; (International Institute) 6479 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Inland Revenue (private secretary) 6490 (iv).

BELAND, Hon. H.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Immigration (agencies) 3915 (ii).
Inland Revenue (explosives apparatus) 6604 (iv).
Justice, Administration of (Montreal circuit court) 6597 (iv).
Labour Dept. (conciliation boards) 1511 (i).
Militia (annual drill) 5478 (iii).
Miscellaneous (counsel fees *re* Lanctot inquiry) 6486 (iv).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5342 (iii).
Post Office (mail service) 6289; (salaries, &c.) 6618 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Tracadie Lazeretto) 1530 (i).
Thibodeau, George, Resignation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6618 (iv).

BELLEMARE, Mr. A., *Maskinongé.*
Budget, The, 5146 (iii).
Election Expenses in Maskinongé, Settlement of (Ques.) 4776 (iii).
Dismissals by Hon. Mr. Lemieux, Par. in 'Le Devoir' (read) 2452, 2664 (ii).
Medical Director General, Apptmt., &c. (Ques.) 2667 (ii).
St. Lawrence Channel Ice Breaker (Ques.) 5680 (iv).
Statue erected on Federal Land in Quebec City by Prov. Govt. (Ques.) 2667 (ii).
Victoria Memorial Museum, Number of Employees, Dismissals, &c. (Ques.) 2294 (ii).

BENNETT, Mr. R. B., *Calgary.*
Address, The, in answer to His Ex.'s Speech (moved) 14 (v).
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5286 (iii).
Alberta Interurban Ry. Co. (B. 33) 1°*, 969 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 5264 (iii).
Imperial Naturalization, Uniformity in Can., on M. (Mr. Macdonald) to Com. of Sup., 2432 (ii).
Premier Life Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 63) 1°*, 1069 (i).
Railway Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 2°, 2522 (ii).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H., *East Simcoe.*
Address, The, on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 127 (i).
Alberta Peace River and Eastern Ry. Co.'s B. 129 (Mr. Chabot) in Com., 5904 (iv).
Continental Can Co.'s Patent Relief B. 119 (Mr. Fripp) on Order for Com., 5903 (iv).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Taylor) to conc., 2846 (ii).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*
Ducharme, Mr., Apptmt. as Commissioner (remarks) *re* Attacks on, 2830 (ii).
Elevators, Control by Govt., ref. to in debate on Address, 137 (i).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2404, 3529, 3781 (ii).
Grain Shipments from Port Arthur and Fort William (Ques.) 539 (i).
Grain Shipments from Ports in Canada, Quantity, Grades, &c. (Ques.) 536 (i).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3963 (ii).
Hudson Bay Railway, ref. to in debate on Address, 132 (i).
Magdalen Island News Service (remarks) 4162 (iii).
Navigable Waters Pollution (B. 107) 1°*, 3449 (ii).
Ottawa Improvement Commission, Minutes of Meetings, Amounts expended, &c., (M. for ret.*) 1588 (i).
Port Arthur and Fort William Ice Breaking and Dredging (personal explanation) 3331 (ii).
Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 105 (Mr. Pelletier) on M. for 2° 3352; in Com., 3360 (ii).
Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Ry. Co.s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5913 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Conservation on Commission (Chicago canal) 6582 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and S.S. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 4720 (iii).
Miscellaneous (art gallery) 2826 (ii).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5366 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Midland) 1855 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2977 (ii).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6421 (iv).

BEST, Mr. J. A., *Dufferin.*
Civil Service Act (rural mail) Amt. B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 6094 (iv).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 22 (Mr. Jameson) in Com., 2011 (ii).
Personal Explanation, Remarks *re* Agricultural Com. Par. in Toronto 'Globe,' 2155 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Railways—N. T. Ry. (construction) 5770 (iv).

BICKERDIKE, Mr. R., *Montreal, St. Lawrence.*
British Preference, Increase of (Ques.) 553 (i).

BICKERDIKE, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Cattle Embargo by G. B., Abolition of (Ques.) 557 (i).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1082 (i).
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amt. B. 180 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 6202 (iv).
Educational Bills, Ques. of Order, *re* Jurisdiction of Dom. Govt., 3873 (ii).
See 'Queens.'
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6457 (iv).
Highlands Bridge, Contract *re* Construction (remarks) 1197 (i); 5790 (iv).
Immigrant Inspection before sailing for Canada (remarks) 618 (i).
Immigration Policy *re* Mar. Provs. on prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2091 (ii).
Juvenile Delinquents Act Amt. (B. 2) 1°*, 12; 2° and in Com., 939 (i).
Liverpool-Manitoba Assurance Co.'s (B. 13) 1°*, 643 (i).
Montreal Harbour, National and Free Port (Ques.) 554 (i).
N.T. Ry., Branch Lines to Montreal, Construction of (Ques.) 554 (i).
Ottawa, Montreal and Eastern Ry. Co.'s (B. 99) 1°*, 2664 (ii).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 3874 (ii), 4750 (iii).
Queen's University Bill, Ref. to Min. of Jus. (remarks) 3730 (ii).
See 'Educational.'
SUPPLY—
Agriculture (animals health) 6469; (live stock industry) 6469 (iv).
Canals—Lachine (Rockfield bridge) 5790 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 1082 (i).
Immigration (agencies) 3918 (ii).
Labour Dept. (Gazette) 1479 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Lachine) 1952 (i).

BLAIN, Mr. R., *Peel.*
British American Trust Co.'s incorp. (B. 155) in Com., 5946 (iv).
Cigarettes, Quantity manufactured and imported in each Prov. for 1905, &c. (Ques.) 556 (i).
Civil Service Act (rural mail) Amt. B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 6099 (iv).
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5882 (iv).
Davidson, David George, Relief (B. 175) 1°*, 5831 (iv).
Dominion-Gresham Casualty Co. Amalgamation (B. 176) 1°*, 5831 (iv).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Freight Rates, Discrimination *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3211 (ii).
Freight Rates, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 668 (i).
Grain Amt. Act B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2537, 2775, 3167 (ii).
Grain Shipments in the West, Freight Rates, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3979 (ii).
Horse Racing: *See* 'Criminal Code,' &c.
Judges Act (salaries) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 6006 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 4498 (iii).
N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1878 (i), 3375, 3411 (ii).
Parcel Post Extension, on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 2350 (ii).
Public Accounts Com., on M. (Mr. Middlebro) to conc. in 2nd Rep., 5836 (iv).
Public Accounts Com., Attendance of R. C. Miller, on M. to adopt 3rd Rep., 6335 (iv).
Race Track Meets: *See* 'Criminal Code,' &c.
Railway Committee, 13th Rep. (presented) 5999 (iv).
Rural Mail: *See* 'Civil Service,' 'Parcel Post.'
Rural Telephone System, Placing in Post Offices (Prop. res.) 2247 (ii).
—— (M.) to stand, 2460 (ii).
St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co's. (B. 172) 1°*, 5680 (iv).
Seely, Keitha Relief (B. 174) 1°*, 5831 (iv).
Sterling Life Assurance Co. of Canada incorp. (B. 72) 1°* , 1410 (i); in Com., 2448 (ii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2895, 3011, 3542 (ii).

BOIVIN, Mr. G. H., *Shefford.*
Address, The, 497 (i).
Beauchemin, J. A., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3337 (ii).
Fenian Raid Vets. Land Grant, &c. (Ques.) 3334 (ii).
Mail Contracts, Cancellation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6642 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. Beland) to M. for 3°, 4969 (iii).
Marriages in Canada, Power of Dom. Govt. to Legalize (Ques.) 575 (i).
SUPPLY—
Post Office—Outside Service (salaries) 6642 (iv).
Weights and Measures (inspectors) 5830 (iv).

BOIVIN, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*
Van Antwerp, C.B., Employment by Inland Rev. Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iv).

BORDEN, Rt. Hon. R. L. (Prime Minister), (*Halifax*).
Address, The, on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), 50 (i).
—— Precedence *re* (M.) 9 (i).
—— (M.) to Present, 519 (i).
—— Reply from H.R.H. (presented) 932 (i).
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5285 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. Pugsley) to M. for 3°, 5563 (iv).
Agricultural 1st Rep. of Com. (remarks) *re* 2375 (ii).
Archives (B. 66) (prop. res.) 1282; 1°*, 1283; 2° m., 1440 (i); in Com., 1494 (i).
Ash Wednesday, Adjournment for (M.) 3343 (ii).
Baldwin, Mr. E., Dismissal from Customs, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Cor., 1362 (i).
Ballots, Voting by Divisions (Ans.) 4979 (iii).
Banking Act, Legislation *re* (remarks) 1820 (i).
Bibeau, Mr. A., Sessional Clerk, Dismissal, &c., (Ans.) 4248 (iii).
B.C. International Boundary Line, Par. from Washington (remarks) 2755 (ii).
B.C. Provincial Boundary, Agreement *re* Subsidy (Ans.) 972 (i).
B.C. Provincial Subsidy, Consultations with other Provs. (Ans.) 573 (i).
Boundary Waters Treaty, Apptmt. of Commissioners, on Inquiry (Mr. Pugsley) for Ret., 2589 (ii).
See 'Waterways Commission.'
Business of the House, Morning Sittings (M.) 4980 (iii).
Cabinet, Constitution of (remarks) in debate on Address, 56 (i).
—— Quebec Ministers of the Cabinet, Choice of Min. of Public Works (Ans.) 545 (i).
—— Stmt. by Hon. Mr. Monk (Ans.) 526 (i).
Cable Rates to G. B., on M. for Sup. (remarks) 3238 (ii).
Cable Rates Reduction, Papers laid on Table, 931 (i).
Cable Rates with G.B., Res. on Order Paper, Withdrawal of (remarks) 3448 (ii).
See 'Postal.'
Canadian Missionaries in China, Relief *re* Dangers (remarks) 230; (stmnt.) 268 (i).

BORDEN, Rt. Hon. R. L.—*Con.*
Canadian Northern Alberta Ry. Co. Subsidy (M.) for Com. on Res., 5841 (iv).
Canadian Northern Pacific Ry. Subsidy B. 187, Res. prop., 5690; in Com. on Res., 6082; on M. for 2°, 6331; in Com., 6341; 3° m., 6495 (iv).
Canadian Offices in London, Cor. *re* Accommodation, on M. (Mr. Bradbury) for Papers, 1400 (i).
Car Shortage *re* Grain Shipments (remarks) 803 (i).
Census Enumerators, Delays in Payment (remarks) 1971, 2156 (ii).
Christmas Adjournment (remarks) 703, 927 (i).
Civil Service Act, (additional commissioners) Amt. (B. 104) Res. prop., 2862; in Com. on Res., 3143; 2° m., 3347; in Com., 3349 (ii).
Civil Service Act (private secretaries) Amt. (B. 60) Prop. Res., 1019; in Com. on Res. 1032; 2° and in Com., 1434 (i); in Com., 3343; on M. for Com., 3540 (ii).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com., Ques. of Order, 4577 (iii).
Civil Service Association, Representations to Govt. (Ans.) 3335 (ii).
Civil Service, Competitive Examination, Extension *re* (Ans.) 533 (i).
—— Investigation *re* Political Partisanship (Ans.) 1582 (i).
Civil Service Reform and Outside Service (Ans.) 727 (i).
Coffin, Mr. Henry, Reinstatement as Sessional Messenger (Ans.) 2289 (ii).
Commisioners of Investigation appointed by Govt., Number &c., (remarks) re Question, 5680 (iv).
See 'Dismissals,' 'Marine.'
Committees, Sel. Standing (M.) 10 (i).
—— List (presented) 703 (i).
—— (M.) to present Rep., 794 (i).
—— (M.) to add Names, 1019 (i), 2217 (ii).
Continental Can Co.'s Patent Relief B. 119 (Mr. Fripp) on M. for 2°, 4396 (iii).
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) on M. for 1°, 5551; on M. for 3°, 5892; on Amt. (Mr. Pugsley) to M. for 3°, 5963 (iv).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Taylor) to conc., 2848 (ii).
See 'Hansard.'
Dismissal of Public Officials, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Papers, 888 (i).
Dismissals from Public Service, Apptmt. of Commissioners (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3248 (ii).

BORDEN, Rt. Hon. R. L.—*Con.*
—— Ruling of Dep. Speaker on Objection (Mr. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 3255 (ii).
—— *See* 'Marine,' 'Civil Service,' 'Commissioners.'
Dismissals from Ottawa Dept., on Inquiry for Ret., 3834 (ii).
—— House of Commons Dismissals, on Inquiry (Mr. C. A. Wilson) for Ret., 6807 (iv).
See 'Sessional, &c.'
—— Post Office Dismissals, since Oct 1911, Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. Lemieux) for Papers, 1395 (i).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1175 (i).
Dismissals: *See* 'Inquiries, B. 19.'
Distribution Office, Salaries (M.) to send Mess. to Senate *re* concurrence in Rep., 6660 (iv).
Dom. Elections Act (deposits) amt. B. 8 (Mr. Burnham) on M. for 2°, 1018 (i).
Dom. Notes, Engraving, Limitations as to Tenders (remarks) 1820 (i).
Dry Dock Subsidies Act, on Prop Res. (Mr. Perley) 5560 (iv).
Dynamite and Explosives, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 724 (i).
Elevators, Ownership and Operation by Govt. (remarks) 2854 (ii).
External Affairs Dept. Amt. (B. 58) 1° m., 971; 2° m., 1434 (i).
Farmers' Bank Failure, Reimbursement for Losses (Ans.) 528, 714 (i), 3333 (ii).
—— (remarks) *re* Question, 3148 (ii).
Farmers' Bank Investigation, Aptmt. of Sir William Meredith (remarks) 3332 (ii).
Fast Atlantic SS. Service (remarks) 5696 (iv).
Fast Atlantic Service and Halifax Terminals, on M. for Sup., 6514 (iv).
Fife, Duke of, Decease (remarks) 2154 (ii).
Fisheries Jurisdiction *re* Provinces (Ans.) 3339 (ii).
Fish Reduction Works at Arichat, Tel. from Prime Minister (Ans.) 2289 (ii).
Fort Osborne Barracks Sale B. 185 (Mr. Hughes) in Com. on Res., 5706, 6067 (iv).
French Translator, Apptmt. of Mr. C. E. Duckett (M.) 1969 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal, Policy of Govt. (remarks) 1971, 3060 (ii).
Good Roads Bill: *See* 'Highways.'
Govt. Ownership: *See* 'Elevators,' 'Public ownership.'
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2535 (ii); on Order for 3°, 4153 (iii).
Grain Shipments: *See* 'Car Shortage.'

BORDEN, Rt. Hon. R. L.—*Con.*
G. T. Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6749, 6766 (iv).
G. T. P. Ry. Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Macdonald) on M. for 1°, 712; on M. for 2°, 796 (i).
G. T. P. Ry., Assiniboine Bridge Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 6060 (iv).
—— Subsidy Bill, on prop. Res. (Mr. White) 2297 (ii).
Gutelius, Mr. F. P., Form of Question, on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3934 (ii).
Guysborough Branch Ry. Co.'s Appropriation, on M. for Sup., 1460 (i).
Hansard, French Edition, Delay in Distribution (remarks) 269 (i).
Health Dept., Legislation *re* (Ans.) 1585 (i).
Highways Improvements B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) on M. for 2°, Objection (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Ref. to Gov. Gen., 3639, 3643; in Com., 3668, 3948 (ii); on Senate Amts., 6398 (iv).
Hindoo Immigration: *See* 'Sikhs'.
Horse Racing: *See* 'Criminal Code B. 165.'
House of Commons, Employees, Salaries Increases (M.) to conc. in Rep. of Speaker, 6660 (iv).
Hudson Bay Ry. Contract, on M. (Mr. Neely) for O. Cs., 751 (i).
Immigration in Ont., Promise of Premier *re* Assistance (Ans.) 546 (i).
Indemnity to Members, &c.: *See* 'Sen. & H. of C.', &c.
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) on M. for 2°, 1024; in Com., 1285, 1425 (i).
I.C.R. Branch Lines, Acquisition by Govt. (Ans.) 566 (i).
—— Legislation *re* Acquisition (Ans.) 569 (i).
I.C.R. Branch Lines, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 1000 (i).
I.C.R. and Brotherhood Unions, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Papers, 793 (i).
I.C.R. Management Board, Abolition of (Ans.) 570 (i).
—— Ticket Collectors, Apptmt. of (remarks) 6787 (iv).
Internal Economy Commission (presented) 11 (i).
Judges Act (additional) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5408 (iii).
Keewatin Separate Schools, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 4241 (iii).
—— *See* 'Man. Boundaries Bill.'
Laforce, Mr. J. E., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3535 (ii).
Legislation, Joint Com. (M.) 2217 (ii).
L'Evenement Publishing Co., Minister acting as Director (Ans.) 1813 (i).
Library Committee (M.) 795 (i).

BORDEN, Rt. Hon. R. L.—*Con.*
Library of Parliament, Rep. (presented) 11 (i).
Live Stock Records Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 6023 (iv).
Lumber Duties, Violation of Customs Act, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) 1790 (i).
Manitoba Boundary Extension (B. 115) (M.) for Com. on Res., 3538; in Com. on Res., 3835; 1° m., 3898 (ii); 2° m., 4263, 4483; agreed to (Y. 114; N. 76) 4494; in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) 4649; on Amt. (Mr. Oliver) 4705; on M. for 3° (M.) to ref. back to Com.; in Com. (amts.) 4836 (iii); 3° m., 4838 (ii).
Man. Boundaries, Conference *re* Separate Schools (Ans.) 715 (i).
—— Discussion of School Question (Ans.) 534 (i).
See 'Separate Schools.'
—— Eastern Extension (Ans.) 3936-7 (ii).
—— Eastern and Western Line, &c. (Ans.) 971 (i).
—— Financial Terms, &c. (Ans.) 558, 716 (i).
—— on Inquiry for, 1820 (i).
—— on Inquiry for Papers, 3834 (ii).
—— Manitoba Questions, (remarks) *re* answers, 581 (i).
—— Memorial, Stmnt. *re* Finances, &c. (remarks) 3631 (ii).
—— Papers *re* (remarks) 3448 (ii).
—— Settlement *re*, Cor. with Man. and Ont. &c., on M. (Mr. Macdonald) 777 (i).
Man. Boundaries: *See* 'Ont. Boundaries.'
Marcil, Mr. Tancrede, Application *re* Govt. Position (Ans.) 2069 (ii).
Marine Hospital Ships, Establishment of *re* Fishermen (remarks) 6787 (iv).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1624; (M.) to adjn. debate, 1629; Agreed to (Y. 87; N. 61) 1706 (i).
Marriage Act Amt., Decision of Privy Council (Ans.) 2856 (ii).
Marriages in Canada, Power of Dom. Govt. to legalize (Ans.) 575 (i).
Marriage Law, Pet. *re* Dom. Legislation (Ans.) 529 (i).
—— Ref. to Supreme Court (remarks) 3332 (ii).
Marriage Question *re* Catholic Hierarchy, (Ans.) 574 (i).
See 'Ne Temere.'
Miner, Bill, Escape &c. (remarks) 939 (i).
Monday Sittings, Precedence of Govt. Business (M.) 2376 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Res. from Corn Exchange Protesting *re* Removal (Ans.) 2070 (ii).

BORDEN, Rt. Hon. R. L.—*Con.*
Montreal, Patronage Committee, Recommendations *re* (Ans.) 1866 (i).
Montreal Harbour, National and Free Port (Ans.) 554 (i).
Morine, Mr. A. B., Charges *re* (Mr. Carvell) as Public Service Commissioner, on M. for Sup., 6541 (iv).
See 'Dismissals.'
—— Objection *re* Candidate at Elections (Ans.) 6336 (iv).
Morning Sessions: *See* 'Business of the House.'
Mounted Police, Increase in Pay (remarks) 4743 (iii).
—— Report (presented) 971 (i).
Naval Bill, Discussion *re* (Ans.) 4240 (iii).
Naval Policy (remarks) in debate on Address, 58 (v).
—— Interview with Hon. Geo. H. Perley, &c. (remarks) 1576 (i).
Naval Policy, Promise *re* Rereferendum (Ans.) 526 (i).
—— Repudiation by Nationalists (Ans.) 714 (i).
—— Speeches in Election Campaign, &c. (Ans.) 552 (i).
N. T. Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1869 (i); 3141, 3393, 3437 (ii).
N. T. Ry. Commission of Investigation *re* Construction (remarks) 2061 (ii).
See 'Gutelius.'
N. T. Ry. Station at Quebec City (remarks) 6786 (iv).
National Waterways Treaty, Negotiations *re* (remarks) 3833 (ii).
Naturalization, Legislation *re* Uniformity, on M. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) for Cor., 767, 771 (i).
Ne Temere Decree, Power of Parlt. (remarks) *re* Answer to Questions, 798 (i).
—— Questions asked of late Govt., Concurrence by present Govt. (Ans.) 719 (i).
—— Stmnt. of member for Peterborough (Ans.) 731 (i).
See 'Marriage.'
Newspaper Articles *re* Dismissals, Ruling *re* Reading, 3058 (ii).
Notes: *See* 'Dom. Notes.'
Oaths of Office (B. 1) 1°*, *pro forma*, 9 (i).
Old Age Pensions (M.) for Special Com., 2217 (ii).
Ontario Boundaries Extension (B. 152); (M.) for Com. on Res., 3944 (ii); in Com. on Res., 5270; 1°*, 5271 (iii); 2° m., 6155; in Com. 3°*, 6188 (iv).
See 'Manitoba Boundaries.'

BORDEN, Rt. Hon. R. L.—*Con.*
Ottawa City Federal District, Referendum *re* (Ans.) 1356 (i).
Ottawa Improvement Commission, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Pets, &c., 979 (i).
Panama Canal, Tolls, &c. (remarks) 2447 (ii).
Parcel Post Convention between Canada and France, on M. (Mr. Lemieux) for Papers, 1396 (i).
Parliament, Limit of Session, &c. (remarks) *re* Question, 557 (i).
—— Redistribution Bills, &c., Stmnt. by Hon. Mr. Taylor, 545, 715 (i).
Peace Memorial Monument, Govt. Action *re* (remarks) 2590 (ii).
Peace River and Ry. Belt Water Power B. 149 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 5969 (iv).
Pelagic Sealing Treaty, Ratification of (remarks) 4460 (iii); (explanation) 4550 (iii).
Petroleum, Crude and Refined, Quantity imported yearly since 1902 (Ans.) 730 (i).
Picotte, Mederic, Dismissal from H. of C. (Ans.) 2066 (ii).
Postal Regulations, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Armstrong) 2285 (ii).
—— on M. to take in Mondays (remarks) 2376 (ii).
See 'Cable.'
Preferential Trade within the Empire (remarks) in debate on Address, 55 (i).
Prime Minister's Visit to Archbishop of Quebec (Ans.) 534 (i).
P. E. I., Better Terms, on M. for Sup., 5173 (iii).
P. E. I. Subsidy B. 178 (Mr. White) in Com., 6143 (iv).
P. E. I. and Mainland Govt. Car Ferry Service, Tel. sent to A. A. McLean (Ans.) 1578, 1581 (i).
Printing of Parliament, Com. (M.) 795 (i).
Private Bills, Consideration of (remarks) 6578 (iv).
—— Extension of Time (M.) 930 (i).
—— Refund of Fees (M.) 930 (i).
Private Secretaries: *See* 'Civil Service B. 60.'
Provincial Boundaries, Res. from Sask. Legislature *re* Transfer of Resources (Ans.) 2578 (ii).
Provl. Boundaries: *See* 'B.C.', 'Man.' 'Ont.' 'P.E.I.', 'Ungava,' 'Que.'
Public Accounts Com. (Diamond Light, Co.) on M. (Mr. Middlebro) to conc. in 2nd Rep., 5833 (iv).
Provincial Control of Western Natural Resources, Promises *re* (Ans.) 553 (i).

BORDEN, Rt. Hon. R. L.—*Con.*
Public Ownership of Govt. Utilities, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 657, 1916 (i).
Quebec Boundaries Extension (B. 151)—(M.) for Com. on Res., 3944 (ii); in Com. on Res., 5268 (iii); 2°*, in Com., 6160; 3° m., 6188, 6338 (iv).
Quebec Bridge Reconstruction, Plans, Tenders, &c., on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Papers, 1402 (i).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) 4757; on Order for Com., 4237 (iii).
Questions not answered (M.) *re*, 6732 (iv).
Race Tracks: *See* 'Criminal Code B. 165.'
Ry. Act (tariffs) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 1016; on M. to resume adjnd. debate, 1821 (i).
—— (remarks) 2499, 2531 (ii).
Railway Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 2°, 2501 (ii).
Ry. Bridges, N.B., Subsidies (prop. res.) 5691 (iv).
See 'St. John Valley.'
Railway Committee, 13th Rep., on M. (Mr. Blain) 5999 (iv).
Railway Estimates, Annual Statement (remarks) 4122 (iii).
Ry. Subsidies (B. 183) (prop. res.) 5681; in Com. on Res., 6060; 1°*, 6061 (iv).
Railway Rates, Transportation, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1916 (i).
Reciprocity, ref. to in Debate on Address, 51 (i).
Red River Pollution, on M. for Sup., 5171 (iii).
Renfrew, S., Vacancy, Issue of Writ (remarks) 1576 (i), 1971, 2059, 2377 (ii).
—— on M. (Mr. A. H. Clarke) to adjn. Hse., 2225 (ii).
Restaurant Committee (M.) for Com., 710 (i).
Returns, on Inquiry for (Mr. Pugsley) 2377 (ii).
Revised Statutes, French Translation B. 65 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1439 (i).
Ritchie, Hon. Mr. Justice, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Macdonald) 3450 (ii).
St. Eustache Election Meetings, Stmnts. of Quebec Ministers (Ans.) 553 (i).
St. John Harbour Improvements, Tel. *re* Terminal Facilities (Ans.) 567 (i).
St. John Valley Ry., Contracts *re* (remarks) 4743 (iii).
St. John Valley Ry. Bridges Subsidy (B. 188) 3° m., 6496 (iv).
See 'Ry. Bridges.'
St. Lawrence River Water Power, Res. from Board of Trade, Montreal (Ans.) 2457 (ii).

BORDEN, Rt. Hon. R. L.—*Con.*
Saturday's Sittings (M.) 6186 (iv).
—— (stmnt.) 5831 (iv).
Seed Grain Distribution, Res. from Wilcox Board of Trade (remarks) 2301 (ii).
Senate and House of Commons Act (indemnity) B. 75, in Com. on Res., 1498 (i).
Senate Amendments to Railway Bills (remarks) 6493, 6577 (iv).
Senate Vacancies (remarks) 5162 (iii).
Senate Vacancy, Apptmt. of Acadian in N.B. (Ans.) 541 (i).
Senate Vacancies in N.S. (remarks) 1576 (i).
—— Pet. *re* French Apptmt. (remarks) 2755 (ii).
Separate Schools, Man. and Keewatin, Demand from Members (Ans.) 4247 (iii).
See 'Man. Boundaries.'
Sessional Employees, Number dismissed (Ans.) 569 (i), 2064 (ii).
Sikhs, in B.C., Decision *re* bringing in their Wives (Ans.) 2457 (ii).
Solicitor General, Appmt. of (Ans.) 546, 1816 (i).
—— Payments to Min. of Jus., &c. (Ans.) 725 (i).
—— Vacancy (remarks) 1577 (i), 5162 (iii).
Speaker, Election of (M.) 2; Reply to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 5 (i).
Speaker, Deputy (M.) 519, 523 (i).
Steam Trawling on Canadian Coasts, on M. (Mr. Sinclair) for Papers, 2462 (ii).

SUPPLY—
Archives (salaries) 6462 (iv).
Canals—Welland (surveys) 5789 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Archives (dep. minister) 6460 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Gov. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 1035 (i).
Civil Govt.—Inland Revenue (private secretary) 6490; (promotions) conc., 6771 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Privy Council (salaries) 6460 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Public Works (private secretary) conc., 6779 (iv).
Fisheries (International Fishery Commission) conc., 6778 (iv).
Legislation—House of Commons (stenographers, &c.) 6461; Senate (sessional indemnity) 6460 (iv).
Militia (automobiles) 5520 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Champlain monument) 6485; (claim of Mrs. Wiley) 6489; (counsel fees *re* Lanctot inquiry) 6486; (honorarias *re* Pelagic Sealing) 5810; (La Société Nationale Gymnastique) 5811; (Olympic games) 6486; (retiring allowance to Staff Sergeant Codd) 5811 (iv).
Mounted Police (pay, subsistence, &c.) 5175 (iii); (pensions) 6485 (iv).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5342 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings (Chatham, conc., 6804 (iv); Ottawa (examining warehouse) 1950; Ottawa (H. of C., addition) 1951 (i).

BORDEN, Rt. Hon. R. L.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers (French River) conc., 6777 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (Halifax docks) 5597; (rolling stock) 6461 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (Annuities Act) 701 (i).
Weights and Measures (inspection) 5828 (iv).
Supreme Court of Canada, Division of (Ans.) 547 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com. on Res., 2160; on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2615; in Com., 2942, 2866, 3024, 3564, (ii) 4081; on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to M. for 3°, 4146 (iii); on Senate Amts., 6667 (iv).
Tariff Commission, Apptmt. of &c. (Ans.) 529 (i).
Taylor, Hon. Geo., Promise *re* Senate (Ans.) 545 (i).
See 'Parlt.'
Temiscouata Election Expenses, Delay *re* Payments to Dep. Ret. Officer (remarks) 1708 (i).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) (prop. res.) 5681; in Com., 6405 (iv).
—— Subsidy; in Com. of Sup., 6080 (iv).
Thompson, Dr., Dismissal, &c., (remarks) 6784 (iv).
Trade Commissioner to the Empire, Apptmt. *re* (Ans.) 5951 (iv).
Transportation Question: *See* 'Ry. Rates.'
Trawling: *See* 'Steam Trawling.'
Under Secretaries of State, Apptmt. of (remarks) 3059 (ii).
Ungava Annexation, Cor. *re* (remarks) 2060 (ii).
Ungava Territory, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 577 (i).
See 'Man.,' &c.
Universal Eyesight Insurance incorp. B., 126 (Mr. McLean) in Com., 5941 (iv).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 6180 (iv).
Waterways Commission, Apptmt. of Commissioners, on M. (Mr. Pugsley) for Cor., &c., 983 (i).
—— on M. (Mr. Pugsley) to Com. of Sup., 6692 (iv).
—— Ratification of Apptmt. by late Govt. (Ans.) 533 (i).
See 'Boundary Waters.'
Wednesday Sittings, Govt. Business (M) *re* Precedence, 1969 (ii).
Winnipeg Military Property Sale: *See* 'Fort Osborne.'

BORDEN, Rt. Hon. R. L.—*Con.*
Yukon Judges Act Amt. B. 123 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5405 (iii).

BOULAY, Mr. H., *Rimouski.*
Beauchesne, Mr., Dismissal from Customs (Ques.) 3151 (ii).
Bourque, Geoffrey, Accident on I.C.R., Inquiry *re* (M. for reps.*) 2459 (ii).
Buildings leased by Govt., Rentals, &c., (Ques.) 1358 (i).
Courchesne, Mr. P. E. C., Dismissal from Inland Revenue (Ques.) 1864 (i).
Dismissals on I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5807 (iv).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1550 (i).
Dismissals in Rimouski County (remarks) 1276 (i).
Dupont, Rene, Dismissal as Immigration Agent (Ques.) 1864 (i).
I.C.R., Board of Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5655 (iv).
—— Fences, Number of Rods, &c., Campbellton Division, (Ques.) 6748 (iv).
Laurier, C. A., Immigration Agent at Marquette, Mich. (Ques.) 2454 (ii).
Laurier, R., Immigration Agent at Detroit (Ques.) 2454 (ii).
Lavoie, Mr. Absolon, Inquiry *re* Death on I.C.R. (M. for cor.*) 4263 (iii).
Lemieux, Mr., Appointments to Govt. Service, List (read) in Com. of Sup., 6297 (iv).
Man. Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. Mondou) to M. for 3°, 4916 (iii).
Matapedia Water Works Co., Claims against I.C.R. (M. for cor.*) 4263 (iii).
Roy, Wm., Complaint of H. Boulay *re* I.C.R. (Ques.) 934 (i).
—— (M. for papers, &c.,) 1391 (i).
St. Laurent, Xavier, Claims for Loss of Horse killed on I.C.R. (M. for cor.*) 4263 (iii).
Sayabec Post Office, Apptmt. of Miss Boulay (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6297 (iv).
Sorel Workshops Investigations, Payments *re* (Ques.) 1205 (i).
SUPPLY—
Justice, Administration of (Montreal Circuit court) 6597 (iv).
Militia (properties) 5539 (iii).
Post Office (mail service) 6297 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Sudbury) 1953 (i).
Railways—I.C.R. (highway crossing) 5601; (locomotives) 5655 (iv).
Sussex Street Property, Purchase by Govt., Total Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 1359 (i).

BOULAY, Mr. H.—*Con.*
Temiskaming Lake Dam Construction, &c. (M. for cor.*) 4262 (iii).
Tourigny, Judge, Charges *re*, Govt. Action (Ques.) 3147 (ii).

BOYCE, Mr. A. C., *West Algoma.*
Algoma Eastern Ry. Co.'s (B. 34) 1°*, 969 (i).
Canadian Missionaries in China, Refusal of British Gunboat for Protection, Rep. *re* (remarks) 1198 (i).
Can. Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. Staples) in Com., 5201 (iii).
Can. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 98 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 5199 (iii).
Copper Cliff Post Office, Dismissal &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2034 (ii).
Dismissals from Govt. Offices (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2033 (ii).
Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 51) 1°*, 970 (i).
Railway Rates, Transportation, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1940 (i).
Rainy River Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 121 (Mr. Beattie) in Com., 5198 (iii).
Sudbury Post Office, Dismissals (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2033 (ii).
Universal Eyesight Co.'s incorp. B. 126 (Mr. McLean) in Com., 5908 (iv).

BOYER, Mr. G., *Vaudreuil.*
Brown, Wm., Postmaster at Point Fortune, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 4779 (iii).
Carillon Canal Hydraulic Power, Name of Lessee (Ques.) 2293 (ii).
Cuillerier, Mr. Jos., Soulanges Canal, Electrician, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 4457 (iii); 6183 (iv).
Dismissal of Conservative Postmaster *re* Political Partisanship (Ques.) 2295 (ii).
Gauthier, Alderic, Dismissal from Soulanges Canal (Ques.) 4976 (iii).
Isidore Chevrier, Charges *re*, &c. (Ques.) 4039 (iii).
Lalonde, Damien, Rep. *re* Assault, &c. (Ques.) 4255 (iii).
Legault, Ophir, Postmaster at L'Ile Perrot, Dismissal of (Ques.) 5950 (iv).
Leroux, Mr., Soulanges Canal, Dismissal (Ques.) 6183 (iv).
Methot, Denis, Apptmt. on Soulanges Canal (Ques.) 4255 (iii).
Montpetit, Dr. E., Pet. sent to P.M.G. *re* Dismissal of William Brown (Ques.) 4977 (iii).
Mount Oscar Postmaster, Dismissal of I. Chevrier (Ques.) 4780 (iii).

BOYER, Mr. G.—*Con.*
Postmasters, Dismissals, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6632 (iv).
Rigaud Postmaster, Applications *re* (Ques.) 2294 (ii).
Robert, Wm., Dismissal from Val des Eboulis Post Office (Ques.) 3537 (ii).
Ste. Anne de Bellevue and L'Ile Perrot Mail Contracts, Expiration of (Ques.) 5951 (iv).
Ste. Anne de Bellevue, Non-delivery of Mail, &c. (Ques.) 5260 (iii).
Soulanges Canal, Charges *re* Damien Lalonde (Ques.) 4249 (iii).
——— Claims of Denis Martin for Damages (Ques.) 2292 (ii).
——— Employees, Names, &c. (Ques.) 4250 (iii).
——— Patronage, &c. (Ques.) 3536 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Excise (tobacco stamps) 5827 (iv).
Militia (annual drill) 5484 (iii).
Post Office—Outside Service (salaries) 6632 (iv).
Weights and Measures (inspectors) 5828 (iv).
Val des Eboulis and Rigaud Mail Service, Contract *re* (Ques.) 4249 (iii).
——— Date of Wm. Robert's Contract (Ques.) 4778 (iii).
Valois, J. B., Dismissal from Vaudreuil Post Office (Ques.) 3537 (ii).

BRABAZON, Mr. G. H., *Pontiac.*
Quinze River and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 54) 1°*, 970 (i).

BRADBURY, Mr. G. H., *Selkirk.*
British American Trust Co.'s incorp. (B. 155) 1°*, 5400 (iii).
Canadian Offices in London, Cor. *re* Accommodation, &c. (M. for copies) 1396 (i).
Dismissals from Govt. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2026 (ii).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6456 (iv).
Flags, Use of (B. 74) 1° m., 1410 (i).
Grain Shipments in the West, Regulation of Freight Rates, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3990 (ii).
Highways Improvements B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3680 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4353; in Com. on Amt. (Mr. Oliver) 4677 (iii).
Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. (B. 64) 1° m., 1069 (i).
Railway Bills, Senate Amendments (remarks) 6494 (iv).
Railway Question, Transportation, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1939 (i).

BRADBURY, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*
Railway Question: *See* 'Grain Shipments.'
Reciprocity Treaty with U.S., Cor. with British Ambassador (M. for copies*) 1817 (i).
——— Cor. between Can. Govt. and U.S. (M. for copies*) 1817 (i).
Red River Pollution, on M. for Sup., 5166 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Justice—Penitentiaries (bonus) 6600 (iv).
Labour Dept. (Gazette) 1479 (i).
Militia, Ques. of Order, 5538 (iii).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Harbour Commissioners incorp. B. 138 (Mr. Hazen) in Com., 5991 (iv).

BRODER, Mr. A., *Dundas.*
Budget, The, 5083 (iii).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6255, 6456 (iv).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 3169 (ii).
Grain Shipments in the West, Regulations of Freight Rates, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3979 (ii).
Highways Improvements B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3672 (ii)
Imperial Naturalization, Uniformity in Can. (remarks) 2426 (ii).
Inspection and Sale Act (grain) Amt. B. 178 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 6196 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4286 (iii).
N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3385 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 6464 (iv).

BROUILLARD, Mr. O., *Drummond and Arthabaska.*
I. C. Ry., Change in Pay Day (Ques.) 3310 (ii).
Lavoie, Mr. Calixte, Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3339 (ii).

BROWN, Mr. J. P., *Chateauguay.*
Budget, The, 5103 (iii).
Chateauguay Co., Inundated Lands, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 6660 (iv).
Customs Smuggling Case, Ques. of Priv., 2216 (ii).
Tomatoes, Prices in U.S. (remarks) in debate on Budget, 5103 (iv).

BUCHANAN, Mr. W. A., *Medicine Hat.*
Address, The, 403 (i).
Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s (B. 79) 1°*, 1862 (i).
Bassano Post Office, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 5557 (iv).
C. P. Ry. Irrigation, Complaint from Alberta Farmers (Ques.) 5262 (iii).

BUCHANAN, Mr. W. A.—*Con.*
Car Shortage in the West (remarks) 1709 (i).
——— Govtl. Action *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1714 (i).
Coal Strike in Alberta (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1507 (i).
Coal Strike in the West, Stmnt. of Min. of Int. *re* Settlement (Ques.) 571 (i).
Dom. Lands Agent at Medicine Hat, Suspension or Dismissal (Ques.) 552 (i).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 3498 (ii), 4077 (iii).
Grain Shipments in the West, Regulation of Freight Rates, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 4004 (ii).
See 'Car,' &c.
Lethbridge Armoury, Plans, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 729 (i).
——— Site *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2210 (ii).
Lethbridge Post Office, Plans, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 728 (i).
Police Point Reserve Transfer (M. for papers*) 5557 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Labour Dept. (industrial disputes investigation act) 1498 (i).
Public Buildings—Alberta (Lethbridge) 2212 (ii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2886 (ii).
United Gold Fields of B. C. (B. 93) 1°*, 2217 (ii).

BUREAU, Hon. J., *Three Rivers, St. Maurice.*
Asbestos Manufactures (remarks) *re* M. for Ret., 1591 (i).
Campaign Literature: *See* 'Political.'
Canada and Gulf Terminal Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6305 (iv).
Dismissal for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1077 (i).
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amt. B. 180 (Mr. Monk) in Com. on Res., 6053 (iv).
Guillemette, Mr. N., Dismissal, Charges *re* (Ques.) 1210 (i).
Judges Act (salaries) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) on Amt. (Mr. Proulx) to M. for 3°, 6064 (iv).
Lemieux Family, appointed by late Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6299 (iv).
Miner, Bill, Rumoured Presence in Ottawa (remarks) 939 (i).
Political Literature, Distribution *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6517 (iv).
Post Office Dismissals, General Policy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6301 (iv).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6305 (iv).

BUREAU, Hon. J.—*Con.*
St. Tite Postmaster, Dismissal of (Ques.) 1210 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6285 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Charges of Management (dom. notes) 1033; Customs—Outside Ports (salaries) 1077; Customs (salaries) 1040; Inland Revenue (salaries) 1040, 1061; Marine Dept. (salaries) 1056; Militia (salaries) 1038; Post Office (salaries) 1067 (i).
Mines (French reports) 6490; (ore deposits) 6490 (iv).
Post Office (mail service) 6285 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Toronto warehouse) 1963 (i).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6449 (iv).
Three Rivers, Inland Revenue Charges against Collector C. D. Hebert (Ques.) 1209 (i).

BURNHAM, Mr. J. H., *West Peterborough.*
Address, The, 318 (i).
Ballots, Voting by Divisions (Ques.) 4979 (iii).
Budget, The, 5101 (iii).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1178 (i).
Dom. Elections Act (deposit) Amt. (B. 8) 1°m., 337; 2°m., 1017 (i).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 4068 (iii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3704 (ii).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1636 (i).
Marriage Law, Par. in Toronto 'Star' (Ques.) 3941 (ii).
National Art Gallery, Owners of Paintings, &c. (Ques.) 6337 (iv).
——— Purchase of Paintings, &c. (Ques.) 6184 (iv).
N. T. Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1875 (i), 3379 (ii).
N. T. Ry. Repair Shops, Erection at Quebec and Winnipeg (Ques.) 4977 (iii).
Old Age Pensions (prop. res.) 1362 (i).
——— (remarks) 1829 (i).
P.E.I. Subsidy B. 178 (Mr. White) in Com., 6133 (iv).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 3877 (ii).
Railway Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 2°, 2506 (ii).
Railway Transportation Question, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1906 (i).
Rambaut, Thomas D., Patent Relief B. 84 (Mr. Ames) in Com., 3488 (ii).

BURNHAM, Mr. J. H.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—
Labour Dept. (Combines Act) 1518 (i).
Militia (annual drill) 5502 (iii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2658 (ii).

BURRELL, Hon. M. (*Minister of Agriculture*) *Yale-Cariboo.*
Agricultural Aid and Encouragement (B. 100) 1° m., 2849 (ii); 2° m., and in Com., 5277 (iii); 3° m., 5561 (iv).
Animals destroyed at North Ham, Compensation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6475 (iv).
Apples and Fruit Growing in N.S. (remarks) 1721 (i).
Caribou, Barkerville and Willow River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6320 (iv).
Cattle Embargo by G.B., Abolition of (Ans.) 558 (i).
Cattle Quarantine, Res of Chamber of Commerce, Beauceville (remarks) 4985 (iii).
Census Enumerators, Delay *re* Payments to (remarks) 935, 1021, 1199 (i), 3835 (ii), 4460 (iii).
Census Enumerators, Payments to (Ans.) 2244, 3335 (ii).
Census Enumerators at Regina, Instructions, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) for Stmnt., 564 (i).
Census Enumerators, Percentage retained of Salaries (Ans.) 934 (i).
Census, Population of Canada, Quebec Cities, &c. (Ans.) 3336 (ii).
Census Report (presented) 4037 (iii).
Census Returns for Saskatchewan, on Inquiry for Ret., 4983 (iii).
——— Completion of (Ans.) 5261 (iii).
Continental Can Co.'s Patent Relief B. 119 (Mr. Fripp) in Com., 5206 (iii).
Conservation Commission, Water Powers Report (presented) 407 (i).
Copyright Bill, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 557, 1208 (i).
——— (remarks) 936 (i).
Dairying Industry in Canada, Complaints *re* Weighing Cheese (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5744 (iv).
Horses destroyed at Weyburn, Rep., &c. (remarks) 6790 (iv).
Horses imported from U.S., Destruction for Glanders (remarks) 5694, 5940 (iv).
Kettle Valley Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5899, 6220, 6322 (iv).
Kettle Valley Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com., 6327 (iv).
Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5899, 6219 (iv).

BURRELL, Hon. M.—*Con.*
Laroche, Capt. Leon, Dismissal of (Ans.) 4549 (iii).
Live Stock Record Association incorp. (B. 167) 1° m., 5553; 2° m., 6021; in Com., 6023 (iv).
Nursery Stock, Purchase for Experimental Farm, N.S. (Ans.) 3333 (ii).
Peace River and Ry. Belt Water Power B. 148 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 5986 (iv).
Pictou Cattle Disease, Compensation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6471 (iv).
Population of Canada and Quebec Cities (Ans.) 731 (i).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. on Res., 5899; in Com., 6219, 6320 (iv).
Regina Census Return (remarks) upon Inquiry for (Mr. Knowles) 1574 (i).
Ste. Anne de la Pocatière Experimental Farm, Buildings *re* (Ans.) 578 (i).
Seed Grain Distribution, Res. from Wilcox Board of Trade (remarks) 2301 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture (animals health) 6469 (iv); (census, &c.) 619 (i), 6462; (experimental farms, branch stations) 6477; (experimental farms, farm bulletins) 6465; (experimental farms, tobacco growing) 6478; (live stock industry) 6469; (Seed Control Act) 6469 (iv).
Agriculture—Miscellaneous (Destructive Insect and Pest Act) 6479; (Dom. Exhibition) 6479; (fumigating stations) 6479; (International Institute) 6478; (Toronto exhibition) 6480; Agriculture, &c. (Year Book) 6465 (iv).
Archives (salaries) 6461 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 1041 (i); (promotions) 6485 (iv).
Veitch Farm, Purchase of by Govt. (Ans.) 933 (i).
Wheeler, Seager, Congratulations *re* Prize Wheat at New York (Ans.) 542 (i).

CARDIN, Mr. P. J. A., *Richelieu.*
Dauphimais, Mr. J. O., Dismissals, &c. (M. for papers*) 4782 (iii).
Dupre, Dr. H., Dismissals from St. Robert Post Office (M. for papers*) 4782 (iii).
—— (Ques.) 3753 (ii).
Govt. Dredges, Contracting *re* Boarding Employees (Ques.) 5953 (iv).
Govt. Dredges and Tugs, Instructions *re* Appointments (Ques.) 5952 (iv).
Investigations *re* Political Partisanships, Cost of (Ques.) 5950 (iv).
Lalonde, Alfred, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 4779 (iii).
—— (M. for cor.*) 6783 (iv).
Marlin, Mrs. A. S., Postmistress, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3753 (ii).
Peloquin, Mr. F., Postmaster at St. Joseph de Sorel, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3753 (ii).

CARDIN, Mr. P. J. A.—*Con.*
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Govt. Dredges, Emplymt. of &c. (Ques.) 4256 (iii).
St. Martin, Madame, Dismissal from St. Louis de Bonsecours (M. for papers*) 4782 (iii).
Sainte Rochs Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6657 (iv).
—— (Ques.) 4248 (iii).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6643 (iv).
Sorel and Ste. Victoria Mail Contracts, Contracts, Tenders, &c. (M. for papers*) 4782 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Post Office—Outside Service (salaries) 6643 (iv).
Weights and Measures (inspectors) 5828 (iv).

CARRICK, Mr. J. J., *Thunder Bay and Rainy River.*
Grain Act, Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2182, 2383 (ii).

CARROLL, Mr. W. F., *South Cape Breton.*
Civil Service Association, Representations to Govt. &c. (Ques.) 3334 (ii).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i).
Glace Bay Mail Delivery, Delay, &c. (Ques.) 804 (i).
Immigration Policy *re* Mar. Provs., on prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2092 (ii).
Labour Gazette Correspondents, Dismissals, &c., on M. for Sup., 1444 (i).
Lightkeepers in N. S., Investigation *re* Charges (remarks) in Com. of Cup., 5234 (iii).
Lobster Twine Customs Duties (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1072 (i).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1649 (i).
Naval Service, Tenders *re* Shipbuilding &c. (Ques.) 558 (i).
New Waterford Mail Service, Change *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6294, 6630 (iv).
North Sydney Harbour Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5226 (iii).
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burnham) 1829 (i).
SUPPLY—
Labour Dept. (conciliation board) 1509; (Gazette) 1475 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 5232 (iii).
Marine (hospitals) 5238 (iii).
Militia (armouries) 5544 (iii).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5377 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 5219; (wreck subsidies) 5231 (iii).
Post Office (mail service) 6294; Outside Service (salaries) 6630 (iv).

CARROLL, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Burke's Head) 2045; (Cape Breton) 2052; (Cow Bay) 2055 (ii).
Weights and Measures (inspectors) 5831 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2872 (ii).

CARVELL, Mr. F. B., *Carleton, N.B.*
Address, The, on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 82 (i).
Advertisements for Govt. Contracts, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 2449 (ii).
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5285 (iii).
Albert Mines and Hillsborough Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6247 (iv).
Asselin, Mr. Oliver, Emplymt. by Immigration Dept. (Ques.) 1813 (i).
Bath Postmistress, Dismissal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6282 (iv).
Bohan, John W., Dismissal from Customs at Bath (Ques.) 3055 (ii).
Boots and Shoes, Imports and Prices, into Canada for 1908-9-10 (M. for ret.) 1267 (i).
Bull, Mr. Robert, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3338 (i).
Canadian Agencies in Europe, Names of Appointees (Ques.) 5261 (iii), 5557 (iv).
Canals Staff, Dismissals (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5801 (iv).
Chauvin, Hector, K.C., Apptmt, *re* Investigation by Public Works Dept. (Ques.) 1414 (i).
Chubb, George, Customs Officer N.B., Dismissal &c. (Ques.) 4459 (iii).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 4564 (iii).
Civil Service Act (rural mail) Amt. B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 6089 (iv).
Continental Can Co.'s Patent Relief B. 119 (Mr. Fripp) on M. for 2°, 4395; in Com., 5483 (iii).
Criminal Code (lumber) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Stevens) in Com., 2532 (ii).
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) on M. for 1°, 5550 (iv).
Diamond Light and Heating Co., Examination *re* Public Accounts, on M. to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 5832 (iv).
See 'Public Accounts.'
Dismissal of Public Officials, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Papers, 899 (i).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1074, 1166 (i).
See 'Marine.'
Dredges and Boiler Inspection (Ques.) 5953 (iv).
Exchequer Court Act Amt. B. 168 (Mr. Doherty) on M. for 1°, 5554 (iv).

CARVELL, Mr. F. B.—*Con.*
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6252, 6256 (iv).
See 'Volunteer.'
Franco-Canadian Relations (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5759 (iv).
Gutelius, Mr. F. P., Apptmt. to N.T.Ry. Commission, British Subject, &c. (Ques.) 4038 (iii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3966 (ii).
Immigration Agent, Mr. Sevigny, Apptmt., Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 1588 (i).
Imperial Naturalization, Uniformity in Can., on M. (Mr. Macdonald) to Com. of Sup., 2429 (ii).
I.C.Ry. Supt., Application of Member of H. of C. (Ques.) 4040 (iii).
Judges Act (additional) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5409 (iii); in Com. on Res., 5959; in Com., 6010 (iv).
L'Evenement Publishing Co., Minister acting as Director (Ques.) 1813 (i).
McLean, W. S., Dismissal from Customs at L'Etang (Ques.) 4780 (iii).
Mail Contracts, Cancellation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6621 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4324; in Com., 4521; on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) 4653 (iii).
Man. Boundaries Bill, Voting (Mr. Mondou) on 2°, Ques. of, 4397 (iii).
Marcil, Mr. Tancrede, Application *re* Govt. Position (Ques.) 2069 (ii).
Marriage Act Amt., Decision of Privy Council (Ques.) 2855 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Officials, Apptmt. of, Promotions, &c. (Ques.) 3944 (ii).
Morine, Mr. A. B., Charges *re* as Public Service Commissioner, on M. for Sup., 6528 (iv).
See 'Dismissals.'
Mundle, D. I., Dismissal as sub-collector at Richibucto, N.B. (Ques.) 4780 (iii).
Municipal Elections and Civil Servants (Ques.) 1813 (i).
N.T.Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3409 (ii).
See 'Gutelius.'
North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6235 (iv).
Patronage Committee, Montreal, Recommendation *re* (Ques.) 1866 (i).
Post Office Dismissals, General Policy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6299 (iv).
Public Accounts Com., Attendance of R. C. Miller, on M. to adopt 3rd Rep., 6333 (iv).
—— 2nd Rep. on M. (Mr. Middlebro) to conc. 5832 (iv).
See 'Diamond Light.'

CARVELL, Mr. F. B.—*Con.*
Public Service Commission, Charges *re* A. B. Morine, on M. for Sup., 6528 (iv).
Quebec Ministers of the Cabinet, Apptmt. Min. of Public Works (Ques.) 545 (i).
Railway Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 2°, 2522 (ii).
Railway Bridges in N.B. Subsidy B. 188 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6211, 6380 (iv).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6211 (iv).
Railway Ties, Contract with Dame Boulay (M. for cor.*) 5957 (iv).
Regiments of Foreign Born Citizens, Organization of (Ques.) 534 (i).
Renfrew, S., Election, on M. (Mr. A. H. Clarke) to adjn. Hse., 2237 (ii).
Robinson, Fred. P., Apptmt. as Preventive Officer, N.B. (Ques.) 4241 (iii).
Rural Mail: *See* 'C. S. Bill 79.'
St. John Valley Ry. Subsidy, Agreement *re* (Ques.) 3049 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4235 (iii).
St. John Valley Ry. Bridges Subsidy B. 188 (Mr. Cochrane) on M. for 3°, (amt.) 6496 (iv).
See 'Ry. Bridges B. 188.'
——— Inquiry for Papers, 3946 (ii).
Sayabec Postmistress, Apptmt. of Miss Boulay (Ques.) 2068 (ii).
——— Dismissal, Apptmt. *re* &c. (Ques.) 2585 (ii).
Sevigny, Mr. J. E., Apptmt. in Immigration Office, &c. (Ques.) 1205, 1814 (i).
Southampton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6224 (iv).
SUPPLY.
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 6462 (iv).
Canals (statistical officers) 5801 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 1074; Railways (salaries) 1064 (i).
Excise (customs duties) 5827; (salaries) 5812; (travelling expenses) 5826 (iv).
Legislation—Senate (indemnities) 6460 (iv).
Militia (annual drill) 5454; (allowances) 5447; (associations and bands) 5529; (armouries) 5541; (automobiles) 5493; (clothing) 5521; (customs dues) 5522; (headquarters staff) 5536; (salaries) 5546; (schools of instruction) 5546 (iii).
Miscellaneous (counsel fees *re* Lanctot Inquiry) 6487 (iv).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5309 (iii).
Post Office (mail service) 6282; Outside Service (salaries) 6621 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings, Dom. (London, England), 6655 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (St. John dry dock) 3300 (ii); Ont. (French River) 6658 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (Board of Management) 4137; (Campbellton) 4162; (construction) 4134; (working expenses) 4163 (iii).
Railways—Miscellaneous (staff salaries) 5801 (iv).

CARVELL, Mr. F. B.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Weight and Measures (inspection electric lights) 5828 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2710; in Com., 3025 (ii).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6404 (iv).
Trade Agents: *See* 'Canadian.'
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 6177, 6450 (iv).
See 'Fenian.'
Wadge, Thomas, Patent Relief B. 16 (Mr. Aikins) in Com., 2984, 2986, 3280, 3479 (ii).
——— reported from Com., 3280 (ii).
White, James, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3338 (ii).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Harbour Commissioners incorp. B. 138 (Mr. Hazen) in Com., 5997 (iv).
Woodstock, N.B., Apptmt. of Excise Officer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5812 (iv).
Yule, Mr., Collector of Customs at Aurora, Dismissal of (Ques.) 5950 (iv).

CASH, Mr. E. L., *Mackenzie.*
Grain Act B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2399, 3190 (ii); on M. for 3° (amt.) 4808; Amt. neg. (Y. 44; N. 86) 4833 (iii).
Man. and North Western Ry. Co. of Canada (B. 92) 1°*, 2217 (ii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com. on Res., 2160 (ii).

CHABOT, Mr. J. L., *Ottawa.*
Alberta, Peace River and Eastern Ry. Co.'s (B. 129) 1°*, 4835 (iii); in Com., 5904, 5942 (iv).
Ottawa and Ungava Ry. Co.'s (B. 61) 1°*, 1069 (i).

CHARLTON, Mr. W. A., *Norfolk.*
James Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com., 6312 (iv).
Lake Erie and Northern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6312 (iv).
Port Dover Harbour Works (M. for rep.*) 3755 (ii).
Quebec Boundaries Extension B. 151 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 6163 (iv).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6312 (iv).

CHISHOLM, Mr. A. W., *Inverness.*
Carmichael, Dr. A. G., Supt. of Fish Hatchery, Dismissal of (M. for cor.*) 3757 (ii).
Fisheries Act (leases) Amt. B. 140 (Mr. Hazen) on M. for 2°, 5276 (iii).
Inverness Public Buildings, Dismissal of Caretaker (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1535 (i).

CHISHOLM, Mr. A. W.—*Con.*
Kennedy, Allan, Govt. Telegraph Repairer, Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 3757 (ii).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2020 (ii).
McFarlane, J. D., Postmaster at Southwest Margaree, Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 3756 (ii).
McIsaac, Colin, Preventive Officer at Port Hood, Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 5956 (iv).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5816 (iv).
McLean, Donald E., Dismissal, &c. (M. for papers*) 4980 (iii).
McLennan, Mr., Dismissal from Inverness Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2017 (ii).
McPhee, James, Customs Officer, Dismissal, &c. (M. for cor.*) 3757 (ii).
Orangedale to Cheticamp Ry. Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4226 (iii).
Port Hawkesbury, Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1345 (i), 2016 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5236 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Bras d'Or Lakes) 4735 (iii).
Militia—(armouries) 5545 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (life saving awards) 5228 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Mar. Provs. (creosoted timber) 2440 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Inverness) 2056; (Melford) 2056 (ii).
Public Works—Telegraphs—Alta. (generally) 2822 (ii).
Railways (surveys, &c.) 4226 (iii).
Weights and Measure (electric light inspection) 5828 (iv).
Telephone Wires strung on Telegraph Poles, permission of Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2822 (ii).

CHISHOLM, WM., *Antigonish.*
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5295 (iii).
Antigonish County Public Works, Appropriations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2438 (ii).
Antigonish to County Harbour, Ry. Subsidy (remarks) 6227 (iv).
Antigonish Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2022 (ii).
Decoste, Capt. Peter, Dismissal, &c. (M. for cor.) 1268 (i).
——- (Ques.) 548 (i).
—— Defective Answer to Question (remarks) 803 (i).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3256 (ii).
Dismissals from Govt. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2030 (ii).
Dismissals *re* Inland Rev. Dept., Policy of Min. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5819 (iv).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1560 (i).

CHISHOLM, Mr. Wm.—*Con.*
—— Apptmt. of Commissioners *re* Investigation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3250 (ii).
—— Recommendation by sitting member (remarks) 1278 (i).
Fisheries Act (leases) Amt. B. 140 (Mr. Hazen) on M. for 2°, 5274 (iii).
Girroir, John, Resignation from I. C. Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4185 (iii).
Great Northern Mining and Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6224 (iv).
Guysborough Branch Ry. Appropriation, on M. for Sup., 1460 (i).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3715 (ii).
McAdam, Alex. R., Fishery Officer at Antigonish, Dismissal, &c. (M. for cor.*) 3343 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 4630 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Settlement *re*, on M. (Mr. Macdonald) for Cor., 783 (i).
Pictou Cattle Disease, Compensation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6472 (iv).
Public Works for N. S., Appropriations *re* Estimates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2796 (ii).
Quebec Boundaries Extension B. 151 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 6171 (iv).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6224 (iv).
Senate Vacancies in N. S. (remarks) 1576 (i).
Southampton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. 6227 (iv).
Steam Trawling, &c., on M. (Mr. Sinclair) for Papers, 2466 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture (animals health) 6470, 6477; (bulletins) 6465 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Pictou and Cheticamp) 4736 (iii).
Militia (automobiles) 5496, 5519 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Port Arthur) 1952 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (creosoted timber) 2440 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Bayfield) 2041; (Blue Rocks Island) 2041; (Cribbin's Point) 2046; (Gillis Point) 2056 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (Moncton shops) 5604 (iv); (Sylvan Valley) 4226; (Truro) 4231 (iii).

CLARE, Mr. Geo. A., *South Waterloo.*
Berlin P.O. Clock (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1346 (i).

CLARK, Mr. H., *North Bruce.*
Fisheries Jurisdiction *re* Provinces (Ques.) 3339 (ii).

CLARK, Mr. H.—*Con.*
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, and M. (Mr. Borden) to adj. debate, 1632 (i).
National Rifle Association, Rules *re* Bisley Competition (remarks) 3748 (ii).
Public Works, Appropriations in Estimates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2804 (ii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. on Res., 5913 (iv).
Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5913 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Labour Dept. (Gazette) 1487 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2996 (ii).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6406 (iv).

CLARK, Mr. M., *Red Deer.*
Address, The, on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 210 (i).
Budget, The (remarks) 5085 (iii).
Christmas, Adjournment, on M. (Mr. Borden) 927 (i).
Civil Service Act B. 106 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 5265 (iii).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1187 (i), 2039 (ii).
Grain Act, Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 3475, 3818 (ii).
Grain Shipments in the West, Regulation of Freight Rates, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 4023 (ii).
See 'Ry. Rates.'
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) on M. for 2°, 3654 (ii).
Horncastle, Isabella Helen, Relief (B. 147) 1°*, 5257 (iii).
Hudson Bay Railway Construction, on M. (Mr. Aikins) for Cor., 1227 (i).
Lumber Duties, Interpretation and Enforcement, on M. (Mr. Knowles) for Papers, 599 (i).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1681 (i).
N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1874 (i).
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burnham) 1380 (i).
Public Accounts Com., on M. (Mr. Middlebro) to conc. in 2nd Rep., 5839 (iv).
Railway Question, Transportation, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1932 (i).
Stewart, Ethel May, Relief (B. 120) 1°*, 4237 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt—Marine Dept. (salaries) 1053 (i).

CLARK, Mr. M.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Immigration (agencies, &c.) 3316 (ii).
Labour Dept. (combines, &c.) 1522 (i).
Militia (annual drill) 5481 (iii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2915, 3030, 3593 (ii); on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to M. for 3°, 4148 (iii); on Senate Amts., 6676 (iv).
——— Mace on Table (remarks) 3619 (ii).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6415 (iv).
Tower Clock, Repairs to (remarks) 1575 (i).

CLARKE, Mr. A. H., *South Essex.*
Brian, Mr., Dismissal from Customs Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1077 (i).
Canadian Missionaries in China, Relief *re* Dangers (remarks) 229 (i).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1077 (i).
Dumontier, Joseph, Apptmt. as Inland Rev. Inspector at Quebec, Qualifications, &c. (Ques.) 3340 (ii).
Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s (B. 12) 1°*, 643 (i).
Farmers' Bank Investigation (remarks) *re* Report, 2853 (ii).
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1311 (i).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1657 (i).
Marriage Law, Pet. *re* Dom. Legislation (Ques.) 528 (i).
Newspaper Postage *re* Dom. Elections Campaign (M. for cor.*) 1589 (i).
Political Literature, Application *re* Free Postage (Ques.) 1585 (i).
Post Office, Change of Names (remarks) 3751 (ii).
Renfrew, S., Election, Issue of Writ (remarks) 2059 (ii).
——— (M.) to adjn. Hse., 2218 (ii).
Rural Mail Delivery Extension (remarks) 2061 (ii).
Statutes of Previous Session, Delay *re* Distribution (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 678 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 1077 (i).
Labour Dept. (Gazette) 1474 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Pelee Island) 642 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (rentals) 1326 (i).
Trade and Commerce (annuities act) 693 (i).

CLARKE, Mr. W. A., *North Wellington.*
G. T. Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6756 (iv).

CLEMENTS, Mr. H. S., *Comox-Atlin.*
Budget, The, 5144 (iii).
Dismissals from Govt. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2029 (ii).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s (B. 90) 1°*, 2217 (ii).
Fisheries Protection Service on Pacific Coast, Capt. Newcombe's Rep. (M. for copy) 2467 (ii).
Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 91) 1°*, 2217 (ii).
Prince Rupert Dry Dock, Subsidy, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 1811 (i).
Public Works Expenditure for last ten years in Different Provinces (Ques.) 2064 (ii).
Wharfs, Total Expenditure for last ten years (Ques.) 1811 (i).

COCHRANE, Hon. F. (*Minister of Railways*) *Nipissing.*
Alberta Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6315 (iv).
Albert Mines and Hillsborough Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6246, 6305 (iv).
Albert Mines Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (amt.) in Com., 6395 (iv).
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5897, 6216, 6312 (iv).
Antigonish to Country Harbour Ry. Subsidy (remarks) 6227 (iv).
American Freight passing through Welland Canal (Ans.) 3536 (ii).
Archibald, Mr. P. S., Employmt. by Ry. Dept. (Ans.) 933 (i).
Belanger, Amedee, Dismissal from I. C. Ry. Investigation *re* (Ans.) 3051 (ii).
Bourque, Mr. Jeffrey, Claims *re* Damages on I.C.R. (Ans.) 2244 (ii).
Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6314 (iv).
Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6318 (iv).
Calgary and Fernie Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6323 (iv).
Canada and Gulf Terminal Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6305 (iv).
Can. Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (B. 189) 1°*, 6083; in Com., 6372 (iv).
Can. Northern Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 187) in Com. on Res., 6081; 1°*, 6082; 2° m., 6331; in Com., 6339; 3° m., 6371 (iv).
Can. Northern Ry., Bridge at Morris, Man., Objections *re* (Ans.) 2587 (ii).
Can. Northern Quebec Ry., Maintenance of Road on L'Ile Bourdon (Ans.) 5262 (iii).
C.P.Ry. (Toulon) Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6217 (iv).
Canals, Capital Expenditure, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 1811 (i).

COCHRANE, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Canal Staffs, Dismissals, &c. (remarks) in Com of Sup., 5801 (iv).
Canal Traffic, Total Tonnage of Freight, &c. (Ans.) 3051 (ii).
Cap. de la Magdeleine Ry. Co.'s B. 43 (Mr. Paquet) in Com., 2014 (ii).
Caribou, Barkerville and Willow River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6320 (iv).
Carillon Canal Hydraulic Power Lease, Name of Lessee (Ans.) 2293 (ii).
Car Shortage, *re* Transportation of Hay Crop (remarks) 2754 (ii).
Cement supplied to Ry. Dept., Tenders, Contract Price, &c. (Ans.) 4245 (iii).
Chateauguay Inundated Lands, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 6661 (iv).
Chatham and Newcastle Ry. Accommodation, Pets. from Boards of Trade (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4192 (iii).
Clarkboro, Sask., C.N.R. Right of Way, Title *re* (Ans.) 934 (i).
Couture, Mr. A., Dismissal from I.C.R. (Ans.) 2242 (ii).
Cuillerrier, Mr. J., Soulanges Canal Electrician, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 6183 (iv).
—— Complaints *re* (Ans.) 4458 (iii).
Cresine, Geo., Quarter Master on SS. *Scotia*, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 1583 (i).
Dismissals, Policy of Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4187 (iii).
See 'Canals,' 'I.C.R.', &c.
Doucet, Mr. A. E., Position on N.T. Ry. (Ans.) 2246 (ii).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6221 (iv).
Falconer, R. S., Dismissal of as Inspector, &c., on I.C.R. (Ans.) 544 (i).
—— Emplymt. as Contractor *re* Public Works (Ans.) 5261 (iii).
Fraser, John, Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4189 (iii).
Fraserville Wharf, Cor. *re* Construction (Ans.) 3534 (ii).
Fredericton and Grand Lake Coal and Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6224 (iv).
Freight Rates in the West, Complaints *re* (remarks) 666 (i).
Freight Rates on Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3217 (ii).
Gass, Trueman, Emplymt. and Dismissal on I.C.R. (Ans.) 2242 (ii).
Gauthier, Alderic, Dismissal from Soulanges Canal (Ans.) 4976 (iii).
Goods Roads Bill: *See* 'Highways.'
Goulet, Apptmt. as Inspector of Stations, N.T.Ry. (Ans.) 3935 (ii).
Grain Act B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2320 (ii).

COCHRANE, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Grain Congestion in the West, Transportation, &c. (remarks) on M. (Mr. Oliver) to Com. of Sup., 6205 (iv).
See 'Freight Rates,' &c.
Grand Lake and Belle River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6307 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry. Co. (Brandon) Subsidy, in Com., 6324 (iv).
—— Nanaimo and Esquimalt Branch Line Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5900 (iv).
G.T.P. Workshops at Quebec, Site for Building (Ans.) 3050 (ii).
G.T.P. Ry.: *See* 'N.T.Ry.'
Great Northern Mining and Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6224 (iv).
Green, John B., Homestead Inspector, Dismissal (Ans.) 6183 (iv).
Gutelius, Mr. F. P., Apptmt. to N.T. Ry. Commission, British Subject (Ans.) 4038 (iii).
See 'N.T.Ry.'
Guysborough Branch Ry. Appropriation, on M. for Sup., 1459 (i).
Ha Ha Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 5895, 6212 (iv).
Hampton Spur Line, Construction *re* (Ans.) 572 (i).
Harvey and Salisbury Ry., Negotiations *re* Supply of Rails, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4130 (iii).
Hay Crop and Car Shortage: *See* 'Car,' &c.
Highlands Bridge, Construction *re* (remarks) 1198 (i).
Highways Improvement (B. 77) 1°m., 1571 (i); 2°m., 3633, 3666, 3667, 3946 (ii); 3°m., 4140 (iii); on Senate Amts., 6397 (iv).
Houle, Stanislas, Emplymt. on Soulanges Canal (Ans.) 3537 (ii).
Hudson Bay Railway Construction, on M. (Mr. Aikins) for Papers, 1263 (i).
Hudson Bay Ry. Contract, on M. (Mr. Neely) for O.Cs., &c., 745 (i).
I.C. Ry., Board of Management, Abolition of, on Stmnt. (Mr. Emmerson) to Com. of Sup., 5586 (iv).
—— Branch Lines, Extension, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 994 (i).
—— Coal Supply, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 2457 (ii).
—— Condon, D. Murray, Transfer of Passenger Agent (Ans.) 3337 (ii).
—— Control by Ry. Commission, Res. *re* (Ans.) 4979 (iii).
—— Dismissals on I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5807 (iv).
—— Dartmouth to Denis Branch Line, I.C.R., Tenders *re* (Ans.) 543 (i).
—— Employees Retirement Fund, Refund to dismissed men (Ans.) 2450 (ii), 5934 (iv).

COCHRANE, Hon. F.—*Con.*
I.C. Ry., Estende to Baddeck Branch Line, Tender *re* (Ans.) 576 (i).
—— Estmere to Baddeck Branch Line, Tenders, &c. (Mr. McKenzie) on M. for papers, 2498 (ii).
—— Fences, Number of Rods on Campbellton Div. (Ans.) 6748 (iv).
—— Fraser, John, Dismissal as Inspector at Stellarton (Ans.) 3935 (ii).
—— Freight on Fish, Aid *re* Transportation (Ans.) 6749 (iv).
—— Guysborough Branch, Construction *re* (Ans.) 571 (i).
—— Hillsborough Branch, Rails loaned, &c. (Ans.) 4978 (iii).
—— Hagerty, S. W., Lismissal from Inspectorship of Ry. Station at Mulgrave (Ans.) 4976 (iii) .
—— Holiday and Sunday Pay, &c. (Ans.) 1583 (i).
—— Inspector, Application from Member of H. of C. (Ans.) 4040 (iii).
—— I.C.R. and G.T.Ry. Arbitration, Delays *re* Settlement (Ans.) 3940 (ii).
—— Matapedia Branch, Inspection *re* Subsidy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4196 (iii).
—— Moncton Office, Tenders *re* Heating, Stmnt. *re* (Ans.) 6744 (iv).
—— Moncton Shops, Heating Tenders, on Inquiry for Papers, 5762 (iv).
—— Moncton Shops, Transfer to Fraserville (Ans.) 544 (i).
—— 'Ocean Limited,' Instructions *re* Transportation of Private Cars (Ans.) 2241 (ii).
—— Pay Day, Change *re* (Ans.) 3340 (ii).
—— Pullman Car Porters, Promotion, &c. (Ans.) 1413 (i).
—— Ry. Ties at Sayabec, Name of Contractor, Price, &c. (Ans.) 4041 (iii).
—— Rivière du Loup, Workshops at, Removal to Fraserville (Ans.) 570 (i).
—— Ste. Anne de la Pocatiere Fence Poles, Charges *re* Removal, &c. (Ans.) 2586 (ii).
—— Snow Blockade, Delays *re* Trains (remarks) 1409 (i).
—— Station at Truro, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 1413 (i).
James Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com., 6309 (iv).
Kettle Valley Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5899, 6322 (iv).
Kettle Valley Ry. Co.'s Bridge Subsidy, in Com., 6327 (iv).
Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6219 (iv).
Lachine Bridge: *See* 'Highlands.'
Lac Seul, Rat Portage and Keewatin Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6217 (iv).

COCHRANE, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Lake Erie and Northern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6312 (iv).
Lalonde, Damien, Rep. *re* Assault (Ans.) 4256 (iii).
Lauzon, Désire, Emplymt. by Govt., References as to character (Ans.) 3538 (ii).
Leroux, Mr., Soulanges Canal, Dismissal (Ans.) 6183 (iv).
Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6314 (iv).
Methot, Dénis, Emplymt. on Soulanges Canal (Ans.) 4255 (iii).
Naas and Skeena River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6321 (iv).
N. T. Ry. Co.'s (B. 21) 1°*, 713; 2° m., 797 (i).
N. T. Ry. Act (Commission) Amt. (B. 76) 1° m., 1571; in Com., 1866 (i); 3126, 3364 (ii).
——— Stmnt. *re* Cost and Progress, in Com. on Bill, 3127 (ii).
N. T. Ry. Branch Lines to Montreal, Construction of (Ans.) 554 (i).
N. T. Ry. Commission, Apptmt. of Mr. Leonard, Duties assigned &c., (Ans.) 533 (i).
——— Payments to Mr. E. Taschereau (Ans.) 2245 (ii).
——— Payments to Taschereau, Cannon & Co. (Ans.) 2245 (ii).
——— Commission, Report *re* (remarks) 2157 (ii).
——— Commissioners, Notification of Dismissal (remarks) 1196, 1199 (i).
——— Damages in Dorchester County, Amounts paid (Ans.) 6184 (iv).
——— Estimated Cost, Stmnt. *re* (Ans.) 3127 (ii), 6733 (iv).
——— Investigation, Apptmt., Salary, &c., of Messrs. Gutelius and Lynch Staunton (Ans.) 4242 (iii).
See 'Gutelius.'
——— Moncton to Levis, Portion uncompleted (Ans.) 932 (i).
——— Pets. *re* Subsidy to Montreal Branch Line (Ans.) 573 (i).
——— Quebec-Moncton Section, Completion *re* Operation by Govt. (Ans.) 723 (i).
——— Repair Shops, Erection at Quebec and Winnipeg (Ans.) 4977 (iii).
——— St. Damien Station, Change of Plans (Ans.) 3533 (ii).
——— Station at Quebec, Contract *re* Building, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Cor., &c., 759 (i).
N. T. Ry. (Montreal Branch), Subsidy, in Com. 5896, 6215 (iv).

COCHRANE, Hon. F.—*Con.*
New Glasgow to Thorburn Ry. Co.'s Lease &c., Legislation *re* (Ans.) 933 (i).
Newmarket Canal, Meeting *re* (remarks) 3058 (ii).
New Glasgow to Thorburn Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6230 (iv).
North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6235 (iv).
Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s B. 161 (Mr. Fripp) in Com., 6127 (iv).
Parent, Hon. S. N., Resignation of (Ans.) 578 (i).
Pariseau, Mr. S. B., Employee of Ry. Dept. and Cedar Rapids Co., (Ans.) 973 (i).
P. E. I. Car Ferry, Construction, &c. (Ans.) 1206 (i).
P. E. I., O'Leary to West Point Ry. Branch Line, Construction *re* (Ans.) 721 (i).
P. E. I., Winter Communication with Mainland, Ry. Service (remarks) 3832 (ii).
Public Works on Rys., Suspension *re*, Names and Locations (Ans.) 531 (i).
Quebec Bridge, Erection of Shops (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5810 (iv).
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6305 (iv).
Quebec and Saguenay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6214 (iv).
Ry. Bridges in N.B. Subsidy (B. 188) 1°*, 6083; in Com., 6374; 3° m., 6394 (iv).
Ry. Construction in the West, Shortage of Steel Rails (remarks) 6543 (iv).
Railway Question: *See* 'Freight Rates,' 'Grain Congestion.'
Railway Subsidies (B. 183) in Com. on Res., 5894, 6080; in Com., 6211, 6304; (M.) to ref. back to Com., 6395; 3°m., 6395; on Amt. (Mr. Emmerson) to M. for 3°, 6396 (iv).
Rainy River Radial Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6312 (iv).
Roy, Wm., Complaint of Mr. Boulay *re* I.C.R. (Ans.) 934 (i).
Ste. Agathe des Monts Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5895, 5896 (iv).
St. Charles and Huron River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6308 (iv).
St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s B. 161 (Mr. Fripp) in Com., 6127 (iv).
St. Jean-Iberville Bridge, Amount voted *re* Construction (Ans.) 571 (i).
St. John, N.B., Ry. Crossing at Haymarket Square, on M. (Mr. Pugsley) for Cor., 1406 (i).
St. John Valley Ry. and Bridges, Subsidy, in Com., 6211 (iv).
See 'Ry. Bridges B. 188.'

COCHRANE, Hon. F.—*Con.*
St. John Valley Ry., Agreement *re* Construction (remarks) 4461 (iii).
——— Agreement *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4233 (iii).
——— Subsidy, Agreement *re* (Ans.) 3050 (ii).
——— Subsidy, Contract to Grand Falls (Ans.) 4978 (iii).
——— Contract *re* (Ans.) 577 (i).
——— on Inquiry (Mr. Carvell) for papers, 3946 (ii).
Sauve, L. A., Dismissal from Soulanges Canal (Ans.) 575 (i).
Senate Amendments to Railway Bills, on M. for Sup. (remarks) 6546 (iv).
Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6912 (iv).
Soulanges Canal, Claims of Denis Martin for Damages (Ans.) 2292 (ii).
——— Employees, Names, &c. (Ans.) 4250 (iii).
Soulanges Canal Patronage, &c. (Ans.) 3537 (ii).
Souris Wharf, Repairs to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5662 (iv).
Southampton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. 6224 (iv).
Sunnybrae and Guysborough Branch Ry., Appropriation *re* (Ans.) 2290 (ii).
——— Tenders *re* (Ans.) 543 (i).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Cornwall (lower lock) 5797 (iv).
Canals—Lachine (lock improvements) 6611 (Rockfield bridge) 5790 (iv).
Canals—Galops (upper lock) 5797 (iv).
Canals—Murray (high spots) 5798 (iv).
Canals—Rideau (Bank St. bridge) 5791 (iv).
Canals—St. Peters (improvements) 5798 (iv).
Canals—Sault Ste Marie (locks) 5791 (iv).
Canals—Soulanges (guard pier) 5798; protection works) 5791 (iv).
Canals—Trent (improvements) 5799; (Newmarket) 5792 (iv).
Canals—Welland (construction) 6607; Port Colborne elevator) 5796; (surveys) 5786 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Railways (private secretary) 5808 (iv); (salaries) 1064 (i).
Highways (subsidies) 6611 (iv).
Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 5762, 6605 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (air brakes) 4136; (board of management) 4136; (branch lines) 4135 (iii), 5618, 5621 (iv); (bridge strengthening) 4137 (iii); (Campbellton) 4162; (Chatham diversion) 4137; (coal contracts) 5611 (iv); (construction) 4131; (construction, working expenses) 4162 (iii); (equipment account) 5677 (iv); (extensions, &c.) 674 (i); (facilities) 5809 (iv); (gratuity to Cuthbertson children) 5678; (Halifax docks) 5596 (iv); (Hampton) 675 (i), 4225 (iii); (highway crossings) 4226 (iii); 5595 (iv); (locomotives) 5609 (iv); (Moncton office) 5653, 6604; (heating at Moncton) 5611; (Moncton shops) 5604; (North Sydney diversion) 5610; (Riviere du Loup) 5654; (rolling stock) 5653; (Sydney diversion) 5658 (iv); (Truro) 4231 (iii); (Wallace Harbour spur line) 6604 (iv).
Railways—Miscellaneous (board of commissioners) 5800 (iv); (litigation) 5801; (remuneration to G. T. P. Director) 5801; (staff salaries) 5801 (iv).
Railways—N. T. Ry. (construction) 5765 (iv).
Railways—P. E. I. (car ferry) 5663; (facilities) 5661; (Harmony-Elmira branch) 5659 (iv).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario and G. T. R. Co.'s B. 145 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6769 (iv).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy (B. 186) 1°*, 6082; in Com., 6402 (iv).
T. & N. O. Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6080 (iv).
Thibault, Theophile, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3339 (ii).
Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6217 (iv).
Toronto, Lindsay and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5898, 6217 (iv).
Transportation Question: *See* 'Freight Rates,' 'Grain Congestion.'
Trent Canal Water Powers, Claims of Prov. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5794 (iv).
Vale Railroad, Operation by I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5615 (iv).
Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5898, 6218 (iv).
Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com., 6325 (iv).
Welland Canal Freight: *See* "American Freight.'
Welland Canal Water Power, Diversion, &c. (Ans.) 6748 (iv).
COCKSHUTT, Mr. W. F., *Brantford.*
Budget, The, 5118 (iii).
Cockshutt Plough Co., Stmnt. of Member for Edmonton *re* Prices in East and West, on M. for Sup., 807 (i).
Imperial Naturalization, Uniformity in Canada, on M. (Mr. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 2429 (ii).
N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1897 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 3034 (ii); on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to M. for 3°, 4150 (iii).
CODERRE, Mr. L., *Hochelaga.*
British Colonial Fire Insurance Co. (B. 10) 1°*, 643 (i).

CODERRE, Mr. L.—*Con.*
Kootenay and Alberta Ry. Co.'s (B. 48) 1°*, 970 (i).
Man. Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. Mondou) to M. for 3°, 4875 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Resignation of Messrs. Geoffrion and Ballantyne (remarks) 6553 (iv).
Montreal Terminal Ry. Co.'s (B. 24) 1°*, 794 (i).
Montreal Transcontinental Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 128) 1°*, 4835 (iii).
Security Life Insurance Co. of Canada (B. 27) 1°*, 794 (i).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal postal station F) 1352 (i).

CROCKET, Mr. O. S., *York, N.B.*
Hamilton Harbour B. 32 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 2449 (ii).
Immigration Policy *re* Mar. Provs., on prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2109 (ii).

CROMWELL, Mr. F. R., *Compton.*
British Empire, Dom. Trust Co.'s Change of Name (B. 46) 1°*, 970; 2° m., 1201 (i).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6263 (iv).

CROTHERS, Hon. T. W. (*Minister of Labour*) *East Elgin.*
American Shoe Machinery Co., Discontinuance of Proceeding *re* (Ans.) 572 (i).
Cable Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lemieux) to M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 4104 (iii).
Cement Merger, Charges *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1518 (i).
Coal Combine in B. C., Investigation *re* (Ans.) 4240 (iii).
Coal Strike in Alberta, Settlement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1503 (i).
Coal Strike in Fernie, B. C., Information *re* (Ans.) 568 (i).
Coal Miners Strike in the West, Settlement of (Ans.) 568 (i).
——— Stmnt. of Min. of Int. *re* Settlement (Ans.) 571.
Conciliation Board, Apptmt. of, *re* International Disputes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1509 (i).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6259 (iv).
Grand Trunk Ry.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6563 (iv).
G. T. Ry. Trainmen's Strike, Settlement of by late Govt., Rep. of Judge Barron, &c. (Ans.) 2581 (ii); 6563 (iv).
Guysborough Branch Ry. Appropriation, on M. for Sup., 1468 (i).

CROTHERS, Hon. T. W.—*Con.*
Hale, Thomas, Dismissal as *Labour Gazette* Cor., Apptmt. of Successor (Ans.) 4459 (iii).
House of Commons Waiters: *See* 'Waiters.'
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1419 (i).
I.C. Ry. Provident Fund (remarks) 5933 (iv).
Labour Conditions in B.C. (remarks) 178 (i).
Labour Gazette Correspondents, Apptmts. in Richelieu County (Ans.) 2292 (ii).
Labour Gazette Correspondents, Names of Apptmts. (Ans.) 1865 (i).
——— Dismissals, &c. (Ans.) 1411 (i).
——— Dismissals, &c., on M. for Sup., 1442 (i).
Living, Cost of, Special Rep. (presented) 6332 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4339 (iii).
Montreal Longshoremen's Strike, Settlement of by Labour Dept. (Ans.) 572 (i).
N.T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1886 (i).
SUPPLY.
Labour Dept. (combines investigation act) 1500 (i); (contingencies) 6615 (iv); (*Gazette*) 1468; (industrial disputes act) 1500 (i); 6615 (iv); (industrial training commission) 1527; (inspection *re* dangerous machinery) 1525 (i); (private secretary) 6615 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (branch lines) 5625 (iv).
Railways—N. T. Ry. (construction) 5782 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2912 (ii).
Technical Education Commission's Rep. (Ans.) 1202 (i).
United Shoe Machinery Co.'s Appeal (Ans.) 6783 (iv).
——— Investigation, Application to Min. of Justice *re* (Ans.) 3148 (ii).
——— Proceedings *re* (Ans.) 2455 (ii).
Waiters, Minimum Wages paid to, in Cities (Ans.) 3049 (ii).

CRUISE, Mr. R., *Dauphin.*
Chard, J. A., Indian Agent at Grand View, Charges *re* (Ques.) 2458 (ii).
Dauphin Custom House (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3244 (ii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com. 2571, 3189, 3510 (ii); on M. for 3° (amt.) 4788, Neg. (Y. 47; N. 89) 4793 (iii).
Justice, Depy. Min., Salary, Extra Payments, &c. (Ques.) 2458 (ii).
Lake Winnipegosis Fishery, Limitation *re* Catch (Ques.) 3055 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Amt. (Mr. Oliver) 4684 (iii).

CURRIE, Mr. J. A., *North Simcoe.*
Alberta, Peace River and Eastern Ry. Co.'s B. 129 (Mr. Chabot) in Com., 5944 (iv).
Barcelona Tramway Light and Power Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 2411 (ii).
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 40) 1°*, 970 (i).
Cockshutt Plough Co., Prices *re* (remarks) 819, 836 (i).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship, Lists dismissed by Lib. Party (read) in Com. of Sup., 1096 (i).
Dogfish Scrap, Price *re*, on M. (Mr. Sinclair) for Cor., 1391 (i).
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amt. Bill (Mr. Monk) in Com. on Res., 6055 (iv).
E. F. Piper, Patent Relief B. 53 (Mr. Fripp) on M. for 2°, 1201 (i).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6255 (iv).
Flaxseed, Stmnt. *re* Shipment of (Mr. Turriff) 661 (i).
Freight Rates, &c., on Public Ownership (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 664 (i).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 2°, 2170; in Com., 2182, 2324 (ii).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co. of Canada (B. 130) 1°*, 4835 (iii); on Order for Com., 5947; in Com., 6563, 6762 (iv).
G.T.R. Trainmen's Strike, 6563, 6762 (iv).
Hudson Bay Ry. Contract, on M. (Mr. Neely) for O.Cs., 733 (i).
Judges Act (salaries) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 6004 (iv).
Lake Erie and Northern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6312 (iv).
Live Stock Records Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 6046 (iv).
Lumber Duties, Violation of Customs Act, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) 1728 (i).
N.T. Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3417 (ii).
Naas and Skeena River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6321 (iv).
Naturalization, Legislation *re* Uniformity, on M. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) for Cor., 773 (i).
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burnham) 1385 (i).
Ontario and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s (B. 50) 1°*, 970 (i); in Com., 2413 (ii).
P.E.I. Subsidy B. 178 (Mr. White) in Com., 6134 (iv).
Printing Com., 1st Rep. (M.) to conc., 3330 (ii).
——— 3rd Rep. (M.) to conc., 6578 (iv).
Private Bills, Consideration of (remarks) 6578 (iv).

CURRIE, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*
Public Works, Appropriations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2808 (ii).
Quebec Bridge Construction Contract, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to M. for Sup., 5443 (iii).
Railway Fares, Reduction to Students (remarks) 6277 (iv).
Railway Question, Transportation, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 664, 1923 (i).
Rideau Hall Improvements Amount expended from 1896 to Nov., 1911, (Ques.) 876 (i).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture—Miscellaneous (Toronto exhibition) 6483 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Outside Ports (salaries) 1096 (i).
Immigration (agencies) 3317 (ii).
Labour Dept. (Conciliation Board) 1511 (ii); (Gazette) 1481 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (St. John) 630 (i); Miscellaneous (art gallery) 2827 (ii).
Railways—I. C. R. (branch lines) 5651; P. E. I. (car ferry) 5665 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2880, 3569 (ii).
——— Ques. of Order, 3616 (ii).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry., and G. T. Ry. Co.'s (B. 145) 1°*, 5257 (iii); on Order for Com., 5947; in Com., 6769 (iv).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6422 (iv).
Wadge, Thomas, Patent Relief B. 16 (Mr. Aikins) in Com., 2854; on 3°, 3280 (ii).

DAVIDSON, Mr. A. L., *Annapolis.*
Decoste, Capt., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3259 (ii).
Douglas Road Post Office, Date of Opening, &c. (Ques.) 3754 (ii).
Faulkner, R. S., Emplymt. by Public Works as Contractor (Ques.) 5261 (iii).
Grain Shipments in the West, Regulations of Freight Rates, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3998 (ii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3722 (ii).
I.C.R. and G.T. Ry. Arbitration, Delays in Settlement, &c. (Ques.) 3939 (ii).
I.C. Ry. Branch Lines, Accommodation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4218 (ii).
Lowe, Robt. S., Emplymt. by Public Works Dept. Leave of Absence, &c. (Ques.) 3754 (ii).
Public Works, Appropriations for N.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2810 (ii).
Seamen, St., Annapolis Co., Post Office, Date of Opening (Ques.) 3754 (ii).

DAVIDSON, Mr. A. L.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—
Railways—I.C.R. (branch lines) 5645 (iv).
Yarmouth Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3276 (ii).

DELISLE, Mr. M. S., *Portneuf.*
Laforce, Mr. J. E., Emplymt. as Immigration Agent (Ques.) 2242 (ii).
Matte, J. Arthur, Postmaster at Montauban, Dismissal of (M. for cor.*) 5957 (iv).
Neuville and C.N.Ry. Station Mail Contract, Cancellation of (Ques.) 2067 (ii).
Notre Dame des Anges Postmaster, Dismissal of (Ques.) 554 (i).
Poulin, Mr. E., Dismissal from Customs, Quebec City (Ques.) 2071 (ii).
St. Vallier Wharf, Award of Contract, &c. (Ques.) 2068 (ii).

DEMERS, Mr. M. J., *St. John, Iberville.*
American Goods shipped into Canada, Names of Firms, &c. (Ques.) 3533 (ii).
Bank Act Amt. B. 169 (Mr. White) in Com. 5852 (iv).
Census Employees, Payments to (Ques.) 3335 (ii).
Dismissals on I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5808 (iv).
Farmers' Bank, St. Jean, Indemnity to Depositors (Ques.) 551 (i).
Garceau, Resignation as Commissioner (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5816 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. Beland) to M. for 3°, 4962 (iii).
Postmasters, Dismissal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6640 (iv).
St. Jean and Iberville Bridge, Amount voted *re* Construction (Ques.) 551, 571 (i).
SUPPLY—
Excise (revenue officers) 5824; (tobacco stamps) 5826 (iv).
Post Office—Outside Service (salaries) 6640 (iv).
Tuberculosis in St. Jean and Iberville, Govt. Information *re* (Ques.) 3533 (ii).

DEVLIN, Mr. E. B., *Wright.*
Address, The, 348 (i).
Bank Act Amt. B. 169 (Mr. White) in Com., 5855 (iv).
Cockshutt Plough Co.'s Prices, &c. (remarks) 859 (i).
Combines in Trade, Restraint *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1520 (i).
Dismissals from Public Works, Par. in Newspapers (remarks) 3058 (ii).
Dismissals in Hull, Official Inquiry (remarks) 550 (i); 4140 (iii).

DEVLIN, Mr. E. B.—*Con.*
—— on M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) for Papers, 954 (i).
Dom. Notes and Stamps Printing Contract, (remarks) 5845 (iv).
French River (remarks) *re* Vote, 6729 (iv).
Georgian Bay Canal, Policy of Govt. (remarks) 3060 (ii).
—— Rep. in Ottawa Citizen *re* P.M.G. Speech, 1970 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal Route and French River (remarks) 6785 (iv).
Grand Lake and Belle River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6307 (iv).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3959 (ii).
Inquiries Act. Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1316 (i).
Judges Act (salaries) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 6010 (iv).
Man. Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. Mondou) to M. for 3°, 4907 (iii).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1617 (i).
Naval Question, Speech of Hon. Mr. Monk at Hull (Ques.) 551 (i).
Naval Service, O.C. *re* Instructions, Circulars issued, &c. (Ques.) 2065 (ii).
'Niobe' and 'Rainbow,' Contracts *re* provisioning (Ques.) 2859 (ii).
—— Sale of (Ques.) 2859 (ii).
Peat Industry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6603 (iv).
Political Literature, Application *re* Free Postage (remarks) 1587 (i).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 4766 (iii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6307 (iv).
St. Peter of Wakefield, Postmaster, Dismissal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6286 (iv).
South Renfrew Elections, Speech of Minister of Customs (remarks) 1573 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt—Finance (contingencies) 1069; Naval Dept. (salaries) 1063 (i); Post Office (H. B. Verret) 6278 (iv).
Labour Dept. (Gazette) 1474 (i).
Miscellaneous Printing Bureau (plant) 6613 (iv).
Post Office (mail service) 6286 (iv).
Public Works—Bridges (Ottawa River) 6806 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Louisville) conc., 6800 (iv).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6420 (iv).
Wright County Public Works Employees, Dismissal of (Ques.) 550 (i).

DOHERTY, Hon. C. J. (Minister of Justice) *Montreal, St. Ann.*
Alberta Great Waterways Ry., Disallowance of (remarks) 1575 (i).
Companies Incorporation, ref. to Supreme Court, Withdrawal of (Ans.) 529 (i).
Criminal Code (log stealing) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Stevens) on M. for 2°, 944; 1821 (i); in Com., 2532 (ii).
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. (B. 165) 1°m., 5550; in Com., 5862; 3°m., 5892, 5960; on Amt. (Mr. Pugsley) to M. for 3°, 5963 (iv).
Deputy Minister of Justice, Travelling Expenses (Ans.) 3150 (ii).
Dugas, Hon. Mr. Justice, Date of Apptmt. (Ans.) 2858 (ii).
Exchequer Court Act (additional judge) Amt. (B. 168) 1°m., 5553; in Com., 5893 (iv).
Ezra Butler Eddy Bessey, Change of Name B. 117 (Mr. Fripp) on M. for 2°, 4239 (iii).
Govt. House Property, Toronto, Transfer (B. 182) in Com. on Res., and 1°*, 5957; in Com., 6181 (iv).
Hull Superior Court, Apptmt. of Mr. Chauvin (Ans.) 4261 (iii).
Inquiries Act, (Dismissals) Amt. (B. 19) 1°m., 710; 2°m., 1021; in Com., 1283; 1414 (i).
Judges Act (additional) Amt. (B. 156) in Com. on Res., 5407; 1°*, 5415 (iii); in Com. on Res., 5958; in Com., 6000; 3°m., 6062; on Amt. (Mr. Proulx) 6063 (iv).
Judges for Ont., Apptmt. of Extra Judges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1035 (i).
Justice, Dep. Min., Salary, Extra Payments, &c. (Ans.) 2458, 3150 (ii).
Juvenile Delinquents Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 939 (i).
Letellier, Judge Blaise, Residence, &c. (Ans.) 3151 (ii).
McRae, Mr. F. D., Pets. *re* Clemency (Ans.) 713 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. Mondou) to M. for 3°, 4845 (iii).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1642 (i).
Marriage Question, Ref. to Privy Council, Provl. Representations (Ans.) 3755 (ii).
Meredith, Hon. Sir William, Application *re* Leave (Ans.) 5954 (iv).
Montreal Circuit Court, Apptmt. of Additional Judges (remarks) 3907 (ii).
—— (Ans.) 545 (i); 2855 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Resignations of Messrs. Geoffrion and Ballantyne (remarks) 6552 (iv).

DOHERTY, Hon. C. J.—*Con.*
Montreal Judiciary, Pets. *re* Increase of Judges (Ans.) 545 (i).
Ne Temere Decree: *See* 'Marriage.'
Ottawa County Superior Court Judge, Apptmt. of Additional Judge (remarks) 4121 (iii).
Penitentiaries in Canada, Deptl. Report (presented) 970 (i).
Penitentiary Employees Salaries, Increases *re* (Ans.) 1205 (i).
Prisons and Reformatories Act Amt. (B. 166) 1°m., 5552; in Com., 5892-3 (iv).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 4751 (iii).
Revised Statutes of Can., French Translation Correction (B. 65) 1° m., 1197; in Com., 1438 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Act (indemnity) Amt. (B. 75) prop. Res., 1414; in Com. on Res., 1497; in Com., 1714 (i).
Sorel Workshops, Investigations *re* Payment of Accounts (Ans.) 1205 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Justice—Exchequer Court (salaries) 1035, 1039 (i); (promotions) 6584 (iv).
Justice, Administration of (Montreal circuit court) 6597; (N. W. Territories) 6560 (iv).
Justice, Miscellaneous (counsel fees *re* Lanctot inquiry) 6487; (litigation) 6561; (pecuniary claims) 6579 (iv).
Justice—Penitentiaries (bonus) 6600; (Dorchester) 6561; (McAllister, Mr., moving expenses) 6597; (St. Vincent de Paul) 6586 (iv).
Miscellaneous (St. John Ambulance Association) 6583; (tuberculosis association) 6579 (iv).
Tourigny, Judge, Charges *re*, Govtl. Action (Ans.) 3147 (ii).
Yukon Territory Judges Act (reduction) Amt. (B. 123) M. for Com. on Res., 3630 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4555-6; 1°*, 4563; 2°*, in Com., 5567 (iii).

DOUGLAS, Mr. J. M., *Strathcona.*
Camrose Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2213 (ii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 3512 (ii); on Amt. (Mr. Thomson) to M. for 3°, 4795 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Strathcona) 2213 (ii).

EDWARDS, Mr. J. W., *Frontenac.*
Canada Shipping Act (pilotage dues) Amt., 1° m., 229 (i).
—— (M. for com.) on prop. Res., 1817 (i).
Cement Duties compared with U.S. (remarks) on Tariff Commission Bill, 2727 (ii).

EDWARDS, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*
Civil Service Act (rural mail) Amt. B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 6103 (iv).
Civil Service Apptmts. between Dissolution of Parlt. and Sept. 31st (M. for stmnt.*) 562 (i).
Dairying Industry in Can., Grievances *re* weighing at Montreal (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5711 (iv).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1084, 1179 (i).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6266 (iv).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3706 (ii).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1704 (i).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture—Miscellaneous (Toronto exhibition) 6482 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Customs—Outside Ports (salaries) 1084 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Cuba) 4722; (Can. and Newfoundland) 4725; (Halifax and Nfld.) 4727 (iii).
Militia (automobiles) 5498 (iii).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5385 (iii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2720; in Com., 2973, 2997, 3550 (ii).
Williamsville Post Office, Kingston, Ques. of Priv., 6271 (iv).

ELLIOTT, Mr. Geo. A., *North Middlesex.*
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3686 (ii).

ELSON, Mr. P., *East Middlesex.*
Immigration Office in London, Ont. (Ques.) 2451 (ii).
Rural Mail Delivery, Number of Boxes in Ont., &c. (Ques.) 6782 (iv).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R., *Westmoreland.*
Address, The, 413 (i).
Albert Mines and Hillsborough Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6246, 6304 (iv).
Albert Mines Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, on Amt. (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6395 (iv).
Ash, Mr. Earl, Claims *re* Damages for Fire on I.C.R. (M. for cor.*) 2246 (ii).
Bank Notes Printing: *See* 'Dom. Notes.'
Battlefields Commission (remarks) *re* in Com. of Sup., 5299 (iii).
Beaumont Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2365 (ii).
Census Enumerators, Delay in Payments (remarks) 1971 (ii).
Christmas Adjournment, on M. (Mr. Borden) 928 (i).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 4565 (iii).
Civil Service Act (rural mail) Amt. B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 6101 (iv).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
Courtenay Bay Harbour Works, Contracts *re* (remarks) 4743 (iii), 6187 (iv).
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5864 (i); on Amt. (Mr. Pugsley) to M. for 3°, 5963 (iv).
Dismissal of Public Officials, on M. (Mr. Maclean) 892 (i).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1076 (i).
See 'Inquiries B. 19.'
Dismissals from Westmoreland County (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1544 (i).
Dom. Notes, Engraving, &c., Limitation as to Tenders (remarks) 1820 (i).
——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1841 (i).
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amt. Bill (Mr. Monk) in Com. on Res., 6048 (iv).
Election Expenses in Albert, Delay in Payment (remarks) 2156 (ii).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6222 (iv).
Estimates, Discussion on Conc. (remarks) 6805 (iv).
Fisheries Protection, Sawdust Pollution (remarks) 937 (i).
Flags, Use of B. 74 (Mr. Bradbury) on M. for 1°, 1410 (i).
Fort Osborne Barracks Sale B. 185 (Mr. Hughes) in Com. on Res., 6078 (iv).
Fredericton and Grand Lake Coal and Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6224 (iv).
Govt. Ownership: *See* 'Public.'
G.T.P. Ry., Esquimalt and Nanaimo Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5900 (iv).
Great Northern Mining & Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6224 (iv).
Immigration Policy *re* Mar. Provs., on prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2110 (ii).
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1298, 1418 (i).
I.C. Ry., Board of Management, Abolition of, on M. for Sup., 5571 (iv).
——— Ques. 569 (i).
I.C.R. Branch Lines, Legislation *re* Acquisition (Ques.) 569 (i).
——— Branch Lines (prop. res.) 985, 1011 (i).
I.C.Ry., Instructions *re* Holiday and Sunday Pay, &c. (Ques.) 1583 (i).
——— Moncton Office, Tenders *re* Heating (Ques.) 6743 (iv).
——— Passes to Employees, Newspaper Reporters, &c., Instructions from Ottawa (remarks) 2328 (ii).
——— Provident Fund, Payments to Dismissed officials (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5930 (iv).
——— Ticket Collectors, Apptmt. of (remarks) 6787 (iv).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
I.C. Ry., Transfer of D. Murray Condon, Passenger Agent (Ques.) 3337 (ii).
Judges Act (salaries) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 6014 (iv).
Live Stock Records Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 6024 (iv).
Man. Boundaries B. 115, in Com., 4609 (iii).
Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com. on Res., 871 (i).
Moncton Heating Tenders, Inquiry for Papers, 5762 (iv).
N.T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1870, 1878 (i), 3130, 3372 (ii).
N.T. Ry. Commission, Apptmt. of Mr. R. W. Leonard (M. for cor., &c.*) 2246 (ii).
——— Resignation of (remarks) 1199 (i).
N.T. Ry. (Montreal Branch) Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5897 (iv).
Newmarket Canal, Meeting at Newmarket, Representations (remarks) 3057 (ii).
Northern N.B. and Seaboard Ry. Co.'s Subsidy in Com., 6229, 6231 (iv).
North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6234 (iv).
Ocean Limited Express Operation (remarks, in Supply on conc., 6774 (iv).
——— Instructions *re* Transportation of Private Cars (Ques.) 2241 (ii).
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burnham) 1837 (i).
Ottawa Plaza, Fences and Posters, Responsibility *re* (Ques.) 876 (i).
Parcel Post Extension, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 2351 (ii).
Patent Relief Bills, on M. for 2°, (remarks) 1202 (i).
P.E.I. and Mainland Govt. Car Ferry, Tel. *re* (Ques.) 1580 (i).
——— Car Ferry System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5220 (iii).
——— Cor. with Govt. *re* Car Ferry System (M. for copies*) 2072 (ii).
Public Ownership of Govt. Utilities, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 655 (i).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickel) in Com., 4755 (iii).
Race Tracks: *See* 'Criminal Code.'
Railway Bills, Amendments by the Senate (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6544 (iv).
——— Explanation *re* (remarks) 6493 (iv).
Railway Com., G. T. Ry., Apptmt. of Subcommittee, Liberals omitted (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5616 (iv).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. on Res., 5897; in Com., 6211; 6304; on M. for 3° (amt.) 6395 (iv).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
Rambaut, Thomas D., Patent Relief B. 84 (Mr. Ames) in Com., 2986 (ii).
Reciprocity Treaty, ref. to in debate on Address, 426 (i).
Reid, Mr. Watson E., Dismissal as Inspector of Hillsboro Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1528 (i).
Roy, Wm., Inquiry *re* Charges, on M. (Mr. Boulay) for Papers, 1393 (i).
St. John and Courtenay Bay Contract, Signing, &c. (remarks) 4743 (iii); 6187 (iv).
St. John Valley Ry., Contracts *re* (remarks) 4743 (iii).
Senate Amts. to Ry. Bills, 6493, 6544 (iv).
Senate and House of Commons Act (indemnity) Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 1498 (i).
Senate Vacancies (remarks) 5162 (iii).
Shediac Island Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2373 (ii).
Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5913 (iv).
Southampton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6224 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Welland (construction) 6609 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 1076 (i); Inland Revenue (promotions) conc., 6772; Justice (promotions) 6586; Public Works (private secretary) conc., 6779 (iv).
Customs—Outside Ports (salaries) 1157 (i).
Highways (subsidies) 6611 (iv).
Immigration (agencies, &c.) 3314 (ii).
Justice—Penitentaries (bonus) 6600; (Dorchester) 6561; (McAllister, Mr., moving expenses) 6596 iv).
Justice—Miscellaneous (litigation) 6561 (iv).
Labour Dept. (Gazette) 1476; 1492 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 4719 (iii).
Militia (armouries) 5541 (iii).
Miscellaneous (St. John Ambulance Ass'n.) 6583 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 5220; (life saving awards) 5228 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—N. B. (Hillsboro) 1528 (i); (Shediac) conc., 6793 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (Sackville) conc., 6805 (iv); (St. John dry dock) 3296 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (French River) conc., 6778 (iv).
Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 5764, 6606 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (facilities) conc., 6774; (gratuity to Cuthbertson children) 5678; (highway crossings) 5595; (locomotives) 5607; (Moncton, heating) 5610; (Moncton office) 5653; (provident fund) 5677; (refrigerator cars) 5603; (Wallace Harbour spur line) 6605 (iv).
Railways—P.E.I. (car ferry) 5672 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (annuities act) 694 (i).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2862, 2887 (ii).
Universal Eyesight Co.'s incorp. B. 126 (Mr. McLean) in Com., 5907 (iv).
Wadge Thomas Patent Relief B. 16 (Mr. Aikins) in Com., 2984 (ii).
Winnipeg Govt. Property Sale: *See* 'Fort Osborne.'

ETHIER, Mr. J. A. C., *Two Mountains.*
Address, The, 295 (i).
Brazeau, Emiler, Postmaster at Cote Rouge, Dismissal (Ques.) 6337 (iv).
Canadian Navy, Repudiation by Nationalists &c. (Ques.) 714 (i).
—— Speeches *re* Election Campaign, &c. (Ques.) 552 (i).
Debates, Official, Correction *re* Vote of member for St. James, Montreal, *re* Man. Bill, 4983 (iii).
Doherty, Mr., Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 725 (i).
Hansard, French Edition, Delay *re* Distribution (remarks) 268 (i).
Houle, Stanislas, Emplymt. on Soulanges Canal (Ques.) 3537 (ii).
House of Commons Messengers, Dismissals, &c. (M. for stmnt.*) 562 (i).
Judges of Superior Court, Superannuation, &c. (M. for cor.*) 2459 (ii).
Lauzon, Desire, Emplymt. by Govt., References *re* Character, &c. (Ques.) 3538 (ii).
Mail Carrier, Como to Oka, Compensation *re* Death (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6282 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4422; on Amt. (Mr. Beland) to M. for 3°, 4937 (iii).
Marriage Question *re* Catholic Hierarchy, &c. (Ques.) 573 (i).
Military Conference, Invitations *re*, Canon Dauth, &c. (Ques.) 552 (i).
Point Aux Anglais, Drainage Works, &c. (Ques.) 4778 (iii).
Provost, Raoul, Dismissal from Marine and Fisheries (Ques.) 2453 (ii).
Solicitor General and Min. of Justice, &c. (Ques.) 725 (i).
SUPPLY—
Post Office (mail service) 6282 (iv).

FORTIER, Mr. E., *Lotbinière.*
Laroche, Capt. Leon, Dismissal of (Ques.) 4549 (iii).
Lotbinière County Postmasters, Dismissals, Number, Names, &c. (Ques.) 972 (i).
Postmasters in Lotbinière, Dismissals, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6294 (iv).
Postmasters, Dismissal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6645 (iv).

FORTIER, Mr. E.—*Con.*
Ste. Croix Wharf Construction (M. for papers*) 5557 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Post Office (mail service) 6294; Outside Service (salaries) 6645 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Three Rivers) 2443 (ii).

FOSTER, Mr. A. De Witt, *Kings, N.S.*
Address, The, on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 201 (i).
Dismissals, Charges *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5804 (iv).
Immigration Policy *re* Mar. Provs., on prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2098 (ii).
Yarmouth Harbour, Grounding of *Niobe* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3277 (ii).

FOSTER, Hon. Geo. E. (*Minister of Trade and Commerce*) *North Toronto.*
Address, The, on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 72 (i).
Annuities Branch Lecturers, Charges *re* J. B. Leger (Ans.) 1413 (i).
—— Payment to Agents (Ans.) 974 (i).
—— Dismissal of Agents, &c. (Ans.) 727 (i).
Appropriations omitted from Estimates, 1913 (i).
——on M. (Mr. Sinclair) for Ret., 1819 (i).
Arichat and Canso SS. Subsidy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4734 (iii).
Bras d'Or Lakes SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5937 (iv).
British West Indies and British Guinea, on Inquiry (Mr. Murphy) for Ret., 1820 (i).
See 'Trade Relations.'
Canada-France Steamship Service, Contract *re* (Ans.) 5262 (iii).
Canadian Agents, Apptmt. of, in Europe (Ans.) 5261 (iii).
Canada and G. B. Mail Service, Renewal of Contract *re* (Ans.) 547 (i).
See 'Supply—Mail Subsidies' 'G. B. and Can.'
Canadian Marine Insurance, Govt. Co-operation (Ans.) 1582 (i).
Car Shortage in the West, Govtl. Action *re*, on M. for Sup., 1716 (i).
Christmas Holidays, Adjournment *re* (remarks) 702 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 5267 (iii).
Commercial Agent in France, Apptmt. as Successor to Mr. A. Poindron (Ans.) 4041 (iii).
Customs Weighing of Goods, Decree of French Govt. (Ans.) 721 (i).
Dismissal of Public Officials, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Papers, 897 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. Geo. E.—*Con.*
See 'Inquiries B. 19.'
Dom. Notes Printing, Ques. of Order, 1843 (i).
Estimates, Discussion *re* (remarks) adjournment, 5937 (iv).
Franco-Canadian Trade Relation, on M. (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 5755 (iv).
Freight Rates on Rys.: *See* 'Grain Shipments.'
Govt. Ownership: *See* 'Telegraph.'
Grain Act Amt. (B. 32) prop. Res., 870; in Com. on Res., 871 (i); 2° m., 2161; in Com., 2179, 2302, 2382, 2535, 2755, 3156, 3451, 3513, 3757 (ii); 4042; on Order being called for 3°, (M.) for Com., 4153; in Com., 4154; (amt.) 4787; M. for 3°, 4788; on Amt. (Mr. L. Thomson) to M. for 3°, 4796 (iii).
—— M. to take up Govt. Orders, 869 (i).
—— Notice of Amendment, 3630 (ii).
See 'Man. Grain B. 96.'
Grain Act, Farmers' Interests, &c. (remarks) 4744 (iii).
Grain Bill, Notice for Discussion (remarks) 1575 (i).
Grain Carriage to Duluth, Stmnt. *re* Washington Despatch, 2577 (ii).
Grain Congestion in the West, on Inquiry (Mr. Oliver) 6187 (iv).
—— Number of Cars despatched (stmnt.) 5954 (iv).
—— Par. in Toronto Globe (remarks) 5929 (iv).
Grain Shipments from Canadian Ports, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 536 (i).
Grain Shipments from Port Arthur and Fort William (Ans.) 541 (i).
Grain Shipments in the West, Regulation of Freight Rates, &c. (remarks) on Prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3976, 4009 (ii).
G.B. and Canada Mail Service, Letter of Quebec Board of Trade (remarks) 1844 (i).
Harvey & Salisbury Ry., on Inquiry for Ret., 1843 (i).
Highlands Bridge Construction, Ques. of Order, 1197 (i).
Hudson Bay Ry. Contract, on M. (Mr. Neely) for O.Cs., &c. 747 (i).
Imperial Naturalization, Uniformity in Canada, on M. (Mr. Macdonald) to Com. of Sup., 2426 (ii).
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1313 (i).
Inspection and Sale Act (feed) Amt. (B. 78) in Com. on Res., 1839 (i); in Com., 6189, 6678 (iv).
Japan, Trade Relations with, Stmnt. by Japanese Consul at Vancouver (Ans.) 560 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. Geo. E.—*Con.*
Magdalen Islands, Marconi Service (remarks) 4161 (iii).
Mail Subsidies, Establishment of Dom. Steamers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 686 (i).
Mail Subsidies, Mar. Provs. and Porto Rico (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 686 (i).
See 'Supply.'
Man. Boundaries Extension, Answer to Question (remarks) 3755 (ii).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. (B. 96) 1°m., 2405 3°m., 2575 (ii).
See 'Grain Act.'
N.T.Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1868 (i).
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burnham) 1375, 1834 (i).
Ottawa, Montreal and Eastern Ry. Co.'s (B. 99) on Senate Amts., 5679 (iv).
Quebec Bridge Construction Contract, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to M. for Sup., 5443-4 (iii).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com. (amt.) 4759 (iii).
Ry. Act. Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 944 (i).
Railway Rates, Transportation, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1923 (i).
See 'Grain Shipments,' &c.
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. on Res., 5902 (iv).
Reciprocity, ref. to in Debate on Address, 76 (v).
Rooms alloted to Liberal Members, Complaints *re* (remarks) 670 (i).
Seed Grain Distribution, Res. from Wilcox Board of Trade (remarks) 2301 (ii).
Stenographic Assistance for Members (remarks) 1847 (i).

SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Justice—Exchequer Court (salaries) 1036, 1039; Marine Dept. (salaries) 1047 (i).
Labour Dept. (combines investigation Act) 1503 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Baddeck, &c.) 4714; (Bras d'Or Lakes) 4734; (Canada and Australia) 4714; (Can. and Cuba) 4721; (Can. and G.B.) 4715 (iii); (Can. and Mexico) 5934 (iv); (Can. and Newfoundland) 4725; (Can. and S. Africa) 4726; (Halifax, Newfoundland and England) 4727; (Halifax and W. Indies) 4740; (Magdalen Islands) 4730 (iii); (North Sydney &c.) 680 (i); (Pictou and Cheticamp) 4736; (Quebec and Gaspe) 4739 (iii); (St. John and Halifax) 678 (i), 4740 (iii); (St. John and W. Indies) 640 (i); (Sydney and Wycocomagh) 4741 (iii).

FOSTER, Hon. Geo. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Trade and Commerce (annuities) 688; (bounties Act) 687 (i); (iron and steel bounties) 5934 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2962 (ii); on Senate Amts., 6671, 6821 (iv).
Telegraph and Telephone Lines, Govt. Ownership (remarks) 2007 (ii).
Trade Agents: *See* 'Can. Agents.'
Trade and Commerce Deptl. Report (presented) 971 (i); 2591, 3630 (ii); 6780 (iv).
Trade Relations between W. Indies, Australia and Canada, on M. (Mr. Pugsley) to Com. of Sup., 1995 (ii).
See 'Supply—Mail Subsidies.'
Universal Eyesight Co.'s incorp. B. 126 (Mr. McLean) in Com., 5908 (iv).

FOWLER, Mr. Geo. W., *Kings and Albert.*
Albert Mines and Hillsborough Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6248 (iv).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Lalor) to conc., 2842 (ii).
Dismissals of Public Officials, on M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) for Papers, 961 (i).
—— Irrelevancy of Debate, 952 (i).
Freight Rates, &c., Public Ownership, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 666 (i).
Grain Shipments in the West, Regulations of Freight Rates, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 4032 (ii).
Harvey and Salisbury Ry., Contract *re* Rails (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4166 (iii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) on M. for 2°, 3663 (ii).
I.C.R. Hillsborough Branch Rails Loaned, &c. (Ques.) 4978 (iii).
James' Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com., 6310 (iv).
Kettle Valley Ry. Bridge Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6329 (iv).
Lumber Duties, Violation of Customs Act, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) 1781 (i).
Mail Contracts, Cancellation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6621 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 3864 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Settlement, on M. (Mr. Macdonald) for Cor., 784 (i).
N.T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1892 (i).
North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6234 (iv).
Pink Rock Wharf, N.B. Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 4257 (iii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6234, 6310 (iv).

FOWLER, Mr. Geo. W.—*Con.*
Steele, Col., Apptmt. to Headquarters Staff (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6653 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture—Experimental Farms (branch stations) 6485 (iv).
Militia (ordnance) 6653 (iv).
Post Office—Outside Office (salaries) 6621 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, N. B. (St. John) 627 (i).
Railways—I.C.R. (board of management) 5676; P.E.I. (car ferry) 5665 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2937 (ii).

FRIPP, Mr. A. E., *Ottawa.*
Address, The, 409 (i).
Continental Can Co. Patent Relief (B. 119) 1°*, 4236; 2°m., 4395; in Com., 5204 (iii); 5483, 5903 (iv).
Eddy, Ezra B., Change of Name (B. 117) 1°*, 4139; 2°m., 4238 (iii).
Edmond F. Piper Patent Relief (B. 53) 1°*, 970; 2°m., 1201 (i).
Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s (B. 161) in Com., 6127 (iv).
Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 25) 1°*, 794 (i).

GAUTHIER, Mr. L. J., *St. Hyacinthe.*
Address, The, 475 (i).
Man. Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. Mondou) to M. for 3°, 4912 (iii).

GAUVREAU, Mr. C. A., *Temiscouata.*
Dairying Industry, Complaints *re* Weighing Cheese (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5726 (iv).
Delisle, L. Treffle, of Trois Pistoles, Dismissals, &c. (M. for cor.*) 4781 (iii).
Dionne, Thos., Dismissal of (M. for cor.*) 2460 (ii).
Dismissals on I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5806 (iv).
Fraserville Bridge Works, Interview with Messrs. LeBel and Riou (Ques.) 549 (i).
Fraserville Wharf, Cor. *re* Construction (Ques.) 3534 (ii).
Fraserville Wharf and Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 3150 (ii).
Ile Rouge Lighthouse Keeper, Dismissal of Mr. Irving (Ques.) 4259 (iii).
I.C.R. Riviere du Loup Workshops, Removal to Fraserville (Ques.) 570 (i).
—— Ticket Collectors, Apptmt. of (remarks) 6786 (iv).
Michaud, Mr. J., Postmaster at St. Moise Station, Dismissal (Ques.) 1864 (i).
Morice, Theophile, Dismissal from I.C.R. (M. for cor.*) 4262 (iii).

GAUVREAU, Mr. C. A.—*Con.*
Morin, Mr. Theo., Reinstatement (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5654 (iv).
Naval Cadets, Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) 6786 (iv).
Poirier, N. P., Investigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5815 (iv).
Postmasters in Temiscouata County, Dismissal, Charges &c. (Ques.) 548 (i).
SUPPLY—
Excise (inspectors) 5815 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (Riviere du Loup) 5654 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 3616 (ii).
Temiscouata Election Expenses, Delays *re* Payment to Dep. Ret. Officer (remarks) 1707 (i).

GERMAN, Mr. W. M., *Welland.*
Address, The, 346 (i).
Buck, Mr. A. E., Postmaster at Crystal Beach, Dismissal of (remarks) 3908 (ii), 5960 (iv).
Canadian Northern Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 187 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6355 (iv).
Civil Service (commissioners) Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 3145 (ii).
Crystal Beach Postmaster, Dismissal, &c., Remarks (Mr. German) 5960 (iv).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2183 (ii).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6570 (iv).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) on M. for 2°, 3664; in Com., 3670 (ii).
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1427 (i).
Judges for Ont., Apptmt. of Extra Number (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1035 (i).
Man. Boundaries B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 1°, 3906 (ii).
N. T. Ry. (P. C. judgment) B. 95 (Mr. White) on M. for 2°, 3115 (ii).
Peace Memorial Monument in Queen's Park, Toronto, Action of Govt. *re* (remarks) 2590 (ii).
Peace River and Ry. Belt Water Power B. 149 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 5970 (iv).
Public Accounts Com., Attendance of R. C. Miller, on M. to adopt 3rd Rep., 6334 (iv).
Spirella Co. of Canada Patent Relief (B. 71) 1°*, 1410 (i).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Welland (construction) 6607 (iv).
Highways (subsidies) 6611 (iv).
Immigration (regulations *re*) 3911 (ii).
Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 6607 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2972, 3549 (ii).

GERMAN, Mr. W. M.—*Con.*
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Harbour Commissioners incorp. B. 138 (Mr. Hazen) in Com., 5990 (iv).

GIRARD, Mr. J., *Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*
Dairying Industry in Canada, Complaints *re* Weighing Cheese (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5731 (iv).
Ha Ha Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6213 (iv).
Railway Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6213 (iv).

GOODEVE, Mr. A. S., *Kootenay.*
British Columbia and Dawson Ry. Co.'s (B. 134) 1°*, 4976 (iii).
Calgary and Fernie Ry. Co.'s (B. 37) 1°*, 970 (i).
Canadian Northern Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 187 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6361 (iv).
Dismissals from Public Office from 1896 to 1911 (M. for ret.) 1280 (i).
Duffy, Edith Harriet, Relief (B. 163) 1°*, 5549 (iii).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6223 (iv).
Foresters, Ancient Order Subsidiary (B. 157) 1°*, 5549 (iii).
Highways Improvements B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3678 (ii).
Jenkins, Wm. Alexander Hunt, Relief (B. 162) 1°*, 5549 (iii).
Kettle Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 62) 1°*, 1069 (i).
Lumber Combine in B. C., Challenge of Mr. A. E. Watts, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Knowles) 2299 (ii).
Lumber Duties, Violation of Customs Act, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) 1731 (i).
Moose, Loyal Order Grand Lodge incorp. (B. 158) 1°*, 5549 (iii).
Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s (B. 161) 1°*, 5549 (iii).
Peace River and Ry. Belt Water Power B. 149 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 5984 (iv).
P.E.I. Subsidy B. 178 (Mr. White) in Com., 6139 (iv).
Railway Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6223 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2702; in Com., 2934 (ii).

GORDON, Mr. D. A., *East Kent.*
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3959 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P., *South Renfrew.*
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5278 (iii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5897, 6216, 6312, 6317 (iv).
Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6314 (iv).
Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6319 (iv).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6223 (iv).
Estimates, Discussion *re* (remarks) *re* adjournment, 5938 (iv).
Canada and Gulf Terminal Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6307 (iv).
Canadian Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 144 (Mr. White) in Com. on Res., 5165 (iii).
——— B. 189 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6372 (iv).
Can. Northern Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 187 (Mr. Cochrane) on M. for 2°, 6331; in Com., 6343; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 6495 (iv).
C.P. Ry. (Toulon) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6217 (iv).
Caribou, Barkerville and Willow River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6320 (iv).
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5886 (iv).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6269 (iv).
Fort Osborne Barracks Sale B. 185 (Mr. Hughes) in Com. on Res., 6070 (iv).
Fredericton and Grand Lake Coal & Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6224 (iv).
Govt. House Property, Toronto, Transfer B. 182 (Mr. Doherty) on M. for 1°, 5958 (iv).
G.T.P. Rv., Assiniboine River Bridge, in Com. on Res., 6061 (iv).
G.T.P. (Brandon) Subsidy, in Com., 6324 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry., Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5900 (iv).
G.T. Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6759 (iv).
Guysborough Branch Line Subsidy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5629 (iv).
Ha Ha Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6213 (iv).
Highways Improvements B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) on Senate Amts., 6398 (iv).
James Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com., 6310 (iv).
Judges Act (salaries) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 6011 (iv).
Kettle Valley Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5900, 6220, 6322, 6327 (iv).
Kettle Valley Ry. Co.'s Bridge Subsidy, in Com., 6327 (iv).
Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6220 (iv).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
Lac Seul, Rat Portage and Keewatin Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6217 (iv).
Lake Erie and Northern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6312 (iv).
Live Stock Record Association incorp. B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) on M. for 1°, 5553; in Com., 6025 (iv).
Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6314 (iv).
Moose, Loyal Order incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 6126 (iv).
Naas and Skeena River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6321 (iv).
N.T. Ry., Estimated Cost (Ques.) 6732 (iv). *See* 'Supply—Railways.'
Northern N.B. and Seaboard Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6230 (iv).
North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6242 (iv).
Ontario Boundaries Extension B. 152 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 6155 (iv); in Com., 6157 (iii).
Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s B. 161 (Mr. Fripp) in Com., 6127 (iv).
Peace River and Ry. Best Water Power B. 149 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 5973 (iv).
Peat Industry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6602 (iv).
Quebec Bridge Construction Contract (stmnt.) *re* English Criticisms, on M. for Sup., 5415 (iii).
Quebec Bridge, Erection of Shops (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5810 (iv).
Quebec and Saguenay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5896, 6214 (iv).
Queen's College B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) on Senate Amts., 6770 (iv).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. on Res., 5896, 6211, 6307; on Amt. (Mr. Emmerson) to M. for 3°, 6396 (iv).
Rainy River Radial Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6312 (iv).
St. Charles and Huron River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6308 (iv).
St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s B. 172 (Mr. Lalor) in Com., 6127 (iv).
St. John Valley Ry. and Bridges Subsidy, &c., in Com., 6211 (iv).
Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5911 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture (animals health) 6472; (census and statistics) 6462; Experimental Farms (tobacco growing) 6478; (International Institute) 6479; (Toronto exhibition) 6480; (Year Book) 6465 (iv).
Archives (salaries) 6461 (iv).
Canals—Cornwall (lower lock) 5797 (iv).
Canals—Galops (upper lock) 5797 (iv).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Canals—Lachine (Rockfield bridge) 5790 (iv).
Canals—Murray (high spots) 5798 (iv).
Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (locks) 5791 (iv).
Canals—Soulanges (guard pier) 5798; (protection works) 5791 (iv).
Canals—Rideau (Bank St. bridge) 5791; (dredging plant) 5798 (iv).
Canals—Trent (improvements) 5799; (Newmarket) 5792 (iv).
Canals—Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 5796; (surveys) 5786 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Inland Revenue (private secretary) 6490; (promotions) conc., 6771; Railways (private secretary) 5808 (iv).
Conservation Commission (Chicago canal) 6579 (iv).
Fisheries (cold storage for bait) 5256; (inspectors, &c.) 5254 (iii); (International Fisheries Commission) conc., 6779 (iv).
Inland Revenue (peat industry) 6491 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction) 5237 (iii).
Militia (associations and bands) 5529 (iii); (associations) 6653 (iv).
Mines Branch (ore deposits) 6602 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Royal Mint) 6584; (St. John Ambulance Ass'n) 6584; (tuberculosis association) 6579 (iv).
Post Office—Outside Service (inspectors) 6646 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (London, Eng.) 6655 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (French river) conc., 6778 (iv).
Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 5762 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (board of management) 5598; (branch lines) 5632; (facilities) 5809; (Halifax docks) 5596; (highway crossings) 5595; (Moncton office) 6604; (North Sydney diversion) 5610; (rolling stock) 5653, 5610, 6461; (Wallace Harbour spur line) 6604 (iv).
Railways—Miscellaneous (Board of Commissioners) 5800; (G.T.P. remuneration to director) 5801; (litigation expenses) 5800-1 (iv).
Railways—N. T. Ry. (construction) 5765 (iv).
Railways—P.E.I. (car ferry) 5662; (Harmony-Elmira branch) 5660 (iv).
Tidal Service (surveying steamers) 5400 (iii).
Temiskaming and Northern Ont. Ry. and G. T. Ry. Co.'s B. 145 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6769 (iv).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6442 (iv).
Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6217 (iv).
Toronto, Lindsay and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5898, 6217 (iv).
Trent Canal Water Power, Claims of Prov. of Ont. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5794 (iv).
Universal Eyesight Co.'s incorp. B. 126 (Mr. McLean) in Com., 5909 (iv).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5898 (iv).
Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com., 6325 (iv).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Rogers) on M. for 2°, 5968 (iv).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Harbour Commissioners incorp. B. 138 (Mr. Hazen) in Com., 5997 (iv).
Yukon Act (judges) Amt. B. 123 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5568 (iv).
GUILBAULT, Mr. J. P. O., *Joliette.*
Canadian Northern, Montreal Tunnel and Terminal Co.'s (B. 39) 1°*, 970 (i).
Canadian Northern Quebec Ry. Co.'s (B. 41) 1°*, 970 (i).
Coffin, Mr. Henry, Emplymt. as Sessional Messenger (Ques.) 2289 (ii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3702 (ii).
Joliette County, Returning Officer, Payments *re* (Ques.) 4979 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4416 (iii).
GUTHRIE, Mr. H., *South Wellington.*
Address, The, on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 62 (i).
Cap de la Magdeleine Ry. Co.'s B. 43 (Mr. Paquet) in Com., 2014 (ii).
Carpet Weavers Union *re* J. C. Murray, Prosecution, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1510 (i).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 4569 (iii).
Freight Rates on Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., Ques. of Order 3213 (ii).
Hudson Bay Ry. Contracts, on M. (Mr. Neely) for O.Cs., 754 (i).
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1422 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 3895; on M. for 1°, 3905 (ii); on M. for 2° (remarks) 4415; in Com., 4537; (amt.) 4541 (iii).
N.T.Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1882 (i).
Peace River and Ry. Belt Water Power B. 149 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 5970; on M. for 3°, 6188; 3°, 6338 (iv).
Rambaut, Thomas D., Patent Relief B. 84 (Mr. Ames) in Com., 2986 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Labour Dept. (concilliation board) 1510 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) on M. for 2°, 2601 (amt.) 6 m. h., 2614; neg. (Y. 52; N. 104) 2751; in Com., 2867, 2939, 3015 (ii).

HAGGART, Hon. J., *South Lanark.*
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5891 (iv).
Dismissal of Public Officials, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Papers, 909 (i).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Macdonald) on M. for 2°, 796 (i).
Magdalen Island Marconi News Service (remarks) 4161 (iii).
Ry. Act (tariffs) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 1016 (i).

HARTT, Mr. T. A., *Charlotte.*
Fast Atlantic Service and Halifax Terminals, on M. for Sup., 6526 (iv).

HAZEN, Hon. J. D. (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) *St. John City and County.*
'Aboukir' Cruiser, Paying off of Crew (remarks) 408 (i).
—— Purchase of by Govt. (stmnt.) 489 (i).
Adams, Mr., Resignation as Examiner of Master and Mates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5227 (iii).
Address, The, on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 162 (i).
—— on M. (Mr. Loggie) to adjn. debate, 487 (i).
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5278 (iii).
Alder Point Lobster Hatchery, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 3054 (ii).
Anderson, Mr., Salary Increase (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1043 (i).
Biological Board of Canada (B. 118) 1°m., 4037; in Com., 4551 (iii); on Senate Amts., 5696 (iv).
Biological Board, Names, Salaries &c. (Ans.) 4258 (iii).
Bird Rock Lighthouse, Drowning of Keeper (remarks) 5258 (iii).
Bourassa, Capt., Pet. *re* Dep. Harbour Master (Ans.) 1814 (i).
British Admiralty, Memo. *re* Conference between Can. and Australia &c. (Ans.) 559 (i).
Bronte Village, Lease of Land, &c. (Ans.) 3151 (ii).
Brymer, Arthur, Dismissal &c. (Ans.) 3752 (ii).
Canada Shipping Act (masters and mates) Amt. (B. 143) in Com. on Res., 5156; 1°*, 5161; in Com., 5400 (iii).
Canadian Missionaries in China, Protection *re*, &c. (remarks) 1198 (i).
Canadian Navy, Tenders *re* Construction of Ships, Deposits, &c. (Ans.) 527 (i).
See 'Navy.'
Canso Reduction Works, Dismissals from (Ans.) 974 (i).

HAZEN, Hon. J. D.—*Con.*
Charlos Cove Lightkeeper, Dismissal of (Ans.) 1208 (i).
Chicago Drainage Canal, Damage to Navigation (Ans.) 4260 (iii).
Coal for Govt. Steamers, Average Cost per Ton (Ans.) 1203 (i).
Dalaire, Mr. L. P., Dismissal of (Ans.) 2454 (ii).
Dismissals in N. B. for Political Partisanship by Liberals (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1544 (i).
Dogfish Scrap, Price *re*, on M. (Mr. Sinclair) for Cor., 1391 (i).
Dredge and Boiler Inspection (Ans.) 5954 (iv).
Ducharme, Pierre, Dismissal of (Ans.) 2454 (ii).
Employees of Govt., Dismissed, Resigned, &c., on M. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) for Ret., 1818 (i).
False Creek Flats, Application for Lease from Marpole and Macdonald (Ans.) 5953 (iv).
Fisheries Act (oysters) Amt.(B. 140) 1°m., 5053; 2°m., 5271; in Com., 5276 (iii).
Fisheries, Contracts *re* Board for Crews, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 683 (i).
See 'Govt. Dredges.'
Fisheries Department, Reorganization of (remarks) 937 (i).
Fish, Fresh, Expenditure *re* Transportation (Ans.) 2666 (ii).
Fishery Guardians in Guysborough County, Names and Dismissals, &c. (Ans.) 3053 (ii).
Fishery Inspectors, N.S., Names, &c. (Ans.) 4257 (iii).
Fisheries Protection Service on Pacific Coast, on M. (Mr. Clements) for Papers, 2486 (ii).
Fishery Regulations *re* Hague Tribunal, (remarks) 3830 (ii).
See 'International.'
Fishery Treaty with U.S., Withdrawal of Canada (remarks) 409 (i).
Fish Hatcheries, B.C., Cost of Construction (Ans.) 4256 (iii).
Fish Scrap, Price paid *re* Fertilizing (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 684-5 (i).
Fritz, Henry, Dismissal as Fishery Overseer (Ans.) 4977 (iii).
Gasolene Engines on Fishing Boats, Number, &c. (Ans.) 2666 (ii).
Gaspé Basin Marine Agent, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 878 (i).
Gaspé Marine Deptl. Inquiry, Apptmt. Salary, &c. (Ans.) 1358 (i).

HAZEN, Hon. J. D.—*Con.*
Gaspé Tidal Wave, Govt. Aid *re* (Ans.) 2859 (ii).
Godbout, Mr. J., Emplymt. by Govt., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3752 (ii).
Goucher, Wesley, Dismissal as Lightkeeper, &c. (Ans.) 4977 (iii).
Govt. Dredges, Contract *re* boarding Employees (Ans.) 5953 (iv).
Govt. Dredges and Tugs, Instructions *re* Appointments (Ans.) 5952 (iv).
Govt. Steamers, B.C., Use for Political Purposes (Ans.) 5263 (iii).
Griever, Mr. S., Charges *re* Lighthouse Keeper (Ans.) 1358 (i).
Harbour Commissioners Rep. (presented) 1571 (i).
Hatfield, Mr., Dismissal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5252 (iii).
Herring Fishery in B.C., Close Season, &c. (Ans.) 4256 (iii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3713 (ii).
Hudson Bay Ry. Terminal Ports, Surveys *re* Navigation, &c. (Ans.) 3943 (ii).
Hurley, Mr. J. M., Fishery Inspector at Belleville, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 2860 (ii).
Ile Rouge Lighthouse Keeper, Dismissal of (Ans.) 4260 (iii).
I.C.R. Branch Lines, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 1004 (i).
International Fisheries Treaty, Memorandum (read) in Com. of Sup., 6646 (i).
See 'Fisheries,' &c.
'Kestrel' Cruiser, Condemnation of (Ans.) 550 (i).
Kidson's Island Lighthouse, Tenders *re*, &c. (Ans.) 3054 (ii).
Lake Winnipegosis Fishery, Limit of Catch (Ans.) 3055 (ii).
Lightkeepers in N .S., Investigation *re* Charges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5233 (iii).
Lightkeepers in P. E. I., Charges, Investigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5232 (iii).
Lighthouse Keepers at Repentigny, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 5949 (iv).
Lobster Fishing Season in N. B., Date of Opening (Ans.) 722 (i).
Magdalen Island Marconi Connections (remarks) 3833 (ii).
—— (stmnt.) 4041 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 4511, 4620 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Extension of (remarks) 490 (i).
Marine Hospital Ships, Establishment of (remarks) 6788 (iv).

HAZEN, Hon. J. D.—*Con.*
Marine Workshops at Quebec, Instructions *re* closing (Ans.) 579 (i).
'Minto,' Apptmt. of Pilot, Name, &c. (Ans.) 876 (i).
Montreal Docks, Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6652 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners (B. 97) Prop. Res., 2295; in Com. on Res., 2406, 2415; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 3631 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners (B. 150) 1° m., 5258 (iii); in Com., 5696; 3° m., 5960 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Apptmt. of Accountant (Ans.) 6661 (iv).
—— Dismissal of Mr. J. A. Masse (Ans.) 3943 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Dismissal (remarks) 2057 (ii).
—— Resignation of Ms. Geoffrion and Ballantyne (remarks) 6555 (iv).
—— Res. from Board of Trade *re* Dismissal (Ans.) 1813 (i).
—— Res. from Corn Exchange, Delegation, &c., *re* Removal (Ans.) 2070 (ii).
—— Retention of (Ans.) 2062 (ii).
See 'Bourassa,' 'Harbour.'
Montreal Harbour Commission, Total Debenture Debt (Ans.) 1357 (i).
Montreal Harbour Officials, Apptmt. and Promotions, &c. (Ans.) 3944 (ii).
Murray, Dr., Charges *re* Poaching in East River (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5248 (iii).
Naval Bill Repeal, &c. (Ans.) 4242 (iii).
Naval Cadets, Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) 6786 (iv).
Naval Defence, Pacific Coast, Res. from B. C. Legislature (Ans.) 4458 (iii).
Naval Discipline Act, Application to Canada (Ans.) 1203 (i).
Naval Service, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 970 (i).
Naval Service, O. C. *re* Instructions, Circulars, &c. (Ans.) 2065 (ii).
Naval Service, Tenders *re* Shipbuilding, &c. (Ques.) 527, 558 (i).
Naval Ships for Canada, Ref. *re* Completion (Ans.) 1206 (i).
Naval Service, Visit of Minister to England (remarks) 938 (i).
'Niobe' and 'Rainbow,' Contracts *re* Provisioning (Ans.) 2859 (ii).
—— Sale of (Ans.) 2859 (ii).
—— Repairs *re* (Ans.) 577 (i).
North Sydney Harbour Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5225 (iii).
Oysters: *See* 'Fisheries Act.'
Pelagic Sealing, Compensation *re* Treaty (Ans.) 4776 (iii).

HAZEN, Hon. J. D.—*Con.*
Pictou-Georgetown Winter Service, Contract *re* Supplies (Ans.) 876 (i).
Pictou Winter Steamers, Amounts paid to, &c. (Ans.) 5949 (iv).
Powers, Laurence, Dismissal from Lobster Hatchery at Arichat, Charges *re* (Ans.) 3751 (ii).
P.E.I. Winter Service, Car Ferry, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5211 (iii).
Provost, Raoul, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 2453 (ii).
Public Works Contracts given without tender (Ans.) 877 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners Act Amt. (B. 31) 1° m., 869; 2° m., 1025; 3° m., 1709 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commission, Names of Members in 1896 and after (Ans.) 579 (i).
——— Resignation of Members (Ans.) 579 (i).
——— Solicitor, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 1814 (i).
Railway Bridges in N.B., Subsidy B. 188 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6377; on M. for 3°, 6394 (iv).
See 'St. John Valley,' &c.
Rainy River Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 121 (Mr. Beattie) in Com., 5198 (iii).
Richards, Mr. S., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6652 (iv).
Rivers, Lachapelle and L. Dubois, Messrs. Charges *re* (Ques.) 3752 (ii).
Returns, on Inquiry for, 5259 (iii).
——— on Inquiry for (Mr. Kyte) 5939 (iv).
Révillon Frères Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 114 (Mr. Baker) in Com., 5203 (iii).
St. John Harbour Dredging, Tenders *re* (remarks) 5694 (iv).
St. John N.B., Appropriation *re* Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2369 (ii).
St. John Ry. Co.'s Crossing at Haymarket Square, on M. (Mr. Pugsley) for Cor., 1404 (i).
St. John Valley Ry. Bridges Subsidy B. 188 (Mr. Cochrane) on Amt. (Mr. Carvell) to M. for 3°, 6496 (iv).
See 'Ry. Bridges.'
St. Lawrence Channel, Average depth of Water between Montreal and Quebec, Cap a la Roche at low tide (Ans.) 544 (i).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Emplymt. of Govt. Dredges (Ans.) 4257 (iii).
See 'Govt. Dredges.'
St. Lawrence Channel Ice Breaker (Ans.) 5680 (iv).
Sorel Marine Yards, Inquiry *re* Administration (Ans.) 974 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Report (presented) 1571 (i).

HAZEN, Hon. J. D.—*Con.*
Steam Trawling on Canadian Coasts, &c., on M. (Mr. Sinclair) for Papers, 2462 (ii).
——— Protection against (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5393 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 1041 (i); 6652 (iv); Naval Dept. (salaries) 1062 (i).
Conservation Commission (Chicago canal) 6579 (iv).
Fisheries (cold storage for bait) 5256 (iii); 6653 (iv); (inspectors, &c.) 5242 (iii); (international commission) 6646; (lighthouse keepers) 6650 (iv); (lobster hatchery) 5256; (oyster culture) 5255; (protection service) 5386 (iii).
Hydrographic Surveys (Arctic) 5398; (Atlantic Coast) 5399 (iii).
Labour Dept. (inspection *re* shipping machinery) 1526 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aid to navigation) 5236, 5241; (constructions) 5237; (International Congress) 5237; (pensions 5236; (salaries) 5232 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Halifax and Newfoundland) 4728; (Magdalen Islands) 4732 (iii).
Marine (hospitals) 5238; (steamboat inspection) 5238 (iii).
Miscellaneous (St. John Ambulance Ass'n. 6584 (iv).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5303, 5335 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 5186, 5211; (life saving awards) 5228; (live stock inspection) 5230; (patrol vessels) 5231; (registration) 5229; (schools of navigation) 5229; (wreck subsidies) 5229, 5231 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (St. John) 634 (i).
Radiotelegraphic Surveys (wireless stations) 5399 (iii).
Railways—I.C.R. (Chatham diversion) 4138 (iii).
Railways—P.E.I. (car ferry) 5668 (iv).
White Head Island Lighthouse Keeper, Dismissal of P. Conway, &c. (Ans.) 2858 (ii).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Harbour Commissioners incorp. (B. 138) 1°*, 4976 (iii); 2°m. and in Com., 5989 (iv).

HENDERSON, Mr. D., *Halton.*
Agriculture and Colonization Com., on M. (Mr. Sexsmith) to ref. to Printing Com. 3933 (ii).
Binks, Mr., Promotion to Dead Letter Office (M. for cor.*) 3946 (ii).
Bronte Village, Lease of Land, &c. (Ques.) 3151 (ii).
Cable Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lemieux) to M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 4109 (iii).
——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3239 (ii).
Canada Shipping Act (masters and mates) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Hazen) in Com. on Res., 5161 (iii).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*
Cap de la Magdeleine Ry. Co.'s B. 43 (Mr. Paquet) in Com., 2013 (ii).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 4569 (iii).
E. F. Piper Patent Relief B. 53 (Mr. Fripp) on M. for 2°, 1202 (i).
Ezra Butler Eddy Bessey, Change of Name B. 117 (Mr. Fripp) on M. for 2°, 4238 (iii).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6261 (iv).
Freight Rates, Discrimination, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3200 (ii).
Grain Act B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2779, 3170 (ii).
Highway Improvements B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3694 (ii).
Immigration Agents and Ontario Farm Labour (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3923 (ii).
Inspection and Sale Act (grain) Amt. B. 178 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 6198 (iv).
Parcel Post Extension, on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 2350 (ii).
Public Works, Appropriations *re* Estimates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2804 (ii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. on Res., 5919 (iv).
Renfrew, S., Election, Issue of Writ (remarks) 2059 (ii).
Rural Mail Delivery B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) on M. for 1°, 5922; in Com., 6108 (iv).
Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5919 (iv).
SUPPLY.
Immigration (agencies, &c.) 3923 (ii).
Militia (annual drill) 5491 (iii).
Railways—I.C.R. (refrigerator cars) 5603 (iv).
Swift Current Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3265 (ii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2736; in Com., 2881 (ii).
Watha Indian Reserve, Tenders *re* Timber (Ques.) 3055 (ii).

HEPBURN, Mr. B. R., *Prince Edward.*
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5875 (iv).
Freight Rates on Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3231 (ii).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6571 (iv).
Prince Edward and Hastings Ry. Co.'s in corp. (B. 136) 1°*, 4976 (iii).

HUGHES, Mr. J. J., *King's P.E.I.*
Address, The, 482 (i).
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5297 (iii).

HUGHES, Mr. J. J.—*Con.*
Bank Act Amt. B. 169 (Mr. White) in Com., 5857 (iv).
Census Enumerators, Payments to (remarks) 2668 (ii).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 4583 (iii).
Fisheries Act (leases) Amt. B. 140 (Mr. Hazen) on M. for 2°, 5275 (iii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3715 (ii).
Immigration Policy *re* Mar. Provs., on prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2136 (ii).
Lightkeepers in P.E.I., Investigation *re* Charges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5232 (iii).
Magdalen Islands Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3278 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 4508, 4637; on M. for 3°, 4838 (iii).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1694 (i) .
Parcel Post Extension, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 2347 (ii).
P.E.I. Better Terms (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5171 (iii).
P.E.I. Car Ferry, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 1206 (i).
P.E.I. Car Ferry System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5213 (iii).
P.E.I. Estimates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2439 (iii).
P.E.I. Subsidy B. 178 (Mr. White) in Com., 6132 (iv).
See 'Man. Boundaries B. 115.'
P.E.I. Winter Communication, Ry. Accommodation (remarks) 3830 (ii).
Souris Wharf, Repairs to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5661 (iv).
SUPPLY.
Fisheries (inspectors, &c.) 5242 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5241; (salaries) 5232 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Magdalen Islands) 4731 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 5192, 5213; (life saving awards) 5229 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Generally (repairs) 3235 (ii).
Public Works—Telegraph Lines—P.E.I.—conc., 6794 (iv).
Railways—P.E.I. (car ferry) 5664; (facilities) 5661; (Harmony-Elmira branch) 5659 (iv).

HUGHES, Hon. S. (Minister of Militia) *Victoria and Haliburton.*
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5279 (iii).
Airships for Military Purposes, Purchase by Govt. (Ans.) 533 (i).

HUGHES, Hon. S.—*Con.*
Aldershot Rifle Range, Caretaker (Ans.) 3536 (ii).
Arsenal at Quebec, Payment to Employees (Ans.) 579 (i).
Automobiles, Purchase of: *See* 'Militia Touring Cars,' 'Supply—Militia.'
Battlefields Commission (remarks) *re* Vote, 5300 (iii).
Bisley Rules: *See* 'N.R.A.'
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1190 (i).
——— Ques. of Order, 1183 (i).
Drill Halls, in the West *re* Donation of Lands for Sites (Ans.) 1816 (i).
See 'Moosejaw,' 'Regina,' 'Supply—Militia.'
Fast Atlantic Service and Halifax Terminals, Ques. of Order, 6522 (iv).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty (B. 190) prop. res., 5558; 1°*, 6083; in Com., 6252, 6454 (iv).
Fenian Raid Vets, Land Grants to (Ans.) 3334 (ii).
Fort Osborne Barracks, Sale (B. 185) (prop. res.) 5557 (iv); in Com. on Res. 5696-7, 6064; 1°*, 6080; in Com., 6203 (iv).
Lavergne, Capt. Armand, Apptmt. *re* Capt. of 61st Regiment (Ans.) 723 (i).
Lethbridge Armoury, Plans, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 729 (i).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1662 (i).
Medical Director General Apptmt. of (Ans.) 2667 (ii).
Militia Act Amt. (B. 171) 1°m., 5556; 2°m., 6061 (iv).
Militia Civil Engineers, Recall from Quebec (Ans.) 580 (i).
Military Conference, Invitations *re* (Ans.) 552 (i).
Militia Council Report (presented) 2668 (ii).
Military Stores Building, Contract *re* Racks (Ans.) 533 (i).
Militia Touring Cars, Order to Ford Motor Co. (Ans.) 4040 (iii).
Montreal Military School, Purchase of Site (Ans.) 4041 (iii).
Moosejaw Armoury Site, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) 3974 (ii).
National Rifle Association, Rules *re* Bisley Competition (remarks) 3742 (ii).
Papal Zouaves, Investigation *re* Reception to Papal Legate (Ans.) 578 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commission, Reorganization *re* (Ans.) 580 (i).
Rayne, R. W., Caretaker Truro Armoury, Dismissal (Ans.) 6184 (iv).
Regiments of Foreign Born Citizens, Organization of (Ans.) 534 (i).

HUGHES, Hon. S.—*Con.*
Regina Armoury, Erection of (Ans.) 580 (i).
Rockliffe Rifle Range, Acquisition of Additional Lands (Ans.) 533 (i).
Ross Rifle: *See* 'Natl. Rifle Assn.'
Sarnia Armoury, Erection of (Ans.) 555 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt—Militia (salaries) 1037 (i).
Militia (allowances) 5447; (annual drill) 5452; (armouries) 5541; (associations and bands) 5528 (iii), 6653 (iv); (automobiles) 5492 (iii); (camps) 5521; (clothing) 5521; (customs dues) 5522; (headquarters staff) 5536 (iii); (Rockliffe ranges) 6654 (iv); (schools of instruction) 5546 (iii); (wages) 5546 (iii).
R. N. W. M. P. (pay of force) 5185 (iii).
Sutherland Rifle Sight: *See* 'N.R.A.'
Veterans of 1866-7, Bounties to (Ans.) 1202 (i).
See 'Fenian,' &c.
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 6451 (iv).
Winnipeg Military Property: *See* 'Fort Osborne.'

JAMESON, Mr. C., *Digby.*
Digby Clock Tower, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3272 (ii).
Dom. Atlantic Railway Co.'s (B. 22) 1°*, 794 (i); in Com., 2011 (ii).
Fisheries Act (leases) Amt. B. 140 (Mr. Hazen) in Com., 5276 (iii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3707 (ii).
Steam Trawlers, Protection against (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5389 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Fisheries (protection service) 5389 (iii).
Immigration (agencies, &c.) 3326 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. John and Halifax) 4739 (iii).

KAY, Mr. Wm. F., *Missisquoi.*
Bedford Postmaster, Dismissal, Inquiry for Ret., 5161 (iii).
——— (M. for cor.*) 3757 (ii).
Customs Dismissals in Missisquoi (M. for cor.*) 3757 (ii).
Horsfall Herbert Relief (B. 109) 1°*, 3449 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Militia (annual drill) 5469; (associations and bands) 5528; (schools of instruction) 5549 (iii).

KEMP, Hon. A. E., *East Toronto.*
N.T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3375 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Toronto warehouse) 1963 (i).

KIDD, Mr. E., *Carleton, Ont.*
Hull City Hall Square, Improvements by Ottawa Commission (Ques.) 2293 (ii).

KNOWLES, Mr. W. E., *Moosejaw.*
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5285 (iii).
B. C. Lumber Combine, Challenge of Mr. A. E. Watts (remarks) 2297 (ii).
Cement Merger, Charges *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1518 (i).
Census Enumerators at Regina, Instructions, Complaints &c. (M. for stmnt.) 563 (i).
——— (remarks) 1440, 1574 (i).
Coal Strike in Alberta (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1506 (i).
Dismissals, &c., Investigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3263 (ii).
Elevators, Ownership and Operation by Govt. (remarks) 2853 (ii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com. on Res., 873 (i); in Com., 2180, 2390, 2548, 2777, 3160, 3455, 3762 (ii), 4044; on Amt. (Mr. Cash) to M. for 3°, 4829; on Amt. (Mr. L. Thomson) to M. for 3°, 4799, (amt.) 4804 (iii).
Grain Act, Notice for Discussion (remarks) 1574 (i).
——— Tel. from Sec. Grain Growers' Association (read) 4744 (iii).
Grain Shipments in the West, Regulations of Freight Rates, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 4000 (ii).
——— Car Service (remarks) 5956 (iv).
Health Department, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 1585 (i).
Judges Act (additional) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5411 (iii).
Lumber Duties, Interpretation and Enforcement (M. for papers) 582 (i).
——— Violation of Customs Act, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) 1755 (i).
Members Travelling Allowance during Adjournments (remarks) 1848 (i).
Moosejaw Armoury, Cor. (read) 3972 (ii).
——— Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2040 (ii).
——— Delegation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2439 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2206 (ii).
Moosejaw District, Proposed Sites, &c. (Ques.) 3342 (ii).
Moosejaw Post Offices, Names and Locations (Ques.) 976 (i).
Moosejaw P. O. Inspector, Pets. *re* Apptmt. (M. for cor.*) 1590 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 4237, 4981 (iii).
Moosejaw Public Building, Tender of McDiarmid Co., Limited (M. for copy*) 562 (i).

KNOWLES, Mr. W. E.—*Con.*
Public Ownership, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 649 (i).
Public Works, Appropriations of last year (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2437 (ii).
Regina Census, Inquiry for Ret., 1574 (i). *See* 'Census.'
Rutherford, Mr. John, Land Agent at Moosejaw, Dismissal, &c. (M. for papers) 1395 (i).
Saskatcheawn Bank incorp. (B. 89) 1°*, 2216 (ii).
S. A. Bounty Scrip, Delay *re* Decision by Govt. (remarks) 3153 (ii).
S. A. Bounty Veterans' Bounty Bill (remarks) 2061 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Labour Dept. (combines investigation act) 1501 (i).
Militia (automobiles) 5515 (iii).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5323 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Calgary) 2205 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 2211; (Weyburn) 2213 (ii).
Svaigher, Adolphe, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 6186 (iv).
Swift Current Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3263 (ii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com. on Res., 2158; in Com., 2872 (ii).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. Bill (remarks) 1577 (i).

KYTE, Mr. Geo. W., *Richmond, N.S.*
Aldershot Rifle Range, Caretaker, &c. (Ques.) 3536 (ii).
Arichat and Canso SS. Subsidy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4733 (iii).
Bissett, Geo. E., Dismissal from Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1534 (i).
Boyle, Dougald R., Fishery Overseer at Arichat, Dismissal, &c. (M. for cor.) 3945 (ii).
Breakwaters, N.S., Inquiry for Ret., 4460 (iii).
Brymer, Arthur, Fishery Officer at Lower L'Ardoise, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3752 (ii).
——— (M. for papers*) 4781 (iii).
Canal Staffs, Dismissal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5802 (iv).
Chapel Cove Breakwater, Pet. *re* Extension (Ques.) 1585 (i).
Charles Forest's Cove Breakwater, Contract *re* Construction (Ques.) 1584 (i).
——— (M. for cor.*) 2460 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2039 (ii).
Civil Service Commission Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 3348 (ii).
Coast Trade, Foreign Shipping, &c. (M. for copies*) 2861 (ii).
Coldbrook Postmaster, Name and Apptmt. (Ques.) 3148 (ii).

KYTE, Mr. Geo. W.—*Con.*
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1193 (i).
—— Inside and Outside Service, Dismissals, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2587 (ii).
Empire Trade Commission, Apptmt. of Representative (Ques.) 5951 (iv).
Fishing Twine for Lobster Nets, Duty *re*, on M. for Sup., 5590 (iv).
Fish Reduction Works at Aricaht, Tel. *re* from Prime Minister (Ques.) 2289 (ii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2783 (ii).
Guysborough Branch Appropriation, on M. for Sup., 1464 (i).
I.C. Ry. Branch Lines (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4223 (iii).
Judges Act (additional) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5411 (iii).
Little Anse Harbour (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2043 (ii).
Londonderry Postmaster, Dismissal of (Ques.) 6337 (iv).
McLeod, Dr. J. R., Dismissal from Port Hawkesbury, Charges, &c. (M. for papers*) 3945 (ii).
N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1867, 1895 (i), 3130, 3364 (ii).
Payson, Mr. W. W., Dismissal from Deep Brook Post Office (Ques.) 2243 (ii).
Pelagic Sealing, Compensation *re* Treaty (Ques.) 4776 (iii).
Port Richmond Breakwater, Contract *re* Construction (Ques.) 1585 (i).
—— (M. for copies*) 2460 (ii).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2044 (ii).
Powers, Laurence G., Supt. of Lobster Hatchery at Arichat, Dismissal, Charges *re* (Ques.) 3751 (ii).
—— (M. for cor.*) 4781 (iii).
Public Accounts Com. (Diamond Light, &c., Co.) on M. (Mr. Middlebro) to conc. in 2nd Rep., 5834 (iv).
Public Service Commission, Apptmt. of Messrs. Jackson and Schwitzer as assistants (Ques.) 5954 (iv).
Public Works in N. S., Appropriations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2803 (ii).
Railway Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 2°, 2512 (ii).
Railway Estimates, Annual Statement (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4223 (iii).
Returns, Inquiry for, 5939 (iv).
Steel and Iron Bounties, Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' (remarks) 2588 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Canal—St. Peters (improvements) 5798 (iv).

KYTE, Mr. Geo. W.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Bras d'Or Lakes) 4735; (Mahone and Tancook) 4733 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Arichat) 2039; (Petit de Grat) 2050 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (rolling stock) 5609 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2655; in Com., 2879, 3540 (ii).

LACHANCE, Mr. A., *Quebec Centre.*
Arsenal at Quebec, Payment to Employees, &c. (Ques.) 579 (i).
Marine Workshops at Quebec, Instructions *re* Closing (Ques.) 579 (i).
Militia Civil Engineers, Recall from Quebec (Ques.) 580 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commission, Names of Members in 1896 and after (Ques.) 579 (i).
—— Reorganization of (Ques.) 580 (i).
—— Resignation from Board of Members (Ques.) 579 (i).

LAFORTUNE, Mr. D. A., *Montcalm.*
Dismissals from Govt. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1565 (i).
Highway Improvements B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3698 (ii).
Montcalm Postmasters, Pets. *re* Removal (Ques.) 575 (i).
St. Jacques Post Office, Plans, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 560 (i).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2442 (ii).
St. Patrick de Brandon, Population, Revenue of P.O., &c. (Ques.) 724 (i).

LALOR, Mr. F. R., *Haldimand.*
Budget, The (remarks) 5070 (iii).
Cable Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lemieux) to M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 4104 (iii).
Dunnville Customs Revenue for 1910-11, Postal Revenue &c. (Ques.) 2066 (ii).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6260 (iv).
Freight Rates on Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3202 (ii).
Inspection and Sale Act (grain) Amt. B. 178 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 6198 (iv).
N.T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3141 (ii).
Parcel Post Extension, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 2353 (ii).
St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s (B. 172) in Com., 6127 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Agricultural Experimental Farms (bulletins) 6467 (iv).

LALOR, Mr. F. R.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Immigration (agencies, &c.) 3927; (regulations) 3914 (ii).
Militia (armouries) 5542; (associations and bands) 5530 (iii).

LAMARCHE, Mr. P. E., *Nicolet.*
Manitoba Boundaries B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4398; on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Mondou) 4840 (iii).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, and Amt. (Mr. Borden) to adjn. debate, 1664 (i).
Naval Repeal Bill, Discussion *re* (Ques.) 4239 (iii).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A., *Lincoln & Niagara.*
Cockshutt Plough Co. Prices *re* (remarks) 820 (i).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1194 (i); 3251 (ii).
—— on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Papers, 911 (i).
Dom. Elections Act. Amt. (B. 4) 1°m., 12 (i).
Freight Rates on Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3203 (ii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2314 (ii); 4069 (iii).
G.T.Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6749 (iv).
Marriage Act Amt. (B. 3) 1° m., 12; 2° m., 1597 (i); neg. (Y. 61; N. 87) 1706 (i).
Ne Temere Decree: *See* 'Marriage B. 3.'
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 4765 (iii).
Railway Act (level crossings) Amt. (B. 5) 1°m., 13 (i).
Railway Question, Transportation, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1947 (i).
SUPPLY—
Miscellaneous (counsel fees *re* Lanctot inquiry) 6488 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2978 (ii); on Senate Amts., 6674 (iv).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 6454 (iv).

LANCTOT, Mr. R., *Laprairie & Napierville.*
Budget, The, 5147 (iii).
Census Population of Canada, and Quebec Cities, &c. (Ques.) 731 (i), 3336 (ii).
Napierville Public Building. Purchase of Site (M. for cor.*) 5263 (iii).
—— Instructions *re* (remarks) 3153 (ii).
—— Payment to Mr. Bourgeois (remarks) on M. to adjn., 2373 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Napierville) 1354 (i).

LAPOINTE, Mr. E., *Kamouraska.*
Belanger, Amedee, Dismissal from I.C.Ry. (Ques.) 3050 (ii).
Courcy, Mr. P., Appmt. at St. Pacome de Kamouraska (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5821, (iv).
—— Emplymt. in Inland Revenue (Ques.) 5952 (iv).
Deschenes, Louis, Wharfinger at River Ouelle, Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 3756 (ii).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6651 (iv).
(iv).
Desjardins, Baptiste, Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 6784 (iv).
Dismissals from Govt. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1554 (i).
Dismissals on I.C.R. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5806 (iv).
Garceau, Mr. N., Appmt. as Inquiry Commissioner (Ques.) 2860 (ii).
Girard, Louis, Dismissal as Postmaster at Ste. Angele de Merici, (M. for pets.*) 2587 (ii).
Herbert, Auguste, Postmaster at St. Pascal, Dismissal, &c. (M. for cor.*) 3756 (ii).
—— Letters missing from Ret. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6291 (iv).
I.C.R. Employees Retirement Fund, Refund to dismissed men (Ques.) 2450 (ii).
Lavergne, Capt. Armand, Apptmt. *re* Capt. of 61st Regiment, Montmagny (Ques.) 723 (i).
Lebel, Mr. W., Dismissal from Customs (Ques.) 1864 (i).
—— (M. for cor.*) 3756 (ii).
Lizotte, Luc, Postmaster at Pacome, Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 3756 (ii).
Madore, Alphonse, Claims for Damages on I.C.R. (M. for cor.*) 3055 (ii).
Man. Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. Beland) to M. for 3°, 4948 (iii).
Michaud, Mr. E., Dismissal from P.O. at St. Germain (M. for cor.) 1592 (i).
Moreau, Mr. Jos., Dismissal, &c. (M. for Cor.) 1818 (i).
N.T. Ry., Quebec-Moncton Section, Completion, &c., Operation by Govt. (Ques.) 723 (i).
Papal Zouaves, Investigation *re* Reception to Papal Legate (Ques.) 578 (i).
Parent, Hon. S. N., Resignation of (Ques.) 578 (i).
Postmasters in Kamouraska County, Names, Dismissals, &c. (Ques.) 6781 (iv).
Public Officials, Inquiries *re* Conduct, &c., Apptmt. of Commissioners in Quebec (Ques.) 2063 (ii).

LAPOINTE, Mr. E.—*Con.*
Railway Bills, Senate Amendments (remarks) 6577 (iv).
Returns, Inquiry for, 4744 (iii).
Rosignol, Major J. E., Qualifications *re* Commandant of 61st Regiment (Ques.) 723 (i).
St. Anaclet Postmaster, Request *re* Dismissal (M. for cor.) 2588 (ii).
St. André Wharf, Discontinuance of Work *re* (Ques.) 724 (i).
Ste. Anne de la Pocatiere, Experimental Farm, Tenders *re* Erection of Buildings (Ques.) 577 (i).
St. Germain, Dismissal of Postmaster, (M. for cor.) 1592 (i).
——— (Ques.) 1579 (i).
St. Pascal Mail Contract, Cancellation *re* (Ques.) 2294 (ii).
St. Valier Wharf, Contract of Alex. Duchesneau (M. for cor.*) 4263 (iii).
SUPPLY.
Agriculture—Experimental Farms (branch stations) 6478 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 6651 (iv).
Justice, Administration of (Montreal circuit court) 6598 (iv).
Militia (annual drill) 5499 (iii).
Post Office (mail service) 6292 (iv).
Syrian Immigration, Pet. *re* O.C. (Ques.) 1209 (i).
Ungava Territory, Legislation *re* Extension (Ques.) 577 (i).

LAPOINTE, Mr. L. A., *Montreal, St. James.*
N.T. Ry. and Montreal Branch Lines, Cor. O.Cs., &c. (M. for copies*) 582 (i).
——— (Ques.) 573 (i).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, *East Quebec and Soulanges.*
Address, The, 33, (amt.) 49; Neg. (Y. 77; N. 121) 517 (i).
Anderson, Mr., Salary Increase (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1044 (i).
Archives B. 66 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 1494 (i).
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5290 (iii).
Agriculture and Colonization Com., on M. (Mr. Sexsmith) to ref. to Printing Com., 3933 (ii).
Bank Act Amt. B. 169 (Mr. White) in Com., 5850 (iv).
Burrard Power Co. v. The King, Judgment of Judicial Com. (M. for copy*) 1409 (i).
Canadian Northern Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 187 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. on Res., 6082; in Com., 6339; on M. for 3°, 6371 (iv).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*
Civil Service Act (Aud. Gen.) Amt. B. 113 (Mr. White) in Com. on Res., 3632 (ii).
Civil Service Act (additional commissioner) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 3143 (ii).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com. on Res., 3972 (ii).
Civil Service Act (private secretaries) Amt. B. 60 (Mr. Borden) on Prop. Res., 1033; in Com., 1435 (i).
Civil Service Act (rural mail) Amt. B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 6084 (iv).
Committees, Sel. Standing, on M. (Mr. Borden) 10 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. Borden) to present, 710, 794 (i).
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) on M. for 1°, 5550; on M. for 3°, 5892; on Amt. (Mr. Pugsley) to M. for 3°, 5892; on Amt. (Mr. Pugsley) to M. for 3°, 5963 (iv).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Taylor) to conc., 2842 (ii).
Dismissal of Public Officials, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Papers, 893 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1092 (i).
Dismissals, &c., on Objection (Mr. Macdonald) to Mr. Dep. Speaker's Ruling in Com. of Sup., 3255 (ii).
Dismissals: *See* 'Inquiries B. 19,' 'Morine.'
Ezra Butler Eddy Bessey, Change of Name B. 117 (Mr. Fripp) on M. for 2°, 4238 (iii).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6260 (iv).
Fife, Duke of, Decease of (remarks) 2155 (ii).
Fort Osborne Barracks Sale B. 185 (Mr. Hughes) in Com. on Res., 6064; in Com., 6203 (iv).
Fishery Regulations *re* Hague Tribunal (remarks) 3830 (ii).
Freight Rates on Rys., &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 667 (i).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays (remarks) 2377 (ii).
——— Precedence on Wednesdays, on M. (Mr. Borden) 1969 (ii).
Govt. Steamers, B.C., Use for Political Purposes (Ques.) 5262 (iii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) on Order for 3°, and in Com., 4153 (iii).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6570 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry. Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) on M. for 1°, 711 (i).
G.T.P. Ry. (Implementing P.C. judgment) on Prop. Res. (Mr. White) 2296 (ii).
See 'N.T.Ry. B. 95.'

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*
Gutelius, Mr. F., Form of Question, on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3934 (i).
Hague Tribunal: *See* 'Fishery.'
Ha Ha Bay Ry. Co's Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5895 (iv).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) on M. for 1°, 1572 (i); on M. for 2°, 3633; Amt. to ref. to Gov. Gen., 3641; in Com., 3667, 3729, 3946 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4140; Amt. neg. (Y. 50; N. 79) 4141 (iii); on Senate Amts., 6398 (iv).
Hudson Bay Ry. Contract, on M. (Mr. Neely) for O.Cs., &c., 749 (i).
Inquiries Act Amt. B 19 (Mr Doherty) in Com, 1283, 1417 (i)
Judges Act (salaries) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5408 (iii), 6009 (iv).
Juvenile Delinquents Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 943 (i).
L'Assomption Public Works (remarks) *re* Answer, 6782 (iv).
Live Stock Records Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 6023 (iv).
Lobster Twine, Customs Duties, on M. for Sup., 1072 (i).
Lumber Duties, Violation of Customs Act, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) 1781 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 3539, 3840; on M. for 1°, 3902 (ii); on M. for 2°, 4359; (amt.) 4375, neg. (Y. 65; N. 103) 4393; in Com. on Amts. (Mr. Borden) 4837; on Amt. (Mr. Mondou) to M. for 3°, 4888 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Cor. *re* Settlement, on M. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 778 (i).
—— Memorial from Premier to Gov. Gen. (remarks) 3630 (ii).
—— Swamp Lands, Acerage, Inquiry for Stmt., 3751 (ii).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1637 (i).
Marriages in Canada, Power of Dom. Govt. *re* (remarks) 576 (i).
Morine, A. B., Charges *re* as Candidate for Election (remarks) 6185 (iv).
Morning Sittings, on M. (Mr. Borden) 4980 (iii).
Mounted Police, Increase in Pay (remarks) 4743 (iii).
N.T.Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1866 (i), 3130 (ii).
N.T.Ry. (P.C. judgment) B. 95 (Mr. White) on M. for 2°, 3061 (ii).
—— (remarks) *re* Factums, 2589 (ii). *See* 'G.T.P.'
N.T.Ry. Station at Quebec, Contract *re* Building (M. for cor. &c.) 755, 763 (i).
—— (remarks) 6786 (iv). *See* 'Gutelius.'

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*
Naturalization, Legislation *re* Uniformity, on M. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) for Cor., &c. 772 (i).
Naval Defences (remarks) in Debate on Address, 42 (v).
Naval Service, Minister's Visit to England *re* (remarks) 938 (i).
Ne Temere Decree: *See* 'Marriage.'
Newspaper Articles, Reading *re* (remarks) 3058 (ii).
Northumberland County Mail Contracts, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 6186 (iv).
Ontario Boundaries, Extension (M. for cor.*) 1590 (i).
Ottawa Improvement Commission, and Architects' Association (M. for cor.) 977 (i).
Peace River and Ry. Belt Water Power B. 149 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 5972 (iv).
Pelagic Sealing Treaty, Ratification of (remarks) 4460 (iii).
—— Treaty between G.B., U.S. and Japan (M. for copy*) 1590 (i).
Piper, E. F., Patent Relief B. 53 (Mr. Fripp) on M. for 2°, 1202 (i).
P. E. I. Subsidy, on Prop. Res. (Mr. White) 5558; in Com. on Res., 5860 (iv).
Provincial Rys. and Public Buildings, Govt. Assistance (M. for cor.*) 562 (i).
Public Accounts Com., 4th Rep., on M. (Mr. Middlebro) to conc., 6492 (iv).
Quebec Boundary Extension, (M. for cor.*) 1590 (i).
Quebec Boundary Extension, B. 151 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 5269 (iii).
Quebec Bridge Reconstruction, Reps., Plans, Tenders &c. (M. for papers) 1401 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners Act Amt. B. 31 (Mr. Hazen) on M. for 2°, 1028; on M. for 3°, 1709 (i).
Quebec and Saguenay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5896 (iv).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 3883 (ii).
Railway Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 2°, 2505 (ii).
Railway Rates: *See* 'Freight Rates.'
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. on Res., 5895 (iv).
Reciprocity, Ref. to in debate on Address, 36 (i).
Renfrew, S. Election, Issue of Writ, on M. (Mr. A. H. Clarke) to adjn., 2230 (ii).
—— (remarks) 1576, 1707 (i), 1971, 2059, 2377 (ii).
—— Speech of Min. of Customs *re* Georgian Bay (remarks) 1573 (i).
Ste Agathe des Monts Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5895 (iv).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*
Senate Amendments to Railway Bills, (remarks) 6577 (iv.)
Senate and House of Commons Act (indemnity) B. 75 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 1498 (i).
Separate Schools: *See* 'Man. Boundaries B. 115.'
Speaker, Election of (remarks) 3 (i).
Speaker, Mr., Congratulations *re* Reading Prayers in French, 1808 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt—Agriculture (salaries) 1041; Charges of Management (dom. notes) 1033, 1034; Customs—Outside Ports (salaries) 1092 (i); Inland Revenue (promotions) conc., 6771 (iv); Inland Revenue (salaries) conc., 6770 (iv); Justice—Exchequer Court (D. Clark) 1035; Militia (salaries) 1037; Naval Dept. (salaries) 1063 (i).
Mounted Police (pay of force) 5179 (iii).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5310, 5358 (iii).
Public Works—Bridges (Ottawa River) 6806 (iv); Buildings—Ottawa (grounds) 3240 (ii); Que. (Louiseville) conc., 6799 (iv); Que. (Quebec P.O.) 1851 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com. on Res., 2158; in Com., 2862, 2947, 3024, 3555, (ii); on M. for 3°, 4144 (amt.) 4146, Neg. (Y. 46; N. 81) 4151 (iii); on Senate Amts., 6665, 6818 (iv).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. on Res., 6080; in Com., 6428 (iv).
Thompson, Dr., Dismissal from N.W.M.P. (remarks) 6784 (iv).
Trade Relations between W. Indies, Australia and Canada, on M. (Mr. Pugsley) to Com. of Sup., 1999 (ii).
Waterways Commissioners, Dismissal and Apptmts., on M. (Mr. Pugsley) to Com. of Sup., 6701 (iv).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Harbour Comsioners incorp. B. 138 (Mr. Hazen) in Com., 5991 (iv).
Yukon Judges Annuities B. 123 (Mr. Doherty) in Com. on Res., 4556 (iii); in Com., 5569 (iv).

LAVALLEE, Mr. J. O., *Bellechasse.*
Chicago Drainage Canal, Damage to Navigation, &c. (Ques.) 4260 (iii).
Doucet, Mr. A. E., Cor. *re* Ry. Station Sites (M. for copies*) 2460 (ii).
—— Position *re* N. T. Ry. (Ques.) 2245 (ii).
Keewatin Separate Schools, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 4241 (iii).
Lettelier, Judge Blaise, Residence *re* (Ques.) 3150 (ii).
N. T. Ry. St. Damien Station, Change in Plans (Ques.) 3532 (ii).

LAVALLEE, Mr. J. O.—*Con.*
Sorel Wharf, Claim of Mr. Larivière for Timber supplied (Ques.) 3535 (ii).
—— Contractors *re* (Ques.) 2859 (ii).

LAW, Mr. B. B., *Yarmouth.*
Fish Trap Licenses issued to Capt. J. H. Thorburn (M. for copy of pets.*) 2861 (ii).
Hatfield, A. M., Charges *re* (M. for copy*) 5263 (iii).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5253 (iii).
Inspection and Sale Act (grain) Amt. B. 78 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 6193, 6680 (iv).
Kelley's Cove Breakwater, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 3340 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Fisheries (inspectors, &c.) 5252 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. John and Halifax) 678 (i).
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 5187; (life saving awards) 5228; (schools of navigation) 5229 (iii).
Trade and Commerce (annuities act) 694 (i).
Webster, Dr., C. A., Port Physician at Yarmouth, Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 6186 (iv).
Yarmouth Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3273 (ii).
Yarmouth Post Office Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3269 (ii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R., *Rouville.*
Address, The, 241 (i).
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5282 (iii).
Annuities Branch, Transfer to P. O. Dept., Dismissal of Agents (Ques.) 727 (i).
—— Extra Payment to Agents (Ques.) 973 (i).
Anse aux Canards Breakwater, Tenders *re* Construction (Ques.) 878 (i).
Anse à Valeau Postmistress, Charges *re* Madame Proulx (Ques.) 2072 (ii).
Atlantic Mail Service: *See* 'Mail Service.'
Bank Act Amt. B. 169 (Mr. White) in Com., 5847 (iv).
Banking Act, Legislation *re* (remarks) 1820 (i).
Battlefields Commission (remarks) *re* Vote, 5299 (iii).
Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., Apptmt. as Commissioner of Inquiry, &c. (Ques.) 2062 (ii).
Berlin Post Office Clock (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1346 (i).
Bird Rocks Lighthouse, Drowning of Keeper (remarks) 5258 (iii).
Bourgoin, Geo., Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 5557 (iv).
—— Inquiry for Papers, 5259 (iii), 6188 (iv).
Bourque, Mr. Jeffrey, Claims for Damages *re* I.C.R. (Ques.) 2243 (ii).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5610 (iv).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R—*Con.*
B.C. International Boundary Line, Par. from Washington (remarks) 2754 (ii).
Cable Rates Exchange (M. for cor.*) 5557 (iv).
Cable Rates to G. B., on M. for Sup., 3237 (ii).
Cable Rates, Reduction of Fees (remarks) 931 (i).
Cable Rates, Parcel Post, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 4088, (amt.) 4097, Neg. (Y. 40, N. 70) 4120 (iii).
Campaign Literature: *See* 'Political Literature.'
Campeau, Michel, Dismissal of (M. for pets.*) 2460 (ii).
Canada-France Steamship Service, Contract *re* (Ques.) 5262 (iii).
—— Notice for Discussion, 4742 (iii).
Canada and Gulf Terminal Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6306 (iv).
Canadian Marine Insurance, Govt. Co-operation, &c. (Ques.) 1582 (i).
Cap Chat P. O., Pet. *re* Change of Name (Ques.) 1204 (i).
Causapscal Post Office, Pet. *re* Site (Ques.) 1020 (i).
Census Enumerators, Delays in Payments (Ques.) 2244 (ii).
—— Percentage retained of Salaries (Ques.) 933 (i).
—— (remarks) 935 (i).
Civil Service Act (additional commissioner) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 3144; in Com., 3349 (ii).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 4569, 4578 (iii).
Civil Service Act (mail clerks) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com. on Res., 3156 (ii); in Com., 4783, 5264 (iii).
See 'P. O. Bill 105.'
Civil Service Act (postmasters) Amt. B. 124 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com. on Res., 4583 (iii).
Civil Service Act (private secretaries) Amt. B. 60 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 3344 (ii).
Civil Service Act (rural mail) Amt. B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) on M. for 1°, 5922; in Com., 6091 (iv).
Civil Service Commissioners, Increase in Number (Ques.) 728 (i).
Civil Service Reform, and Outside Servie (Ques.) 727 (i).
See 'Dismissals.'
Collingwood Dry Dock Subsidy, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Com. on Res., 3343 (ii).
Commercial Agent in France, Successor to Mr. A. Poindron (Ques.) 4041 (iii).
Couture, Mr. A., Dismissal from I.C.R. (Ques.) 2242 (ii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R—*Con.*
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) on M. for 1°, 5551; in Com., 5862 (iv).
Customs Salaries: *See* 'C. S. Bill 116.'
Debates, Examination of Reporters, Inquiry for Papers, 6338 (iv).
—— Translation, 6613 (iv).
Deschamps, Mr. R., Apptmt. by Govt. (remarks) 6277 (iv)
Dismissals from Govt. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1275, 1955 (i), 3252 (ii).
Dismissals by Hon. Mr. Lemieux, Par. in *Le Devoir* (remarks) *re* Question, 2453 (ii).
Dismissals from Post Offices (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2035 (ii).
See 'Inquiries Act, &c.'
Dom. Notes and Stamps Printing Contract, Complaints of British Tenderers (remarks) 1842 (i); 5843 (iv).
Dry Docks Subsidies Act Amt. B. 180 (Mr. Monk) on prop. Res., 5560; in Com., 6201 (iv).
Ducharme, Mr. G. N., Apptmt. of (M. for cor.*) 4980 (iii).
—— Attack *re* Apptmt. to Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2830 (ii).
—— Resignation *re* (Ques.) 4979 (iii).
Dunn, Albert, Charges *re* Political Partisanship (Ques.) 4039 (iii).
Elevator Men employed by Govt., Dismissals, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3245 (ii).
Exchequer Court Act (Judges) Amt. B. 168 (Mr. Doherty) on M. for 1°, 5553; in Com., 5894 (iv).
Ezra Butler Eddy Bessey, Change of Name B. 117 (Mr. Fripp) on M. for 2°, 4239 (iii).
Farmers' Bank, Reimbursements *re* (Ques.) 528 (i).
Fast Atlantic SS Service, Conference *re* (remarks) 5695 (iv).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6253, 6454 (iv).
Fidelity Trust Co., Incorporation &c. (M. for papers*) 3757 (ii).
Franco-Canadian Relations, Apptmt. of Agents (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5747 (iv).
See 'Can. and France, &c.'
Franking: *See* 'Political Literature.'
Gaspé Basin Marine Agency, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 878 (i).
—— Deptl. Inquiry, Salary &c. (Ques.) 1358 (i).
Gaspé Landing Pier, Appropriation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2785 (ii).
Gaspé, Magdeleine and Chlorydormes Mail Contracts, Annulment of (Ques.) 1204 (i).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R—*Con.*
Gaspé Basin to Matapedia Line of Ry., Inspection *re* Subsidy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4194 (iii).
Gaspé Shore Tidal Wave, Govt. Aid, *re* (Ques.) 2858 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal, Govt. Construction &c. (Ques.) 544 (i).
Godbout, Mr. J., Emplymt. by Govt., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3752 (ii).
——— (M. for cor.*) 4980 (iii).
Govt. House Property, Toronto Sale B. 182 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 6181 (iv).
Govt. Ownership: *See* 'Cable,' 'Parcel,' 'Telegraph,' &c.
Griever, Mr. S., Lighthouse Keeper, Charges *re* (Ques.) 1358 (i).
Guimond, Eugene, Dismissal, of (M. for cor.*) 2460 (ii).
Ha Ha Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 5895, 6212 (iv).
Hamel, Hector, Customs Appraiser Montreal, Dismissal of (M. for cor.*) 3343 (ii).
Harbour Commissioners, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1960 (i).
Harbour, Geo. T., Dismissal, &c. (M. for cor.*) 2460 (ii).
——— Letter *re* Dismissal (read) in Com. of Sup., 3252 (ii).
Harbours and River Works, Policy *re* Tenders (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2044 (ii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3675 (ii).
Hull Superior Court, Apptmt. of Mr. Chauvin (Ques.) 4261 (iii).
Hurley, Mr. J. M., Fishery Inspector at Belleville, Dismissal, &c., (Ques.) 2860 (ii).
Immigration Agents, Dismissal, Number and Names (Ques.) 877 (i).
Immigration Agents in Belgium, Number, &c. (Ques.) 878 (i).
Immigration Agents in France, Number, &c. (Ques.) 878 (i).
I. C. R. Moncton Shops, Transfer of to Fraserville (Ques.) 544 (i).
——— Snow Blockade, Delay of Trains (remarks) 1409 (i).
——— Ties contracted for at Sayabec, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 4041 (iii).
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1311 (i).
James Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6309 (iv).
Japan, Trade Relations with, Stmnt. by Japanese Consul at Vancouver (Ques.) 559 (i).
Justice, Dep. Min., Travelling Expenses (Ques.) 3150 (ii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R—*Con.*
Juvenile Delinquents Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 940 (i).
La Banque de St. Hyacinthe, Investigation *re* Liquidation (Ques.) 2069 (ii).
——— and La Banque St. Jean, Reimbursements &c. (Ques.) 528 (i).
Laberge, Mr., Mail Carrier, Compensation to widow (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6284 (iv).
Langevin Block, Overcrowding: *See* 'Post Office.'
L'Assomption Public Works (remarks) *re* Answer, 6782 (iv).
Lepage, M. J., Preventive Officer, Rimouski, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 4458 (iii).
Levis Dry Dock, on Inquiry for Ret., 6492 (iv).
Longshoremen's Strike in Montreal, Settlement &c. (remarks) 269 (i).
Magdalen Islands, Dredging, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3277 (ii).
Magdalen Islands Marconi News Service, Copy. of Instructions *re* (M. for papers*) 4459 (iii).
——— (remarks) 3833 (ii), 4159 (iii).
——— (remarks) on stmnt. (Mr. Hazen) 4042 (iii).
——— Salary of Correspondent (Ques.) 4262 (iii).
Mail Bags Repairs, Names of Firms, &c. (Ques.) 4777 (iii).
Mail Clerks: *See* 'C.S. Bill 106.'
Mail Contracts, Cancellation of (M. for ret.*) 2460 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 5693 (iv).
Mail Service between G.B. and Canada, Letter of Board of Trade, Quebec (read) 1843 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 3852, 3896 (ii); on M. for 2°, 4461 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Settlement, on M. (Mr. Macdonald) for Cor., 783 (i).
Marconi Co., Negotiations *re* Wireless Messages to all Dominions (Ques.) 2585 (ii). *See* 'Magdalen Islands.'
Marriage Act Amt., Ref. to Privy Council, Provincial Representations (Ques.) 3755 (ii).
Marriage Laws, Ref. to Supreme Court (remarks) 3332 (ii).
Montreal Athletic Association at Nancy, Pet. *re* Govt. Aid (remarks) 1722 (i).
Montreal Circuit Judges, Addition, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 545 (i); 2855 (ii).
——— (remarks) 3907 (ii).
Montreal Customs House, Dismissals (Ques.) 4040 (iii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R—*Con.*
Montreal Docks Construction, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6652 (iv).
Montreal Dry Dock, Contract *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3301 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 1708 (i), 2057 (ii).
——— Resignation of Messrs. Ballantyne and Geoffrion (remarks) 6551 (iv).
——— Res. from Corn Exchange Protesting *re* Removal, Delegations, &c. (Ques.) 2069 (ii).
Montreal Longshoremen's Strike, Settlement of by Govt. (Ques.) 572 (i).
Montreal Military School, Purchase of Site (Ques.) 4040 (iii).
National Ports (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2837 (ii).
N.T.Ry. (Montreal Branch) Subsidy, in Com., 5896, 6215 (iv).
Naval Policy of Govt. ref. to in debate on Address, 250 (i).
Naval Service Cor. between Can. and G. B. (M. for copy*) 562 (i).
Naval Ships, Construction of, Rep. of Admiral Kingsmill (M. for copy*) 2459 (ii).
Nicolet and St. Monique Mail Contract, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 724 (i).
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burnham) 1384, 1832 (i).
Ontario Boundaries Extension B. 152 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 6158 (iv).
Ottawa City Federal District, Referendum *re* (Ques.) 1356 (i).
Ottawa County Superior Court, Apptmt. of Additional Judge (remarks) 4121 (iii).
Parcel Post System, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 2337 (ii).
See 'Cable,' 'Postal Regulations,' &c.
Parcel Post Convention between Canada and France, Signature *re* (Ques.) 569 (i).
——— (M. for papers) 1396 (i).
——— Request for Papers, 935 (i).
Parcel Post Rates to European Countries (Ques.) 4776 (iii).
Peace River and Ry. Belt Water Power B. 149 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 6175 (iv).
Peat Industry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6603 (iv).
Political Literature, Application *re* Free Postage (remarks) 1586 (i).
Postal Regulations, &c., on Prop. Res. (Mr. Armstrong) 2285 (ii).
Postmasters dismissed by Govt., List read in Com. of Sup., 6636 (iv).
Postmasters, Rural, Increase of Salary to (remarks) 3060 (ii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R—*Con.*
Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 105 (Mr. Pelletier) on M. for 2°, 3351; in Com. 3358 (ii).
See 'C. S. Bill 106.'
Post Office Deptl. Building, Condition of Offices, Charges *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1855 (i), 2010 (ii).
Post Office Dismissals, since Oct. 1911, Pets. *re* &c. (M. for ret.) 1395 (i).
Post Office Dept., Stmnt. *re* Dismissals since Oct. 1911 (M. for ret*.) 1589 (i).
——— Salaries: *See* 'Bill 106.'
——— List read, 6636 (iv).
Pouliot, Louis, Dismissals, &c. (Ques.) 4459 (iii).
Private Secretaries: *See* 'Bill 60.'
Privy Council Chamber, Improvements *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1340 (i).
Provident Trust Co., Incorporation, &c. (M. for papers*) 3755 (ii).
Public Works, Dismissal of Workmen (Ques.) 2584 (ii).
Quebec Boundaries Extension B. 151 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 5269 (iii); in Com., 6162 (iv); on M. for 3°, 6188 (iv).
Quebec Dry Dock, Construction, &c. (remarks) 6784 (iv).
——— Subsidy, Rep. *re* (remarks) 6493 (iv).
Quebec Harbour Board, Removal of Members, &c. (Ques.) 560 (i).
Quebec and Saguenay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 5896, 6214 (iv).
Queen's Hotel Co., Limited, Litigation *re* (M. for cor.*) 3755 (ii).
Railway Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 5895; in Com., 6212, 6306 (iv).
Reciprocity, Ref. to in debate on Address, 244 (i).
Relatives appointed to Govt. positions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6295-97 (iv).
Rideau Hall Lighting, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3234 (ii).
Robitaille, J. C., Charges *re* Inland Revenue, Quebec (Ques.) 2858 (ii).
Rural Mail Delivery B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) on M. for 1°, 5922 (iv).
See 'Bill 179.'
Rural Mail Delivery, Extension (remarks) 2061 (ii).
Rural Mail Routes, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 4978 (iii).
——— Stmnt. *re* Routes, &c., Inquiry for, 5561 (iv).
St. Adelaide de Pabos Postmaster, Investigation *re* Charges (Ques.) 2068 (ii).
St. Agathe des Monts Post Office, Dismissal of Mrs. Bedard (Ques.) 973 (i).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R—*Con.*
——— Investigation *re* Charges (M. for cor.) 1591 (i).
Ste Agathe des Monts Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5895 (iv).
St. Angele de Laval, County of Nicolet, Postmaster, Charges *re* (Ques.) 3755 (ii), 4039 (iii).
St. John Harbour Works, Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3295 (ii).
St. Lawrence Channel, Average depth of water between Montreal and Quebec Cap a la Roche at low tide (Ques.) 544 (i).
St. Lawrence River Power, Res. from Board of Trade, Montreal (Ques.) 2456 (ii).
St. Monique Mail Contract, Annulment of (Ques.) 1584 (i).
St. Paul d'Abbottsford Postmaster, P. L. St. Pierre, Investigation *re* (M. for papers*) 1589 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6290 (iv).
Ste. Rosalie Branch, I.C.R., Lack of Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4134 (iii).
Sauve, Mr. L. A., Dismissal from Soulanges Canal (Ques.) 575 (i).
Sayabec Post Office, Appmnt. of Miss Boulay (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6295 (iv).
Separate Schools, Establishment of in Man. (M. for pets.*) 4263 (iii).
Separate Schools in Man. and Keewatin, Demand from Members (Ques.) 4247 (iii).
See 'Man. Boundaries B. 115.'
Sheldon v. Rex. (M. for papers*) 3756 (ii).
Sikhs in B. C., Decision *re* bringing in their Wives (Ques.) 2457 (ii).
Solicitor General, Appmnt. of (Ques.) 1816 (i).
——— Vacancy (remarks) 1577 (i).
Stenographic Assistance for Members (remarks) 1847 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt—Post Office (H. B. Verret) 6278; (promotions) 6280; Public Works (private Secretary) conc., 6779 (iv).
Conservation Commission (Chicago canal) 6580 (iv).
Fisheries (protection service) 5386 (iii).
Geological Survey (explorations) 6604 (iv).
Hydrographic Surveys (Arctic) 5398; (Atlantic Coast) 5399 (iii).
Immigration (agencies, &c.) 3311 (ii).
Justice, Administration of (Montreal circuit court) 6598; (miscellaneous expenditure) 6560; (miscellaneous litigation) 6562; Penitentiaries (St. Vincent de Paul) 6586 (iv).
Labour Dept. (contingencies) 6615; (Industrial Disputes Act) 6615 (iv).
Legislation—Senate (salaries) 6461 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 4727; (Magdalen Islands) 4732; (Quebec and Gaspé) 4738 (iii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Militia (annual drill) 5457; (automobiles) 5516; (rifle ranges, Rockliffe) 6654 (iv).
Miscellaneous—(Parliamentary Documents translation) 6613; (Paris agency) 6614 (iv).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5304 (iii).
Post Office (mail service) 6290; Outside Service (inspectors) 6546 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (furniture) 3286 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Port Arthur) 1951; (Renfrew) 1953; (Seaforth) 1953; (Sudbury) 1954; (Toronto warehouse) 1963 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Eastern Block) 1339; (examining warehouse) 1949 (i); (furniture) 3279, 3285; (grounds) 3240; (heating, &c.) 3278 (ii); (Historic Tableaus) 1336; (Library improvements) 1950; (plumbing, &c.) 1855 (i); (rents) 3291; (Rideau Hall repairs) 3285; (site for new buildings) 3242; (snow cleaning) 3279 (ii).
Public Works—(Buildings—Que. (Levis armoury) 1347 (i); (Louiseville) conc., 6791 (iv); (Maisonneuve) 1347; (Marieville) 1348; (Montreal barracks) 1350; (Montreal customs) 1351; (Montreal P. O. enlargement) 1348; (Montreal postal station F) 1353; (Quebec custom house) 1849; (Quebec drill hall) 1849; (Quebec P. O.) 1851; (St. Lambert) 1853 (i); (St. Laurent) conc., 6804 (iv); (St. Therese) 1854; (Shawinigan) 1852; (Three Rivers) 1854 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Generally (repairs) 3235 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John dry dock) 3299 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse au Canard) 2785; (Blue Rocks Island) 2043; (Levis graving dock) 3295; (Quebec harbour) 2836; (River St. Charles) 2837 (ii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (monuments) 2823; (monument to Madeleine de Verchères) 2824; (Temiskaming dam) 2830 (ii).
Public Works—Telegraphs (Gaspé) 3305; (Magdalen Islands) 3302; (repairs, &c.) 2817; (Yukon system) 3303 (ii).
Public Works—Roads and Bridges (Doncaster indian reserve) 6806 (iv).
Radiotelegraphic Service (wireless stations) 5399 (iii).
Railways—I.C.R. (construction) 4134 (iii).
Weights and Measures (inspectors) 5829 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com. on Res., 2157 (ii).
Taylor, Hon. Geo., Promise *re* Senate Apptmt. (Ques.) 545 (i).
Telegraph and Telephone Lines, Govt. Ownership (remarks) 2007 (ii).
See 'Cable,' &c.
Therrien, J. F., Charges *re* Political Partisanship, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 1413 (i), 3152 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5823 (iv).
(iv).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Thibault, Theophile, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3339 (ii).
Tobacco Growers of Yamaska, Govt. Aid to (M. for cor.) 1591 (i).
Under Secretaries of State, Apptmt. of (remarks) 3059 (ii).
Ungava Annexation, Cor. *re* (remarks) 2060 (ii).
Universal Eyesight Co.'s incorp. B. 126 (Mr. McLean) in Com., 5907 (iv).
Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6219 (iv).
Veit, Frederick, Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 6783 (iv).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 6176 (iv).
Williamsville Post Office, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Edwards) 6274 (iv).
Yukon Judges Annuities B. 123 (Mr. Doherty) in Com. on Res., 4557 (iii); in Com., 5405, 5567 (iv).
Yule, Mr., Customs Officer at Aurora, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 4779 (iii).

LENNOX, Mr. H., *South Simcoe.*
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5291 (iii).
Alberta, Peace River and Eastern Ry. Co.'s B. 129 (Mr. Chabot) in Com., 5905 (iv).
Cap de la Magdeleine Ry. Co.'s B. 43 (Mr. Paquet) in Com., 2012 (ii).
Cockshutt Plough Co.'s Prices (remarks) 847 (i).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Taylor) to conc., 2841 (ii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) on M. for 2°, 3651; in Com., 3670 (ii).
Marriage Bill 3 (Mr. Lancaster) remarks *re* 2nd reading, 582 (i).
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal B. 30 (Mr. G. V. White) in Com., 4699 (iii).
N.T.Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1894 (i); 3410 (ii).
Postal Regulations, on M. to take in Mondays (remarks) 2376 (ii).
Railway Committee, Apptmt. of Subcommittee *re* G.T.Ry. Bill, Liberals omitted (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5617 (iv).
Senate Amendments to Railway Bills, (remarks) 6456, 6494, 6577 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Naval Service (maintenance) 5320 (iii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) Ques. of Order, 3618; on Ques. of Order (Mr. Currie) 3616 (ii); on Senate Amts., 6669, 6811 (iv).

LESPERANCE, Mr. D. O., *Montmagny.*
Carriere and Laine Property, Levis, Rental, &c. (Ques.) 731 (i).
Dismissals on I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5806 (iv).
International Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 141) 1°*, 5156 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. Mondou) to M. for 3°, 4863 (iii).

LOGGIE, Mr. W. S., *Northumberland, N.B.*
Address, The, 487, (M.) to adjn. debate, 487, 491 (i).
Chatham and Newcastle Ry. Service, Pets. from Boards of Trade (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4190 (iii).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1154 (i).
Fishing Twine for Lobster Nets, Duties *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5593 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Customs—Outside Ports (salaries) 1095 (i); Public Works—Buildings (Chatham) conc., 6804 (iv); Railways—I.C.R. (Chatham diversion) 4138 (iii).

LOW, Mr. T. A., *Renfrew South.*
Eganville Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ques.) 725 (i).

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M., *Pictou.*
Adams, Mr., Resignation as Examiner of Master and Mates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5227 (iii).
Address, The, on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 107 (i).
Archibald, Mr. P. S., Employmt. by Ry. Dept. (Ques.) 933 (i).
Art Gallery of Painting (Ques.) 1865 (i).
Australian Pacific Cable, Proposals *re* &c. (Ques.) 576 (i).
Banking Act Legislation (remarks) 938 (i).
Barcelona Tramway Light and Power Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 2411 (ii).
Benoit, Joseph, Dismissal from I.C.Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4184 (iii).
Bisley Rules: *See* 'N.R.A.'
Bourassa, Capt., Pet. *re* Dep. Harbour Master (Ques.) 1814 (i).
British Admiralty, Memo. *re* Conference between Canada. and Australia, &c. (Ques.) 559 (i).
B.C. Boundary, Agreement *re* Subsidy (Ques.) 971 (i).
B.C. Fishing Ret., Inquiry for, 6277 (iv).
B.C. Provincial Subsidy, Consultations with other Provs. (Ques.) 573 (i).
'British News,' &c., Purchase of by Interior Dept. (Ques.) 6660 (iv).

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*
Cable Rates, &c. on Amt. (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 4102 (iii).
Canada and G.B. Mail Service, Renewal of Contract *re* (Ques.) 547 (i).
See 'G. B. and Canada.'
Can. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 98 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 5199 (iii).
Canada Shipping Act (masters and mates) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Hazen) in Com. on Res., 5161 (iii).
Cavanagh, Geo., Dismissal from Customs Service (M. for cor.*) 3342 (ii).
Census Returns, Number of Males, Females, &c. (M. for ret.*) 561 (i).
Christmas Adjournment, 927 (i).
Civil Service Act (rural mail) Amt. B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 6085 (iv).
Coal used in Govt. Buildings, Canadian (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3286 (ii).
Connolly, John, Coal Inspector, Complaints *re* (M. for cor.*) 2588 (ii).
Continental Can. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. Fripp) on M. for 2°, 4396; in Com., 5204 (iii).
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5866 (iv).
Dartmouth and Denis Branch Line, I.C.R., Tenders *re* (Ques.) 543 (i).
Deschamps, Raoul, Apptmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 2667 (ii).
Dismissals, Apptmt. of Commissioners in N.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3247 (ii).
—— Objections to Ruling of Dep. Speaker in Com. of Sup., 3254 (ii).
Dismissal of Public Officials, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Papers, 921 (i).
'Earl Grey' and 'Minto,' Govt. Steamers, Names of Employees (M. for ret.*) 1816 (i).
East River, Pictou County, Deepening, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2020 (ii).
Elevator Men in Govt. Employ (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3245 (ii).
Estimates, Discussion *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2439 (ii).
Excavators purchased from Mr. Harris &c. (Ques.) 559 (i).
Falconer, R. S., Dismissal as Inspector on I.C.R., Apptmt. of Successor (Ques.) 543 (i).
False Creek Flats, Date of Application for Lease from Messrs Marpole and Macdonald, (Ques.) 5953 (iv).
—— (M. for papers*) 6186 (iv).
Farmers Bank Investigation, Apptmt. of Sir William Meredith (remarks) 3332 (ii).
—— O. C. *re* Apptmt. of Sir William Meredith (M. for copy*) 3756 (ii).
D½
MACDONALD, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*
Fenian Raid, Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6257 (iv).
See 'Veterans.'
Fishery Act Prosecutions in Pictou County, (M. for papers*) 1589 (i).
Fraser, John, Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4188 (iii).
—— Dismissal of (Ques.) 3935 (ii).
Fraser, Mr. John, Postmaster at Stellarton, Dismissal of (Ques.) 546 (i).
See 'Stellarton.'
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com. on Res., 872 (i).
G. T. Pacific Ry. (B. 20), 1° m., 711; (M.) to suspend Rule, 713; 2°m., 795 (i).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6572 (iv).
G. T. Ry. Employees Strike, Settlement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1515 (i), 6572 (iv).
Gray, W. W., Coal Inspector, Charges *re*, Investigation by H. P. Duchemin (M. for papers*) 2588 (ii).
G. B. and Canada Mail Service, Contracts *re* (remarks) 1845 (i), 4718 (iii).
See 'Can. and G. B.'
Goods purchased by Public Works since Oct. 1911, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 1578 (i).
See 'Pub. Works.'
Govt. Business on Mondays (remarks) 2377 (ii).
Govt. Printing, Patronage to French Papers in Quebec (Ques.) 1357 (i).
Govt. Purchases for Public Works, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 1204 (i).
Governor General of Canada, Letters Patent (M. for copy*) 2247 (ii).
Guysborough Branch Ry. Co.'s Appropriation, on M. for Sup., 1465 (i).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5626 (iv).
Hale, Thomas, Dismissal as Correspondent *Labour Gazette*, Apptmt. of Successor (Ques.) 4459 (iii).
—— (M. for cor.*) 4263 (iii).
Hawkes, Mr.: *See* 'British News.'
Highway Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) on M. for 2°, 3656; in Com., 3719, 3947, 3956 (ii); on M. for 3° (amt.) 4142; Neg. (Y. 52; N. 85) 4142 (iii).
Immigration in Ont., Promise of Premier, *re* Assistance (Ques.) 546 (i).
Imperial Naturalization, Uniformity, &c., on M. for Sup., 2420 (ii).
I. C. Ry., Coal Supply, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 2457 (ii).
—— Employees in Pictou, Charges *re* Political Partisanship (M. for cor.*) 2246 (ii).

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*
I. C. R. and Ry. Commission, Res. *re* Control (Ques.) 4979 (iii).
Japanese, Oriental, &c., Immigration, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 875 (i).
Leaitch, Alvena Bell Relief (B. 142) 1°*, 5156 (iii).
Lightkeepers in N.S., Investigation *re* Charges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5233 (iii).
McAuley, Angus, Claims for Damages *re* Fire, Investigation (M. for rep.*) 3756 (ii).
McLeod, John, Dismissal as Postmaster at Denmark, N.S. (M. for cor.*) 4460 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 3851; on M. for 1°, 3905 (ii); in Com., 4525 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. Mondou) to M. for 3°, 4844; on Amt. (Mr. Oliver) 4708 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Cor. &c. *re* Settlement with Provs. of Man. and Ont. (M. for cor.) 774, 789 (i).
—— Terms *re* (Ques.) 716 (i).
Maritime Telephone Co., and P. E. I. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3303 (ii).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1698 (i).
Marriage Law, Cor. with Federal Govt. *re* Legislation (M. for copies*) 3341 (ii).
—— Cor. with Prime Minister *re* Legislation (M. for copy*) 2861 (ii).
Matheson, Jas. W., Charges *re* (M. for cor.*) 5263 (iii).
'Minto,' Apptmt. of Pilot, Name, &c. (Ques.) 876 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Apptmt. of Accountant (Ques.) 6661 (iv).
—— Dismissal of Mr. J. A. Masse &c. (Ques.) 3943 (ii).
Murray, Dr., Poaching on East River for Salmon (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5242 (iii).
N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1880 (i); 3378 (ii).
N. T. Ry. Commission, Investigation *re* Construction (remarks) 2060 (ii).
—— Rep. *re* (remarks) 2157 (ii).
National Rifle Association, Rules *re* Competition at Bisley (remarks) 3730 (ii).
Naturalization Legislation, Uniformity in (M. for cor. &c.) 765 (i).
Naturalization: *See* 'Imperial.'
Naval Defence of the Pacific Coast, Res., from B. B. Legislature &c. (Ques.) 4458 (iii).
Naval Discipline Act. Application to Canada (Ques.) 1203 (i).
Ne Temere Decree: *See* 'Marriage.'

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burnham) 1822 (i).
Pariseau, Mr. S. B., Employee of Ry. Dept. and Cedar Rapids Co. (Ques.) 973 (i).
Pictou-Georgetown Winter Mail Service, Contract Supplies to Crews, &c. (Ques.) 876 (i).
Pictou Mail Service, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 2580 (ii).
Pictou Winter Steamers, Amounts paid to, &c. (Ques.) 5949 (iv).
Poaching for Salmon on East River (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5242 (iii).
Postmasters, Dismissal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6625 (iv).
Postmasters and Town Councillors, Regulations *re* Acceptance (Ques.) 2587 (ii).
Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 105 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 3355 (ii).
P. E. I. Car Ferry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5189, 5210 (iii).
P. E. I. Ferry Papers, Inquiry for 4232 (iii).
P. E. I. Subsidy B. 178 (Mr. White) in Com., 6118, 6130 (iv).
Public Works, Contracts *re* (Ques.) 559 (i).
Public Works Contracts, Amounts given without Tender (Ques.) 877, 1578 (i).
—— Contracts in Montreal and Quebec, given without tender (Ques.) 877 (i).
Public Works, Deptl. Supplies, Orders without Tenders, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2459 (ii).
—— (Ques.) 1204 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commissioner's Solicitor, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 1814 (i).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 3884 (ii).
Railway Estimates, Annual Stmnt. (remarks) 4121 (iii).
Railway Facilities in N. S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4213 (iii).
Rayne, R. W., Caretaker, Truro Armoury, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 6184 (iv).
Ritchie, Hon. Mr. Justice, Apptmt. (remarks) 3331 (ii).
—— (personal explanation) 3449 (ii).
River John, Mail Carrier, Name, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 1579 (i).
—— (M. for cor.*) 2247 (ii).
Rural Mail: *See* 'C. S. Bill 179.'
Salmon Fisheries, B. C., Negotiations *re* Exportations, &c. (M. for papers*) 3756 (ii).
Scotch Village Postmaster, Apptmt. in 1903, Charges *re* (Ques.) 2666 (ii).
Senate Vacancies (remarks) 5161 (iii).
Smith, Angus, Pilot of D. G. S. 'Earl Grey' Suspension of (M. for papers*) 1590 (i).
Solicitor General, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 546 (i).

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*
Solicitor General, Vacancy (remarks) 5162 (iii).
Stellarton Postmaster Mr. John Fraser, Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 1589 (i).
See 'Fraser.'
Stellarton Station Mail Service, Cancellation of (M. for cor.*) 2247 (ii).
Sunny Brae to Guysborough Branch Line, I.C.R., Tenders *re* (Ques.) 542 (i).
Sunnybrae Branch Ry. (remarks) in Com. of of Sup., 4216 (iii).
See 'Guysboro.'
SUPPLY—
Fisheries (oyster culture) 5255 (iii).
Immigration (agencies) 3307 (ii).
Labour Dept. (Gazette) 1468; (combines investigation act) 1501; (conciliation board) 1509; (industrial disputes act) 1500 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (International Congress) 5237; (pensions) 5236 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 4718; (Can. and Newfoundland) 4725; (Can. and S. Africa) 4726; (Halifax, Nfld. and England) 4728; (Magdalen Islands) 4732; (North Sydney) 678 (i).
Militia (annual drill) 5453; (allowance) 5449; (associations and bands) 5528; (automobiles) 5492, 5513; (camps) 5521; (customs dues) 5522 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 5189, 5210; (patrol vessels) 5231; (St. Lawrence channel) 5231; (wrecks) 5229; (wreck subsidies) 5231 (iii).
Post Office—Outside Service (salaries, &c.) 6625 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Port Arthur) 1951 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (electric power) 3286; (lighting) 3291 (ii).
Public Works—Telegraphs (P.E.I. system) 3303 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (air brakes) 4136; (branch lines) 4135 (iii), 5620 (iv); (bridge strengthening) 4137 (iii); (coal contracts) 5611 (iv); (construction) 4130 (iii); (Guysborough branch) 676 (i); (SS. subsidies improvements) 5597 (iv); (working expenses) 4163 (iii).
Trade and Commerce (bounties act) 687 (i).
Supreme Court of Canada, Division *re* (Ques.) 547 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com. on Res., 2159; in Com., 3551 (ii).
Technical Education Commission, Report *re* (Ques.) 1202 (i).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy, B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6406, 6439 (iv).
Vale Ry. Lease Bill, and Acadia Coal Co., Legislation *re* (Ques.) 933 (i).
—— Operation by I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5612 (iv).
Venoit, Mr. Joseph, Complaints *re* Suspension, &c. (M. for cor.*) 1817 (i).

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*
Veterans of 1866-7, Bounties to (Ques.) 1202 (i).
See 'Fenian.'
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 6451 (iv).
Westville Public Buildings, Dismissal of Caretaker (remarks) in Com of Sup., 1531 (i).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C., *South Toronto.*
Barcelona Tramway, Light and Power Co. (B. 36) 1°*, 969 (i); in Com., 2410 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act (deposits) Amt. (B. 17) 1° m., 644 (i).
Dominion Trust Co.'s (B. 80) 1°*, 1862 (i); in Com., 4237 (iii).
G. T. Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6764 (iv).
G. T. Ry. Trainmen's Strike, Settlement of by late Govt., Judge Barron's Rep., &c. (Ques.) 2580 (ii).
Hudson Bay Ry. Contract, on M. (Mr. Neely) for O. Cs., 733 (i).
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act (aids) Amt. (B. 87) 1° m., 2058 (ii).
Mexican Interurban Electric Ry. Co.'s (B. 132) 1°*, 4835 (iii).
Moose Loyal Order incorp. (B. 158) in Com., 6126 (iv).
Patent Act (time limit) Amt. (B. 59) 1° m., 1020 (i).
Ry. Act (section men) Amt. (B. 86) 1° m., 2058 (ii).

MACLEAN, Mr. A. K., *Halifax.*
'Aboukir' Cruiser, Paying off of Crew (remarks) 408 (i).
Archives B. 66 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 1440 (i).
Baldwin, Mr. E., Dismissal from Customs at Coaticooke (M. for cor.) 1361 (i).
Bank Act Amt. B. 169 (Mr. White) in Com., 5846 (iv).
Barcelona Tramway Light and Power Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 2410 (ii).
Beaver Bank Station Mail Contract, Cancellation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6286 (iv).
Bedford Mail Contract, Cancellation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6616 (iv).
Biological Board of Canada B. 118 (Mr. Hazen) in Com., 4551 (iii).
Braine, Dr. Lawrence, Indian Medical Attendant at Chester, N.S., Dismissal &c. (Ques.) 4976 (iii).
B. C. Railway Belt, Unalienated Lands, O. C. *re* (remarks) 1200 (i).
Budget, The, 5011 (iii).
Can. Northern Ont. Ry. Subsidies, Guarantee, &c. (M. for papers*) 4781 (iii).

MACLEAN, Mr. A. K.—*Con.*
Canada Shipping Act (masters and mates) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Hazen) in Com. on Res., 5160 (iii).
Civil Service Act (private secretaries) Amt. B. 60 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 3344 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 3348; in Com., 3349 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 5264 (iii).
Census Enumerators, Delay *re* Compensation (remarks) 1199 (i).
Chester Canal, N.S., Discontinuance of Work (Ques.) 716 (i).
——— (remarks) 806 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2049 (ii).
Criminal Code (lumber) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Stevens) in Com., 2532 (ii).
Digby Clock Keeper, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3272 (ii).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1076 (i).
——— Ques. of Order, 1183 (i).
Dismissal of Public Officials (M. for papers, &c.) 878 (i).
See 'Inquiries B. 19.'
Elevator Men in Govt. Employ (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3244 (ii).
Estimates, Discussion of Irrelevant Subjects (remarks) on Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker), 2444 (ii).
Estimates, Suppl., Inquiry for, 1575 (i).
Fast Atlantic Service and Halifax Terminals, on M. for Sup., 4196, 4719 (iii), 6496 (iv).
Fishery Treaty with U. S., Withdrawal *re* (remarks) 408 (i).
Financial Review, 6707 (iv).
Fritz, Henry, Dismissal as Fishery Overseer (Ques.) 4977 (iii).
Goucher, Wesley, Lightkeeper at Margaretsville, N.S. Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 4977 (iii).
Govt. House Property, Toronto Sale B. 182 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 6181 (iv).
Govt. Loans, Amount, Rate of Interest, &c. (Ques.) 4777 (iii).
Guysborough Branch Ry. Co.'s Appropriation, on M. for Sup., 1460 (i).
Halifax Terminal Facilities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4196 (iii), 6496 (iv).
Ham, Robt., Dismissal from Trachoma Hospital, Halifax (Ques.) 875 (i).
Hawke, Mr. A., Apptmt. in Immigration Dept. on M. (Mr. Oliver) for O. C., 617 (i).
Hayden, W. W., Wharfinger at Digby, Dismissal of (M. for cor.*) 5957 (iv).
Hefferman, Mr. F. S., Dismissal from Customs, (Ques.) 4039 (iii).

MACLEAN, Mr. A. K.—*Con.*
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) on M. for 1°, 1572 (i); in Com., 3689 (ii).
House of Commons Desks, Change of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 623 (i).
Immigration Policy *re* Mar. Provs., on Prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2139 (ii).
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1300, 1420 (i).
I. C. R. Brotherhood Unions, Agreements, &c. (M. for papers) 793 (i).
——— Pullman Conductors, Promotions &c. (Ques.) 1413 (i).
——— Truro Station, Tenders *re* Construction (Ques.) 1412 (i).
Labour Gazette Correspondents, Dismissals, &c., on M. for Sup., 1443 (i).
Lawlor's Island Quarantine Station, Memorials, &c. (M. for copies*) 2460 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1531 (i).
Lobster Fishing Season in St. John, Date of Opening (Ques.) 722 (i).
Lobster Traps, Customs Change in Tariff on Twines (M. for papers) 1362 (i).
Lobster Twine Customs Duties, on M. for Sup. (remarks) 1070 (i).
McEachren, Mr. Charles, Dismissal from Tatamagouche Post Office (Ques.) 2243 (ii).
Mader, D., Dismissal from Mahone Post Office (Ques.) 722 (i).
Mail Contracts, Cancellation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6621 (iv).
Man. Boundaries B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 1°, 3906 (ii); in Com., 4524 (iii).
Medical Attendance free to Fishermen (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 680 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Res. from Board of Trade *re* Dismissal (Ques.) 1812 (i).
Mosher, Mr. G. A., Preventive Officer at Ship Harbour, Dismissal (Ques.) 4039 (iii).
N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1899 (i); 3446 (ii).
'Niobe' Cruiser, Repairs to (Ques.) 577 (i).
Nursery Stock, Purchase of Experimental Farm, N.S., (Ques.) 3333 (ii).
O'Brien, A. J., Dismissal from Immigration Office at Halifax (Ques.) 717 (i).
P. E. I. Subsidy B. 178 (Mr. White) in Com., 6124 (iv).
Quebec Boundaries Extension B. 151 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6174 (iv).
Railway Companies incorp. (B. 191) 1° m., 6492 (iv).
Returns, Inquiry for, 2056 (ii).
Revised Statutes, Correction *re* French Translation B. 65 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1438 (i).

MACLEAN, Mr. A. K.—*Con.*
Royal N. W. M. P., Annuties to families of Inspector Fitzgerald and others (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5176 (iii).
Spry Bay Post Office, Removal *re* (M. for cor*.) 582 (i).
——— (Ques.) 577 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Customs—Outside Ports (salaries) 1076; Marine Dept—(salaries) 1053 (i); Post Office (promotions) 6279 (iv).
Fisheries (lobster hatchery) 5256 (iii); (medical attendance, free) 680 (i).
Highways (subsidies) 6611 (iv).
Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 3305; (agents) 3918 (ii).
Labour Dept. (combines investigation act) 1501; (Gazette) 1476; (industrial training commission) 1527; (inspection dangerous machinery) 1527 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Australia) 4714; (Can. and Cuba) 4721; (Can. and G. B.) 4719 (iii); (Canada and Mexico) 5935 (iv); (Halifax and W. Indies) 4748; (Magdalen Islands) 4730; (St. John and Halifax) 4739 (iii); (St. John and W. Indies) 641 (i).
Militia (associations and bands) 5530 (iii). Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 5186, 5216 (iii).
Post Office (mail service) 6286; Outside Service (salaries) 6616, 6621 (iv).
Public Works—B. C. (generally) 2215 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (caretakers) 3293 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings, N.S. (Lawlor's Island) 1341; (Lunenburg) 1343; (Tracadie Lazeretto) 1531 (i).
Public Works—Ottawa—(H. of C. telephones) 3243 (ii); (observatory) 1322; (Sussex St.) 1322 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal P. O.) 1353 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Devil's Island) 2055 (ii); (dredging) 639 (i); (Yarmouth) 2056 (ii).
Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 677 (i).
Railways—I.C.R. (branch lines) 622; (Dartmouth branch) 670 (i); (Halifax docks) 5596, 5601 (iv).
R.N.W.M.P. (pay of force, &c.) 5176 (iii).
Trade and Commerce (bounties on steel and iron) 5934 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2621; in Com., 2997, 3043, 3548 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Currie) 3617 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Lennox) 3618 (ii).
Tariff Commission, Legislation *re* (remarks) 938 (i).
Trade Relations between W. Indies Australia and Canada, on M. (Mr. Pugsley) to Com. of Sup., 2002 (ii).
United Shoe Machinery Co.'s Appeal (Ques.) 6783 (iv).

MACLEAN, Mr. W. F., *South York, Ont.*
Budget, The, 5041 (iii).
Cable Rates, Parcel Post, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lemieux) to M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 4097 (iii).
Cement supplied to Ry. Dept., Tenders, Contract Price, &c. (Ques.) 4244 (iii).
Combines Act, *re* Companies, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1516 (i).
Companies, Over-capitalization of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1516 (i).
Dom. Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 1°, 645 (i).
Govt. Ownership: *See* 'Cable Rates,' 'Parcel,' 'Public Ownership,' 'Ry. Rates.'
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 2°, 2172; in Com., 2199, 2317, 3472 (ii), 4063 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4424; on Amt. (Mr. Béland) to M. for 3°, 4946 (iii).
Man. Bill, Correction *re* Voting (remarks) 4984 (iii).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, and M. (Mr. Borden) to adjn. debate, 1630 (i).
Parcel Post, Extension of System (amt.) on M. for Sup., 2329 (ii).
Public Ownership of Public Utilities, on M. for Sup., 645 (i).
Railway Rates, Transportation, &c., on M. for Sup., 1902 (i).
——— Notice of Discussion, 1494 (i).
Reciprocity in Trade (remarks) on M. for Sup., 645 (i).
SUPPLY—
Labour Dept. (combines act) 1516 (i).
Trade and Commerce (annuities act) 688; (bounties act) 687 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com. on Res., 2158; in Com., 2959 (ii).
United Shoe Co.'s Machinery, Investigation, Application to Min. of Justice *re* (Ques.) 3148 (ii).
——— Proceedings *re* (Ques.) 2455 (ii).
Volunteer Bounty Act, 1908, Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Rogers) on M. for 1°, 4975 (iii).

MACNUTT, Mr. T., *Saltcoats.*
Adams, William Hollaway Relief (B. 122) 1°*, 4457 (iii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 3°, 4810 (iii).
G.T.P. Ry. Strike and Board of Conciliation (M. for cor.*) 3756 (ii).
Guarantee Life Insurance Co. of Canada incorp. (B. 154) 1°*, 5400 (iii).
Hudson Bay Railway Construction, on M. (Mr. Aikins) for Papers, 1258 (i).
Isaac, Isabell, Relief (B. 131) 1°*, 4835 (ii).

MacNUTT, Mr. T.—*Con.*
Railway Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 2°, 2524 (ii).
Sutherland, George McKay, Relief (B. 153) 1°*, 5400 (iii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2749 (ii).

McCRANEY, Mr. G. E., *Saskatoon.*
Bank Act. Amt. B. 169 (Mr. White) in Com., 5855 (iv).
Broderick Post Office, Change of Name (M. for cor.*) 5263 (iii).
Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 98) 1°*, 2664 (ii); in Com., 5198 (iii).
Coal in the West, Remission of duties (remarks) 178, 230 (i).
Drill Halls, in the West, Donation of Lands *re* Sites (Ques.) 1815 (i).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 2°, 2179; in Com., 2201, 3790 (ii); 4043, 4155; on M. for 3° (amt.) 4803 (iii).
Grain Congestion in the Northwest (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5760 (iv).
International Guarantee Co.'s incorp. (B. 148) 1°*, 5257 (iii).
Moosejaw Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2208 (ii).
Parcel Post Extension, on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 2349 (ii).
Prime Minister's Visit to Archbishop of Quebec, &c. (Ques.) 534 (i).
Railways in Man. and N.W., Subsidies &c. (M. for stmnt.*) 562 (i).
Railway Rates, Transportation, &c. on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1934 (i).
St. Aldwyn Post Office, Change of Name from Broderick P.O., Cor. &c. (read) on M. for Sup., 5922 (iv).
Supply—
Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 5764 (iv).
Wheeler, Seager, Congratulations *re* Prize Wheat at N.Y. Exhibition (Ques.) 542 (i).

McCREA, Mr. F. N., *Sherbrooke.*
Criminal Code (lumber) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Stevens) in Com., 2534 (ii).
Eastern Township, Field for Immigrants (remarks) 6557 (iv).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6267 (iv).
Immigration into Eastern Townships (remarks) 6557 (iv).
Postmasters, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6631 (iv).
Supply—
Militia (automobiles) 5518 (iii).

McCREA, Mr. F. N.—*Con.*
Supply—*Con.*
Post Office—Outside Service (salaries) 6631 (iv).

McCOIG, Mr. A. B., *West Kent.*
Kennedy, John Angus Relief (B. 164) M. 1°*, 5549 (iii).
Supply—
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Wheatley Creek) 640 (i).

McCURDY, Mr. F. B., *Shelburne & Queens.*
Fast Atlantic Service and Halifax Terminals, on M. for Sup., 6506 (iv).
Halifax Terminal Facilities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4203 (iii).
Mail Subsidies *re* W. Indies Service, Establishment by Dom. Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 685 (i).
Supply—
Railways—I.C.R. (branch lines) 5634 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2933 (ii).
Trade Relations between Canada, Australia and W. Indies, on M. (Mr. Pugsley) to Com. of Sup., 2004 (ii).

McKAY, Mr. J., *Prince Albert.*
Freight Rates on Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3233 (ii).
Hudson Bay Railway Construction, on M. (Mr. Aikins) for Papers, 1232 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. Neely) for O.Cs., &c., 740 (i).
Keewatin Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation, incorp. (B. 70) 1°*, 1410 (i).
Northern Territorial Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 82) 1°*, 1862 (i).
Railway Rates, Transportation, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1930 (i).
Saskatchewan Life Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 26) 1°*, 794 (i).
Saskatchewan Power Co.'s (B. 83) 1°*, 1862 (i).

McKENZIE, Mr. D. D., *North Cape Breton.*
Address, The, (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt., 178 (i).
Alder Point Lobster Hatchery, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 3053 (ii).
Apples and Fruit Growing in N.S., Resolution of Fruit Growers' Ass'on. *re* Industry (remarks) 1719 (i).
Battlefields Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5303 (iii).
Bras d'Or Lakes SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5936 (iv).
British Mails, Landing at North Sydney, Tests *re* (Ques.) 5948 (iv).

McKENZIE, Mr. D. D.—*Con.*
Canada Shipping Act (masters and mates) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Hazen) in Com., 5403 (iii).
Christmas Adjournment (remarks) 703 (i).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 4582 (iii).
Civil Service Commission, Attack *re* Apptmts. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2834 (ii).
Clock Towers in Public Buildings, N.S., Votes *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1344 (i).
Continental Can Co.'s Patent Relief B. 119 (Mr. Fripp) in Com., 5205 (iii).
Day, Luke, Dismissal, &c. (M. for cor.*) 2861 (ii).
Dismissals, Generally (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5803 (iv).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1158 (i).
See 'Inquiries B. 19.'
Dismissals from Public Works, Investigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3251 (ii).
Estmere to Baddeck Branch Ry., Tenders *re* (M. for cor.*) 1589 (i).
Exchequer Court Act (judges) Amt. B. 168 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5893 (iv).
Fast Atlantic Service and Halifax Terminals, on M. for Sup., 6521 (iv).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6457 (iv).
Gillies, Cap., Dismissal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3261 (ii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2563, 3507, 3767 (ii).
Grand Narrows Canal, Obstruction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5678 (iv).
Guysborough Branch Ry. Appropriation, on M. for Sup., 1456 (i).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3710 (ii).
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1301, 1416 (i).
I. C. R., Estende to Baddeck Branch Line Tenders *re* (Ques.) 576 (i).
——— Estmere to Baddeck Branch Line, Surveys, Tenders, &c. (M. for papers) 2494 (ii).
——— 'Market Tickets' to Employees (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5809 (iv).
Judges Act (additional) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5409 (iii).
Kidson's Island Lighthouse, Tenders *re* &c. (Ques.) 3054 (ii).
Lighthousekeepers, Investigation *re* Charges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5234 (iii).

McKENZIE, Mr. D. D.—*Con.*
Live Stock Records Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 6034 (iv).
McDonald, Dr. D., Dismissal from Indian Reserve, Baddeck (M. for cor.*) 2861 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4345; in Com., 4621 (iii).
National Ports (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2838 (ii).
N. T. Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1876 (i).
North Sydney Harbour Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5223 (iii).
Postmasters, Dismissal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6644 (iv).
Postmasters, Rural, Increase of Salary (remarks) 3060 (ii).
Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 105 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 3362 (ii).
Public Works in Cape Breton County, Appropriations omitted from Estimates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2800 (ii).
Public Works in Cape Breton, Tenders *re* (remarks) 805 (i).
Public Works, Votes for last year, Continuation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1340 (i).
Ry. Mail Clerks, Inquiry for Answer to Question, 5561 (iv).
Rambaut, Thomas D., Patent Relief B. 84 (Mr. Ames) in Com., 3489 (ii).
Revillon Freres Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 114 (Mr. Barker) in Com., 5203 (iii).
St. Patrick's Channel Lighthouse (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5238 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture—Experimental Farms (branch stations) 6477; Miscellaneous (Toronto exhibition) 6481 (iv).
Excise (inspectors) 5825 (iv).
Fisheries (cold storage for bait) 6653 (iv); (protection service) 5386 (iii).
Immigration (agencies, &c.) 3309, 3916 (ii).
Labour Dept. (Gazette) 1475; (industrial training commission) 1527; (inspection *re* dangerous machinery) 1526 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aid to navigation) 5238; (salaries) 5232 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Baddeck, &c.) 4714; (Bras d'Or Lakes) 4734; (Can. and Newfoundland) 4725; (Halifax and Nfld.) 4727 (iii); (North Sydney) 679 (i); (Sydney and Wycocomagh) 4740 (iii).
Marine (steamboat inspection) 5238 (iii).
Militia (armouries) 5544; (associations and bands) 5535; (customs dues) 5523 (iii).
Miscellaneous (honoraria *re* pelagic sealing) 5811 (iv).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5372 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 5186; (life saving awards) 5228; (live stock inspection) 5229; (registration) 5229 (iii).

McKENZIE, Mr. D. D.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (caretakers) 3293 (ii); (generally) 1340 (i); (rents, &c.) 3290 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Baddeck) 6658 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (leases) 1324 (i); (water supply) 3294 (ii).
Public Works—Telegraphs (Cape Breton) 2817; (Wood Mountain) 2821; (working expenses) 3302 (ii).
Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 5765, 6607 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 4137; (Chatham diversion) 4139 (iii); (extensions) 673 (i), 5641; (Moncton shops) 5607; (refrigator cars) 5603; (Sydney diversion) 5658 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (annuities act) 691 (i).
Weights and Measures (inspectors) 5829 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2873, 3551 (ii), 4080 (iii).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6423 (iv).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 6453 (iv).
Wadge, Thomas, Patent Relief B. 16 (Mr. Aikins) in Com., 2983 (ii).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Harbour Commissioners incorp. B. 138 (Mr. Hazen) in Com., 5989 (iv).

McLEAN, Mr. A. A., *Queens, P.E.I.*
Immigration Policy *re* Mar. Provs., on prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2142 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Settlement *re*, on M. (Mr. Macdonald) for Cor., 786 (i).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1620 (i).
P.E.I. Subsidy B. 178 (Mr. White) in Com., 6140 (iv).
P.E.I. Winter Service, Car Ferry, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5207 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 5196, 5207 (iii).
Universal Eyesight Insurance incorp. (B. 126) 1°*, 4835 (iii); in Com., 5907, 5940 (iv).

McLEAN, Mr. H. H., *Sunbury and Queens, N.B.*
St. John Ry. Co.'s Crossing at Haymarket Square, on M. (Mr. Pugsley) for Cor., 1405 (i).

McMILLAN, Mr. J. A., *Glengarry.*
McRae, Mr. F. D., Pets. *re* Clemency (Ques.) 713 (i).

MARCILE, Mr. J. E., *Bagot.*
Mail Contracts, Cancellation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6641 (iv).

MARCILE, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—
Excise (inspectors) 5812 (iv).

MARSHALL, Mr. D., *East Elgin.*
Budget, The, 5102 (iii).
Freight Rates on Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3226 (ii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2731; in Com., 3046 (ii).

MARTIN, Mr. M., *Montreal, St. Mary's.*
Budget, The, 5154 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Bonds, Govt. Guarantees, &c. (Ques.) 4247 (iii).
Ministers from Quebec, Statements at St. Eustache ,Election Campaign Meetings (Ques.) 553 (i).

MARTIN, Mr. W. M., *Regina.*
Address, The, 464 (i).
Armoury at Regina, Erection of (Ques.) 580 (i).
British Western Loan Co.'s incorp. (B. 101) 1°*, 3049 (ii).
Car Shortage *re* Grain Shipments (remarks) 802 (i).
Census Enumerators at Regina, Instructions, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) for stmnt., 564 (i).
Census of Saskatchewan, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 5261 (iii).
——— Inquiry for, 4983 (iii).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 4579 (iii).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6456 (iv).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 2°, 2170; in Com., 2563, 3182, 3491, 3767 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4808; on Amt. (Mr. Cash) 4816 (iii).
High River, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 81) 1°*, 1862 (i).
Leigh, Mr. W. M., Dismissal from Kirkton Post Office (Ques.) 5949 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Amt. (Mr. Oliver) 4687, 4701 (iii).
Morine, A. B., Charges *re* Candidate in last Election (Ques.) 6185, 6335 (iv).
Mounted Police, Increase *re* Pay (remarks) 4743 (iii).
Natural Resources, Provincial Control of in the West, Promise *re* (Ques.) 553 (i).
Pacific Trans-Canada and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 52) 1°*, 970 (i).
Provincial Boundaries, Res. from Leg. of Saskatchewan, *re* Negotiations for transfer of Resources (Ques.) 2577 (ii).
Reciprocity Treaty, ref. to in debate on Address, 466 (i).

MARTIN, Mr. W. M.—*Con.*
Saskatchewan Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 146) 1°*, 5257 (iii).
Seed Grain Distribution, Res. from Board of Trade of Wilcox (remarks) 2299 (ii).
SUPPLY.
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Regina) 2212 (ii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2728 (ii).
Tariff Commission, ref. to in debate on Address, 465 (i).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 6453 (iv).
Voters' Lists, Preparation of by Federal Govt., Stmnt. of Minister of the Interior (Ques.) 553 (i).
Western Dom. Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 125) 1°*, 4835 (iii).

MEIGHEN, Mr. A., *Portage la Prairie.*
Barcelona Tramway Light and Power Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 2410 (ii).
Clarkboro, Sask., C. N. R. Right of Way, Title *re* (Ques.) 934 (i).
Cockshutt Plough Co., Prices *re* (remarks) 817 (i).
Freight Rates on Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3220 (ii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2189, 2321, 3475, 3506, 3783, 4046 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4810, 4814 (iii).
Lumber Duties, Interpretation and Enforcement, on M. (Mr. Knowles) for Papers, 602 (i).
Ne Temere Decree, Power of Parlt. (remarks) *re* Questions, 798 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4286 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Cor. *re* Ont. Govt. (M. for copies*) 2459 (ii).
N.T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1870 (i); 3414 (ii).
N.T.Ry. (P.C. judgment) B. 95 (Mr. White) on M. for 2°, 3090 (ii).
Ontario and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s B. 50 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 2414 (ii).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 4774 (iii).
Railway Act (farm crossings) Amt. (B. 7) 1°m., 267 (i); 2°m., 2500 (ii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2689; in Com., 2876, 2978, 3022, 3545-8 (ii).
Universal Eyesight Co.'s incorp. B. 126 (Mr. McLean) in Com., 5908 (iv).
Wadge, Thomas, Patent Relief B. 16 (Mr. Aikins) in Com., 2854, 2983; on M. for 3°, 3281 (ii).

MICHAUD, Mr. P., *Victoria, N.B.*
Laforce, Mr. J. E., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3535 (ii).
Railway Bridges, N.B., Subsidy B. 188 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6378 (iv).
Senatorship from Mar. Prov., Pet. *re* French Apptmt. (remarks) 2755 (ii).
St. John Valley Ry., Contract *re* (Ques.) 577 (i).
——— Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 2460 (ii).
St. John Valley Ry. Subsidy, Contract to Grand Falls (Ques.) 4977 (iii).
SUPPLY.
Immigration (agencies) 3915 (ii).

MIDDLEBRO, Mr. W. S., *North Grey.*
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Taylor) to conc., 2847 (ii).
Dismissal of Public Officials, on M. (Mr. Carvell) for Papers, 956 (i).
Fenian **Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr.** Hughes) in Com., 6268 (iv).
N.T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1880 (i).
N.T.Ry. (P.C. judgment) B. 95 (Mr. White) on M. for 2°, 3069 (ii).
Public Accounts Com. (Diamond Light Co. &c.) 2nd Rep. (M.) to conc., 5832 (iv).
——— 3rd Rep. (M.) to adopt., Ordering Attendance of Mr. R. C. Miller, 6333 (iv).
——— 4th Rep. (presented) 6492 (iv).
——— 5th Rep. (presented) 6732 (iv).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. on Res., 5911 (iv).
Rambaut, Thomas D., Patent Relief B. 84 (Mr. Ames) in Com., 3489 (ii).
Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5911 (iv).
SUPPLY.
Naval Service (maintenance) 5325 (iii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, (M.) to adjn. debate, 2664; resmd. debate, 2668; in Com., 2880, 3546 (ii).
Trade Relations between Canada, Australia and West Indies, on M. (Mr. Pugsley) to Com. of Sup., 2002 (ii).

MOLLOY, Mr. J. P., *Provencher.*
Can. Northern Ry. Bridge at Morris, Representations *re* Objections (Ques.) 2587 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 4596 (iii).
Man. Boundaries, Conference *re* Separate Schools (Ques.) 715 (i).
——— Eastern and Western Line, &c. (Ques.) 971 (i).
Parliament, Duration of Present Redistribution Bill, &c., Stmnt. by Hon. Mr. Taylor (Ques.) 557, 715 (i).

MONDOU, Mr. A. A., *Yamaska.*
Abenakis Indian Agent, Apptmt., Salary &c. (Ques.) 1587 (i).
Address, The, 263, 270 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4455; in Com., (amt.) 4656; on M. for 3° (amt.) 4839; Neg. (Y. 24; N. 160) 4924 (iii).
—— Notice of Amt., 4537 (iii).
Naval Bill, Repeal of, &c. (Ques.) 3942 (ii), 4242 (iii).
Naval Policy of Govt., ref. to in debate on Address, 270 (i).
Yamaska Electoral Agent, (Ques.) 1584 (i).

MONK, Hon. F. D., (Minister of Public Works) *Jacques Cartier.*
Address, The, on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 223 (i).
Adjournment of House, *re* defective Electric Light (M.) 267 (i).
Anse aux Canards Breakwater, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 878 (i).
Antigonish Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2022 (ii).
Appropriations omitted from Estimates, 1912, on M. (Mr. Sinclair) for Ret., 1819 (i).
Art Gallery, Purchase of Paintings (Ans.) 1865 (i).
See 'National.'
Bassano Post Office, Pet. *re* Construction (Ans.) 5557 (iv).
Beauchemin, J. A., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3337 (ii).
Bissett, Geo. E., Dismissal from Govt. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1536 (i).
Bridge Works at Fraserville, Interview with Messrs. LeBel and Riou (Ans.) 549 (i).
Buildings leased by Govt., Rentals, &c. (Ans.) 1358 (i).
Cabinet Dissensions (remarks) in debate on Address, 233 (i).
Campeau, Michel, Dismissals from St. Louis du Mile End (Ans.) 1414 (i).
Canso Public Buildings, Dismissal of Caretaker (remarks) 581 (i).
Cap de la Magdeleine Ry. Co.'s B. 43 (Mr. Paquet) in Com., 2014 (ii).
Carrier Laine Property at Levis, Rental, &c. (Ans.) 732 (i).
Chance Harbour, N.B., Improvements *re* (Ans.) 555 (i).
Cedar Rapids Power Co., Water Power Concessions to, *re* St. Lawrence River, &c. (Ans.) 728 (i).
Chapel Cove Breakwater, Pet. *re* Extension (Ans.) 1585 (i).
Charles Forest's Cove Breakwater, Contract *re* Construction (Ans.) 1584 (i).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2040 (ii).

MONK, Hon. F. D.—*Con.*
Chats Falls Timber Slide, Date of Deed, &c. (Ans.) 4549 (iii).
Chauvin, Hector, K.C., Apptmt. as Investigation *re* Public Works Dept., 1414 (i).
Chester Canal, Discontinuance of Work, (Ans.) 716 (i).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2050 (ii).
Civil Service Commission, Apptmts. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2835 (ii).
See 'Dismissals,' 'Ducharme,' &c.
Coal, Canadian used for Govt. Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3286 (ii).
Clocks in Towers of Public Buildings, N.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1345 (i).
Collingwood Dry Dock Subsidy B. 111 (M.) for Com. on Res., 3343, in Com. on Res., 3450, 1* of Bill, 3451; 2° m., 3633 (ii).
Courtenay Bay Harbour Works, Contracts *re* (remarks) 4743 (iii).
See 'St. John.'
Dauphin Custom House (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3244 (ii).
Decoste, Capt. Peter, Dismissal from Dredge Cape Breton (Ans.) 548 (i).
—— defective answer (remarks) 804 (i).
—— on M. (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) for Cor., 1270 (i).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3262 (ii).
Deschamps, Raoul, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 2667 (ii).
—— (remarks) 6278 (iv).
Dismissals from Govt. Offices (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1956 (i), 2018 (ii).
See 'Inquiries B. 19,' 'Ottawa.'
—— Official Inquiry in Hull (remarks) 4140 (iii).
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amt. (B. 180) in Com. on Res., 6047; 1°*, 5939; 2°*, in Com., 6201 (iv).
Ducharme, Mr., Attack of ex-P. M. G. *re* Appmt. to Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2832 (ii).
—— Resignation *re* (Ans.) 4979 (iii).
Dumelong, Mr. E., Dismissal from L'Assomption P. O. (Ans.) 720 (i).
Dunn, Albert, Charges *re* Political Partisanship (Ans.) 4039 (iii).
East River, Pictou County, Deepening, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2021 (ii).
Eganville Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ans.) 725 (i).
Elevator Men Employed by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3244 (ii).
Estimates, Discussion of Irrelevant Subjects (remarks) *re* Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker), 2444 (ii).
Excavators purchased from Mr. Harris, &c. (Ans.) 559 (i).

MONK, Hon. F. D.—*Con.*
Fraserville Wharf and Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 3150 (ii).
Gaspe Landing Pier, Appropriation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2788 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal, Govt. Construction *re* (Ans.) 544 (i).
Gooseberry Cove, N.B., Improvements *re* (Ans.) 555 (i).
Govt. Works Tolls Act Amt. (B. 103) in Com., 3450 (ii).
See 'Timber.'
Guillemette, Mr. N., Dismissal &c. (Ans.) 1210 (i).
Harbours and Rivers Works, Policy *re* Tendering (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2044 (ii).
House of Commons, Desks, Change of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 623 (i).
—— Improvements in Acoustics (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1336 (i).
—— Parliamentary Restaurant, Payment to Waiters (Ans.) 2861 (ii).
—— Telephones in H. of C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3243, 3539 (ii).
Ice-Breaker at St. Gerard, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 2452 (ii).
Ile Bezard and Ste. Genevieve Wharfs, Completion of Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 557 (i).
Imperial Naturalization, Uniformity in Can., on M. (Mr. Macdonald) to Com. of Sup., 2427 (ii).
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1299 (i).
I. C. Ry., Passes to Employees, Instructions *re* Newspaper Reporters, &c. (remarks) 2329 (ii).
—— Ocean Limited Express, Hauling Private Cars (remarks) on conc., 6776 (iv).
Inverness Public Building, Dismissal of Caretaker (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1535 (i).
Kelley's Cove Breakwater, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 3340 (ii).
Kennedy, Mr., Charges *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2020 (ii).
Kennie, Capt. Edmund, Dismissal (Ans.) 6782 (iv).
L'Achigan Ice Breaker, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 2295 (ii).
Lalonde, Mr. Alfred, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 4779 (iii).
Lapointe, Mr. Joseph, Apptmt. as Overseer at Lake Aylmer (Ans.) 4550 (iii).
Larry's River Dredging, Apptmt. of Inspector (Ans.) 5055 (iii).
L'Assomption Public Works, Votes in Estimates (Ans.) 5951, 6781 (iv).
L'Assomption Wharf, Appropriation for (Ans.) 2451, 2579 (ii).

MONK, Hon. F. D.—*Con.*
Laurentides Public Building, Acquisition of Property (Ans.) 2451 (ii).
Lemieux, Hon. R., late P.M.G., Par. in 'Le Devoir' *re* Dismissals (Ans.) 2665 (ii).
Lethbridge Armoury, Site *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2210 (ii).
Lethbridge Post Office, Plans, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 728 (i).
Little Anse Harbour (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2043 (ii).
Live Stock Records Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 6025 (iv).
Lorneville Cove, Tests *re* Foundations (Ans.) 555 (i).
Lowe, Mr. R., Emplymt. by Govt., Leave of Absence, &c. (Ans.) 3754 (ii).
McLennan, Mr., Dismissal from Inverness Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2017 (ii).
Magdalen Islands Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3277 (ii).
Maisonneuve Postal Station, Erection of (Ans.) 550 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4407; in Com., 4548; on Amt. (Mr. Mondou) to M. for 3°, 4903 (iii).
Man. School Bill, ref. to in debate on Address, 226, 231 (i).
Maritime Telephone Co. and P.E.I. System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3304 (ii).
Melford, N.S. Public Wharf, Notice to suspend (Ans.) 549 (i).
Military Stores Building, Contract *re* Racks (Ans.) 533 (i).
Montreal Dry Dock, Contract *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3301 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Dismissals, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1961 (i).
Moosejaw Armoury, Construction *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2040, 2207 (ii).
Moosejaw Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2440 (ii).
Napierville Post Office Site, Purchase of (remarks) 2374, 3153 (ii).
National Art Gallery, Purchase of Paintings, &c. (Ans.) 6184, 6337 (iv).
—— Presentation of Oil Painting by H.R.H. Princess Louise (announcement) 5056 (iii).
National Ports (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2837 (ii).
Naval Policy (remarks) in debate on Address, 234 (i).
Naval Question, Speech of Hon. Mr. Monk at Hull (Ans.) 551 (i).
New Harbour Breakwater (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2045 (ii).

MONK, Hon. F. D.—*Con.*
Ontario and Minnesota Pulp and Paper Co., Prohibition *re* Grinding Machines (remarks) 2060 (ii).
Ottawa Dismissals, Investigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3262 (ii).
See 'Dismissals,' &c.
Ottawa Plaza, Fences and Posters, Responsibility *re* (Ans.) 876 (i).
See 'Sussex St.,' 'Supply—Buildings—Ottawa.'
Petawawa Public Wharf, Tenders *re*, Contract awarded (Ans.) 532 (i).
Petite Lameque Wharf, Construction *re* (Ans.) 1358 (i).
Pink Rock Wharf, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 4257 (iii).
Point Aux Anglais Drainage Works (Ans.) 4778 (iii).
Port Hawkesbury Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1345 (i), 2016 (ii).
Port Richmond Breakwater, Contract *re* Construction (Ans.) 1585 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2044 (ii).
Prince Rupert Dry Dock, Subsidy, Completion, &c. (Ans.) 1811 (i).
Printing Bureau, Policy of Govt. *re* Erection (Ans.) 546 (i).
Privy Council Chamber, Improvements *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1340 (i).
Public Buildings in Alberta and Sask., Purchase of Sites, Govt. Policy *re* (Ans.) 2069 (ii).
Public Expenditures, Scandals, &c., by late Govt. (remarks) in debate on Address, 231 (i).
Public Works in Cape Breton, Tenders *re* (remarks) 805 (i).
Public Works in N.B., Appropriations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2436 (ii).
Public Works Contracts *re* (Ans.) 559 (i).
Public Works Contracts given without tender (Ans.) 877 (i).
Public Works Expenditure for last ten years in Different Provs. (Ans.) 2064 (ii).
Public Works Employees, Dismissal of workmen (Ans.) 2584 (ii).
Public Works, Engineering Branch (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1058-9 (i).
Public Works now under construction, Approval of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 621 (i).
Public Works, Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1343 (i).
——— Purchases for Public Works, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 1204 (i).
——— (remarks) 1579 (i).
Public Works, Suspension of, Names and Locations, &c. (Ans.) 530 (i).

MONK, Hon. F. D.—*Con.*
Public Works, Votes for last year, Continuation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1340 (i).
Quebec Bridge, Reconstruction, Reps., Plans, Tenders, &c., on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Papers, 1402 (i).
Quebec Dry Dock, Construction *re* (Ans.) 4260 (iii).
——— (remarks) 6785 (iv).
——— Rep. *re* Subsidy (remarks) 6493 (iv).
Quebec Harbour Board, removal of Members (Ans.) 560 (i).
Reciprocity Treaty, (remarks) in debate on Address, 231 (i).
Reid, Mr. Watson E., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1528 (i).
Returns, on Inquiry for, 4460 (iii), 6494 (iv).
Rideau Hall Improvements, Amount expended from 1896 to 1911 (Ans.) 876 (i).
——— Amount expended *re* H.R.H. Occupency (Ans.) 547 (i).
——— Lighting and Heating (remarks) *re* Com. of Sup., 3234 (ii).
——— Stmnt. *re* Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 727 (i).
Rivière des Prairies, Drainage, Continuation of, &c. (Ans.) 715 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 621 (i).
Roy, Wm., Charges *re*, Rep., &c., on M. (Mr. Boulay) for Papers, 1394 (i).
St. André Wharf, Discontinuance of Work *re* (Ans.) 724 (i).
St. Jacques de l'Achigan Post Office Site (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2442 (ii).
St. Jean and Iberville Bridge, Amount voted *re* Construction (Ans.) 551 (i).
St. John Harbour, Tugs employed, Amount paid per day (Ans.) 548 (i).
St. John Harbour Works, Contract *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3295 (ii).
St. John and Courtenay Bay Contract, Signing, &c. (remarks) 6187 (iv).
See 'Courtenay.'
St. Vallier Wharf, Award of Contract, &c. (Ans.) 2068 (ii).
Separate Schools: *See* 'Man. Boundaries B. 115.'
Shediac Island Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2373 (ii).
Sorel Deep Water Wharfs, Contracts *re* (Ans.) 2859 (ii).
——— Claim of Mr. Lariviere for Timber supplied (Ans.) 3535 (ii).
Speaker, Mr., Congratulation *re* Reading prayers in French, 1808 (i).
Stenographic Assistance for Members (remarks) 1848 (i).
Storey, Wm., Dismissal, Investigation, &c. (Ans.) 5055 (iii).

MONK, Hon. F. D.—*Con.*
SUPPLY.
Civil Govt.—Conservation Commission (salaries) 1069 (i); Inland Revenue (promotions) conc., 6771 (iv); Marine Dept. (salaries) 1050 (i); Public Works (private secretary) conc., 6779 (iv); Public Works (salaries) 1064 (i).
Labour Dept. (Gazette) 1469 (i).
Miscellaneous (art gallery) 2825 (ii).
Public Works—Bridges (Ottawa river) 6806 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Calgary) 2204; (Edmonton) 2206; (Lethbridge) 2212; (Strathcona) 2213 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (generally) 2215 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (caretakers) 3293; (furniture) 3286 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings, N.B. (Hampton) 1527; (Hillsboro) 1528; (St. John quarantine) 1530 (i); (Shediac) conc., 6794 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings, N.S. (Lawlor's Island) 1341; (Lunenburg) 1343; (Tracadie Lazeretto) 1530; (Wolfville) 1343 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Gananoque) 1855; (Kingston R.M.C.) 1855; (Midland) 1855; (Port Arthur) 1951; (Renfrew) 1953; (Seaforth) 1953; (Sudbury) 1954; (Toronto warehouse) 1964 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Eastern Block addition) 1339 (i); (electric power) 3286 (ii); (examining warehouse) 1949 (i); (furniture) 3279; (grounds) 3239; (heating, &c.) 3278 (ii); (leases) 1324; (library improvements) 1950 (i); (lighting) 3291 (ii); (observatory) 1321 (i); (rents, &c.) 3290; (Rideau Hall furniture) 3285; (site for new buildings) 3242; (snow cleaning) 3279 (ii); (Sussex St.) 1322 (i); (water supply) 3295 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Lachine) 1346, 1953; (Lévis armoury) 1346 (i); (Louiseville) conc., 6795 (iv); (Maisonneuve) 1347; (Montreal barracks) 1350; (Montreal customs) 1351; (Montreal P. O. enlargement) 1348; (Montreal postal station F) 1352; (Napierville) 1354; (Quebec customs house) 1849; (Quebec drill hall) 1849; (Quebec P.O.) 1851; (Rigaud) 1852; (St. Lambert) 1853 (i); (St. Laurent) 6804 (iv); (St. Thérèse) 1854; (Shawinigan) 1852; (Sherbrooke) 1853; (Three Rivers) 1854 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 2204; (Humboldt) 2211; (Regina) 2212; (Weyburn) 2213 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Alta. (Athabaska river) 2815; (Edmonton) 2816 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Generally (repairs, &c.) 3235 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (repairs, &c.) 2814 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (creosoted timber) 2440 (ii); (dredging) 2816 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (Bathurst) 2363 (ii); (Beaumont) 2366; (generally) 2368; (Goose Creek) 2373 (ii); (St. John) 627 (i); (St. John dry dock) 3297 (ii); (Sackville) conc., 6805 (iv).

MONK, Hon. F. D.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Arichat) 2040; (Bayfield) 2041; (Blue Rocks Island) 2041; (Burke's Head) 2045; (Cape Breton) 2053; (Cole Harbour) 2055; (Cow Bay) 2055; (Devil's Island) 2056 (ii); (dredging) 639 (i); (Gillis Point) 2056; (Inverness) 2056; (Melford) 2056; (repairs, &c.) 2051; (Yarmouth) 2056 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (French River) conc., 6777 (iv); (Toronto harbour) 2445 (ii); (Wheatley Creek) 640 (i); (York bridge) 2817 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Levis graving dock) 3296; (Quebec Harbour) 2836; (Rivieres des Prairies) 2441; (St. Charles River) 2837; (Three Rivers) 2441 (ii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (monuments) 2823; (Temiskaming dam) 2827 (ii).
Public Works—Telegraphs—Alta. and Saskn. (Athabasca Landing) 2819; (Fort McMurray) 2819; (Moose to Durlingford) 2820; (North Battleford) 2823; (Peace River) 2822; (Wood Mountain) 2821 (ii).
Public Works—Telegraphs, Generally 3303; (repairs, &c.) 2817; (working expenses) 3303 (ii).
Public Works—Telegraphs, N.S. (Cape Breton) 2817 (ii).
Public Works—Telegraphs (P.E.I. system) 3304 (ii); conc., 6794 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraphs (Gaspé) 3305; (Magdalen Islands) 3302 (ii).
Public Works—Telegraphs (Yukon system) 3303 (ii).
Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 623 (i).

Sussex St. Property, Purchase by Govt., Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 1359 (i).
—— Explanation (Mr. Pugsley) 2010 (ii).
Sutherland, Mr. Roderick, Dismissal of (remarks) 1274 (i).
—— *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2019 (ii).
Swift Current Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3268 (ii).
Temiskaming Dam, on Inquiry for Ret., 6662 (iv).
Tolls for Timber on Govt. Works (B. 103) 1°m., 3049 (ii).
See 'Govt. Tolls B. 103.'
Tower Clock, Repairs to (remarks) 1575 (i).
—— (explanation) in reference to repairs, 1708 (i).
Vegreville and Lloydminister Public Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2214 (ii).
Victoria Memorial Museum, Number of Employees, Dismissals, &c. (Ans.) 2294 (ii).
Waterways Commissioners, Dismissal and Apptmts., on M. (Mr. Pugsley) to Com. of Sup., 6705 (iv).
Weedon Public Building, Construction, &c. (Ans.) 4550 (iii).

MONK, Hon. F. D.—*Con.*
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 6492 (iv).
Westville Public Building, Dismissal of Caretaker (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1531 (i).
Wharfs, Total Expenditure for ten years (Ans.) 1812 (i).
Wright County Public Works Employees, Dismissal of (Ans.) 551 (i).
Yarmouth Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3274 (ii).

MORPHY, Mr. H. B., *North Perth.*
Agricultural Committee, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Best) *re* Par. in Toronto 'Globe,' 2156 (ii).
Cattle diseased, Compensation *re* Damages (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6471 (iv).
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5882 (iv).
Dairying Industry in Canada, Complaints *re* Weighing (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5740 (iv).
Farmers Bank Failure, Inquiry by Chief Justice Meredith (remarks) 6710 (iv).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6459 (iv).
G.T.Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6757 (iv).
Live Stock Records Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 6043 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2° (remarks) 4307 (iii).
Poaching in East River, N.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5247 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture (animals health) 6471 (iv).
Militia (associations and bands) 5533 (iii).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5365 (iii).
Railways—I.C.R. (branch lines) 5625, 5633 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 3011 (ii).

MURPHY, Hon. C., *Russell.*
Address, The, 501 (i).
Airships for Military Purposes, Purchase by Govt. (Ques.) 533 (i).
Archives B. 66 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 1495 (i).
Bread Combines, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1521 (i).
Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6320 (iv).
Cabinet Ministers from Quebec, Stmnt. by Hon. Mr. Monk (Ques.) 526 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 3349 (ii).
Civil Service Act (private secretaries) Amt. B. 60 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 1436 (i).

MURPHY, Hon. C.—*Con.*
Civil Service Competitive Examination, Extension *re* (Ques.) 533 (i).
Coal Strike in Alberta, Settlement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1504 (i).
Coal Strike in the West, Settlement of (Ques.) 567 (i).
Companies Act Amt., Legislation *re* (Ques.) 529 (i).
Companies Incorporation, Ref. to Supreme Court, Withdrawal by Govt. (Ques.) 529 (i).
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) on M. for 1°, 5552; in Com., 5868 (iv).
Dom. Notes, Engraving, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 4778 (iii).
——— Limitations *re* Tenders (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1841 (i).
Farmers' Bank Failure, Reimbursement to Depositors (Ques.) 527 (i).
——— Indemnifying Shareholders, Speech Hon. Mr. Crothers *re* (Ques.) 3147, 3332 (ii).
——— Promises to Reimburse by Ministers, &c. (Ques.) 713 (i).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6569 (iv).
Gutelius, Mr. F. P., Naturalization of, &c. (Ques.) 4242, 4978 (iii).
Hawkes, Mr. Arthur, Apptmt. *re* Immigration Dept. (Ques.) 527 (i).
House of Commons Sessional Employees, Number dismissed, &c. (Ques.) 568 (i), 2064 (ii).
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1309, 1426 (i).
James Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com., 6309 (iv).
Judges Act (additional) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5413 (iii).
King's Printer, Apptmt. of Assistant (Ques.) 1809 (i).
Maritime Law International Conference, Invitation to Govt. *re* (Ques.) 2586 (ii).
Military Stores Building, Contract *re* Racks (Ques.) 532 (i).
Militia Touring Cars, Order to Ford Motor Co. (Ques.) 4040 (iii).
N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1879, 1889 (i),
N. T. Ry. Commission, Duties assigned to New Chairman (Ques.) 533 (i).
——— Investigation *re* Apptmt., Salary &c., of Messrs Gutelius and Staunton (Ques.) 4242, 4978 (iii).
Naval Policy, Interview with Hon. Geo. H. Perley in London (remarks) 1576 (i).
——— Promise *re* Referendum (Ques) 526 (i).

MURPHY, Hon. C.—*Con.*
——— Tenders *re* Construction of Ships, Deposits, &c. (Ques.) 526 (i).
Petewawa Public Wharf, Tenders *re*, Contract awarded (Ques.) 532 (i).
Printing Bureau Employees, Changes *re* Duties (Ques.) 2243 (ii).
——— Dismissals and Apptmts. (Ques.) 1809 (i).
——— Salary Increases, &c. (Ques.) 2066 (ii).
——— Weekly Consultations (Ques.) 2243 (ii).
Printing Bureau, Policy of Govt. *re* Erection of (Ques.) 546 (i).
Public Works on Rys., Suspension *re*, Names and Locations (Ques.) 531 (i).
Public Works, Suspension of, Names and Locations, &c. (Ques.) 530 (i).
Renfrew, S. Election, Issue of Writ, on M. (Mr. A. H. Clarke) to adjn. Hse. 2238 (ii).
Returns, Inquiry for, 4836 (iii), 5560 (iv).
Rockliffe Rifle Range, Acquisition of Additional Land (Ques.) 533 (i).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture, Experimental Farms (branch stations) 6484; (International Institute) 6478 (iv).
Archives (salaries) 6462 (iv).
Canals—Lachine (lock improvements) 6611; Welland (construction) 6610 (iv).
Charges of Management (coin circulation) 1034 (i).
Civil Govt—Agriculture (promotions) 6485 (iv); Customs (salaries) 1040 (i); Inland Revenue (private secretary) 6490; Inland Revenue (promotions) conc., 6771 (iv); Interior (salaries) 1039; Justice—Exchequer Court (salaries) 1035 (i); (promotions) 6585 (iv); Militia (salaries) 1037; Post Office (salaries) 1067; Public Works (salaries) 1065; Secretary of State (printing bureau) 1038; (salaries) 1038 (i).
Civil Service Commission (additional commissioner) 6615 (iv).
Conservation Commission (Chicago canal) 6582 (iv).
Inland Revenue (explosives apparatus) 6604 (iv).
Justice (pecuniary claims) 6579 (iv).
Labour Dept. (combines investigation act) 1500; (Gazette) 1472; (industrial training commission) 1527 (i).
Militia (Rockliffe ranges) 6654 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Champlain monument) 6485; (claim of Mrs. Wiley) 6489; (counsel fees *re* Lanctot inquiry) 6486; (Olympic games) 6486 (iv).
Printing Bureau (plant, &c.) 6611 (iv).
Public Works—Bridges (Ottawa River) 6806 (iv).
Public Korks—Buildings—Ont. (Gananoque) 1855 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Sussex St.) 1333 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (French River) 6657; conc., 6776 (iv).
Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 6607 (iv).

E

MURPHY, Hon. C.—*Con.*
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) on Senate Amts., 6670 (iv).
Typewriters and Supplies, Names of Firms, &c. (Ques.) 1809 (i).
Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com., 6326 (iv).
Waterways Commission, Ratification of Apptmt. by late Govt. (Ques.) 533 (i).
W. Indies Trade Arrangements, Negotiations *re* (M. for papers*) 977 (i).
——— Inquiry for, 1820 (i).

NANTEL, Hon. W. B. (*Minister of Inland Revenue*) *Terrebonne.*
Courcy, Mr. P., Apptmt. at St. Pacome de Kamouraska (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5822 (iv).
——— Emplymt. in Inland Revenue (Ans.) 5952 (iv).
Courchene, Mr. P. E. C., Dismissal from Inland Rev. Dept. (Ans.) 1864 (i).
Desmarais, Mr., Charges *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5817 (iv).
Dismissals from Inland Rev., Letter sent out (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5820 (iv).
Dumontier, Joseph Alphonse, Apptmt. as Inland Rev. Inspector, Quebec (Ans.) 3340 (ii).
Flemming, Mr. Charles, Dismissal from Inland Rev. Dept. at Petrolia (Ans.) 4259 (iii).
Forest, Mr. Medard, Excise Officer at L'Epiphanie, Dismissal, Charges, &c. (Ans.) 726 (i).
Garceau, Mr. N., Apptmt. as Inquiry Commissioner (Ans.) 2860 (ii).
Inland Revenue Reports (presented) 565 (i)
Locas, Mr. Henri, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3338 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. Béland) to M. for 3°, 4959 (iii).
Maple Sugar, Cancellation of O.C. *re* Standards (Ans.) 716 (i).
Peat Industry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6602 (iv).
Poirier, N. P., Investigation *re* Charges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5815 (iv).
Robitaille, J. C., Charges *re* Political Partisanship (Ans.) 2858 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Inland Revenue (private secretary) 6490; (promotions) conc., 6771 (iv); (salaries) 1040, 1061; Mines Dept. (salaries) 1066 (i).
Excise (customs duties) 5827; (inspectors) 5812; (salaries) 5812; (tobacco stamps) 5826; (travelling expenses) 5826 (iv).
Geological Survey (explorations) 6604 (iv).
Inland Revenue (explosive apparatus) 6603 (iv).

NANTEL, Hon. W. B.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Mines (French reports) 6491; (ore deposits) 6602, 6490; (peat industry) 6491 (iv).
Public Works—Roads and Bridges (Doncaster Indian reserve) 6806 (iv).
Weights and Measures (inspection electric lights) 5828 (iv).
Therien, J. F., Dismissal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5824 (iv).
——— Investigation *re* Political Partisanship (Ans.) 1413 (i).
Three Rivers, Charges *re* Collector C. D. Hebert (Ans.) 1209 (i).
Woodstock, N.B., Apptmt. of Excise Officer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5812 (iv).

NEELY, Mr. D. B., *Humboldt.*
Bounties on Steel Rods, &c. (Ques.) 529 (i).
Census Enumerators and Returning Officers, Delays *re* Payment (remarks) 2156 (ii).
Cockshutt Plough Co., Prices *re* (remarks 824 (i).
Hudson Bay Ry., Contract (M.) for O. Cs., &c., 732 (i).
Grain Act B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2187, 2306, 2392, 2545, 2770, 3160, 3762 (ii), 4155 (iii).
Lumber Duties, Interpretation and Enforcement, on M. (Mr. Knowles) for Papers, 592 (i).
Railway Question, Transportation, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1927 (i).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings (generally) 2215; Sask. (Humboldt) 2211 (ii).
Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 622 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2904 (ii).
Tariff Commission, Apptmt. of, &c. (Ques.) 529 (i).

NESBITT, Mr. E. W., *North Oxford.*
Alberta, Peace River and Eastern Ry. Co.'s B. 129 (Mr. Chabot) in Com., 5907 (iv).
Barcelona Tramway, Light and Power Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 2411 (ii).
Budget, The, 5134 (iii).
Cable Rates, &c., Rural Mails, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 4088 (iii).
Can. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 98 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 5200 (iii).
Canal Staffs, Dismissals (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5802 (iv).
Civil Servants and Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1538 (i).
Continental Can Co.'s Patent Relief B. 119 (Mr. Fripp) in Com., 5204 (iii), 5903 (iv).
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5862 (iv).

NESBITT, Mr. E. W.—*Con.*
Dominion Trust Co.'s B. 80 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 4238 (iii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com. on Res., 872 (i); in Com., 2184, 2556 (ii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3682 (ii).
Lumber Combine in B.C., Ques. of Order, 2299 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 4546 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Discussion *re* Man. School Questions (Ques.) 534 (i).
Manitoba Questions (remarks) *re* Answers, 581 (i).
N. T. Ry. (P. C. judgment) B. 95 (Mr. White) on M. for 2°, 3126 (ii).
N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1869 (i), 3372 (ii).
Ontario and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s B. 50 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 2414 (ii).
Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 105 (Mr. Pelletier) on M. for 2°, 3354; in Com., 3361 (ii).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 3881 (ii).
Rambaut, Thomas D., Patent Relief B. 84 (Mr. Ames) in Com., 2988 (ii).
Rural Mail Delivery B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) on M. for 1°, 5922 (iv).
See 'Cable.'
Rural Telephone System, placing in Post Office, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 2248 (ii).
South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 56) 1°*, 970 (i).
Stenographic Assistance for Members (remarks) 1847 (i).
SUPPLY.
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 620 (i).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 1041; Inland Revenue (salaries) 1040; Marine Dept. (salaries) 1046 (i).
Canals—Trent (Newmarket) 5793; Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 5797 (iv).
Labour Dept. (industrial training commission) 1527 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 4717 (iii).
Militia (allowance) 5451; (annual drill) 5452, 5464; (associations and bands) 5535 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (St. John quarantine) 1530 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (rentals) 1327 (i).
Railways—Generally (salaries) 5801 (iv).
Railways—Miscellaneous (board of commissioners) 5800; (litigation) 5801 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (annuities act) 698 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2696; in Com., 2871, 2903, 3546 (ii), 4080 (iii).

NESBITT, Mr. E. W.—*Con.*
Universal Eyesight Co.'s incorp. B. 126 (Mr. McLean) in Com., 5908 (iv).
West Ontario Pacific Railway Co.'s (B. 28) 1°*, 795 (i).
Yukon Judges Annuities B. 123 (Mr. Doherty) in Com. on Res., 4559 (iii).

NICHOLSON, Mr. D., *Queens, P.E.I.*
P.E.I. Subsidy B. 178 (Mr. White) in Com., 6150 (iv).

NICKLE, Mr. W. F., *Kingston.*
N.T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3437 (ii).
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burnham) 1377 (i).
Queens Theological College incorp, (B. 69) 1°*, 1410 (i).
Queens University at Kingston (B. 68) 1°*, 1410 (i); in Com., 3874 (ii); 4745; Order called for Com., 4237; 3°m., 4869 (iii); on Senate Amts., 6770 (iv).
SUPPLY.
Justice—Penitentiaries (bonus) 6601 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2738 (ii).

NORTHRUP, Mr. W. B., *East Hastings.*
Address, The, 357 (i).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, and M. (Mr. Borden) to adjn. debate, 1632 (i).
National Rifle Association, Rules *re* Bisley Competition (remarks) 3746 (ii).
N.T. Ry. (P.C. judgment) B. 95 (Mr. White) on M. for 2°, 3093 (ii).
Naval Policy of Govt., Ref. to in debate on Address, 357 (i).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6434 (iv).

OLIVER, Hon. F., *Edmonton.*
Address, The, 448 (i).
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5293 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. Pugsley) to M. for 3°, 5564 (iv).
Alberta Great Waterways Ry., Disallowance of (remarks) 1575 (i).
Alberta Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. 6314 (iv).
Alberta Peace River and Eastern Ry. Co.'s B. 129 (Mr. Chabot) in Com., 5904, 5942 (iv).
Budget, The, 5093 (iii).
Cable Rates, &c., on M. to withdraw Res., 3448 (ii).
Calgary and Fernie Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6323 (iv).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Canadian Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 189 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6373 (iv).
Canadian Northern Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 187 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6361 (iv).
Can. Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. Staples) in Com., 5201 (iii).
Can. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 98 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 5198 (iii).
Canada Shipping Act (masters and mates) Amt. B. 143, in Com., 5401 (iii).
Christmas Adjournment, on M. (Mr. Borden) 929 (i).
Civil Service Commission Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 3348 (ii).
Civil Service Act (private secretaries) Amt. B. 60 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 3344 (ii).
Coal Strike in Alberta, Settlement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1502 (i).
Cockshutt Plough Co., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Cockshutt) 812, 815 (i).
Continental Can Co.'s Patent Relief B. 119 (Mr. Fripp) in Com., 5205 (iii).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6220 (iv).
Farm Implements, Price of: *See* 'Cockshutt,' 'Tariff Commission.'
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6455 (iv).
Freight Rates on Rys. on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3216 (ii).
See 'Ry.'
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 2°, 2174, 2180, 2303, 2382, 2535, 2755, 3156, 3452, 3508, 3758 (ii), 4053; on Order for 3° and M. (Mr. Foster) for Com., 4153-4; (amt.) 4806; on Amt. (Mr. Cash) 4820 (iii).
See 'Man. Grain Act.'
Grain Congestion in the West, Car Distribution (remarks) 5956, 6556 (iv).
——— Further Information, Inquiry for, 6186 (iv).
Grain Congestion, Transportation, &c., Remarks on M. for Sup., 6203 (iv).
Grain Shipments from the West, Freight Rates, &c. (prop. res.) 3975; Neg. (Y. 54; N. 84) 4035 (ii).
See 'Freight Rates.'
Grain Shipments to Terminal Elevators (remarks) 6792 (iv).
Grain Storage at Minneapolis, Inquiry for Papers, 6493 (iv).
Grain Transportation in the West, Par. in Toronto Globe (remarks) 5928 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry. (Brandon) Subsidy, in Com., 6325 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry., Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5901 (iv).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Hawkes, Mr. A., Apptmt. in Immigration Dept. (M. for O.Cs.) 605 (i).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3721 (ii).
Horses imported from U.S., Destruction for Glanders (remarks) 5693, 5939 (iv).
Horses destroyed at Weyburn, Rep. *re* (remarks) 6790 (iv).
House of Commons, Ventilation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1336 (i).
Hudson Bay Railway Construction, on M. (Mr. Aikins) for Papers, 1240 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. Neely) for O.Cs., &c. 746 (i).
Immigration Policy *re* Mar. Provs., on prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2146 (ii).
Immigration, Rep. of Mr. Hawkes, Inquiry for, 6551 (iv).
See 'Hawkes.'
Imperial Naturalization, Uniformity in Canada, on M. (Mr. Macdonald) to Com. of Sup., 2428 (ii).
Inspection and Sale Act (grain) Amt. B. 78 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 6189, 6679 (iv).
James Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6310 (iv).
Judges Act (salaries) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 6015 (iv).
Kettle Valley Ry. Bridge Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6327 (iv).
Kettle Valley Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5899, 6220, 6322 (iv).
Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5899, 6219 (iv).
Live Stock Record Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) on M. for 2°, 6022; in Com., 6023 (iv).
Lumber Duties, Violation of Customs Act, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) 1794 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 3870, 3886; on M. for 1°, 3902 (ii); on M. for 2°, 4297; in Com. (amt.) 4673 (iii).
Manitoba Boundary Extension, Answer to Question (remarks) 3755 (ii).
——— Eastern Boundary Extension (Ques.) 3936 (ii).
——— Financial Terms, &c. (Ques.) 558 (i).
——— Inquiry for Papers (remarks) 3448, 3834 (ii).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 96 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 1°, 2406; on M. for 3°, 2575 (ii).
See 'Grain Act.'
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal B. 30 (Mr. G. V. White) in Com., 4699 (iii).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Naas and Skeena River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6321 (iv).
N. T. Ry. (P. C. judgment.) B. 95 (Mr. White) on M. for 2°, 3086 (ii).
N.T.Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1875 (i); 3426 (ii).
Ottawa City Items (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3235 (ii).
Peace River and Ry. Belt Water Power B. 149 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 5969, 6175 (iv).
Public Works Estimates, Information *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3278 (ii).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 4767 (iii).
Railway Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 2°, 2513 (ii).
Railway Estimates, Annual Statement (remarks) 4124 (iii).
Railway Question, Transportation, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1943 (i).
See 'Freight Rates,' 'Grain Congestion,' 'Hudson Bay Ry.'
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. on Res., 5899; in Com., 6218, 6310 (iv).
Rainy River Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 121 (Mr. Beattie) in Com., 5198 (iii).
Rambaut, Thomas D., Patent Relief B. 84 (Mr. Ames) in Com., 2985, 3332, 3484 (ii).
——— on Order for Com. (remarks) 3332 (ii).
Reciprocity Treaty, ref. to in debate on Address, 449 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture &c. (census) 6463 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Indians (salaries) 1039 (i); Inland Revenue (promotions) conc., 6773 (iv); Interior (salaries) 1038 (i).
Immigration (agencies) 3306, 3919 (ii).
Justice (N.W. Teritories) 6560; Penitentiaries (salaries) 6596 (iv).
Labour Dept. (combines investigation act) 1502; (Gazette) 1491 (i).
Marine (Govt. steamers) 1964 (i).
Miscellaneous (art gallery) 2825 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Calgary) 2205; (Edmonton) 2206 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (generally) 2215 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 2204 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Alberta (Athabaska River) 2814; (Edmonton) 2816 (ii).
Public Works—Telegraphs—Alta. (Athabaska Landing) 2819; (Fort McMurray) 2819; (North Battleford) 2822; (Peace River) 2821; (Wood Mountain) 2821 (ii).
Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 6605 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (bounties act) 687 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) in Com. on Res., 2160; on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2685; in Com., 2877, 2972, 2994, 3586, (ii); on Senate Amts., 6675 (iv).
Universal Eyesight Insurance incorp. B. 126 (Mr. McLean) in Com., 5908, 5940 (iv).
Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6218 (iv).
Veitch Farm, Purchase of by Govt. (Ques.) 933 (i).
Vegreville and Lloydminster Public Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2214 (ii).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 6177 (iv).
Wadge, Thomas, Patent Relief B. 16 (Mr. Aikins) in Com., 2983 (ii).
Webster, Immigration Agent at Edmonton, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3922 (ii).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Harbour Commissioners incorp. B. 138 (Mr. Hazen) in Com., 5989 (iv).
Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Rogers) on M. for 2°, 6182 (iv).

OSLER, Sir E. B., *West Toronto.*
Architectural Institute of Canada (B. 35) 1°*, 969 (i).
Canadian Mortage Investment Co.'s (B. 11) 1°*, 643 (i).
Fort Osborne Barracks Transfer (Mr. Hughes) in Com. on Res., 5709 (iv).
Grain Act B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2542 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Trent (Newmarket) 5793 (iv).

PACAUD, Mr. L. T., *Megantic.*
Doucet, Odilon, Postmaster at Notre Dame de Lourdes, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 1863 (i).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6285 (iv).
Kirouac, Mr., Postmaster at Manseau, Dismissal of (Ques.) 2579 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Post Office (mail service) 6285 (iv).

PAQUET, Mr. E., *L'Islet.*
Budget, The, 5151 (iii).
Cap de la Magdeleine Ry. Co.'s (B. 43) 1°*, 970 (i); in Com., 2012 (ii).
Dismissals from Government Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1570 (i).
Franco-Canadian Trade Relations (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5759 (iv).
French Canadian Repatriation, Policy of Govt. (remarks) 619 (i).
Immigration Agents for Farm Labourers, in Quebec, Number (Ques.) 1359 (i).
Immigrant Agents in France, Names, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1212 (i).

PAQUET, Mr. E.—*Con.*
Immigration, Amount expended, Number of Immigrants, &c. (Ques.) 1211 (i).
Immigrants deported, Number, Amount expended (Ques.) 1213 (i).
Immigration Hospitals, Number and Location (Ques.) 1210 (i).
Immigration Literature, French Publications (Ques.) 1212 (i).
Immigration Medical Examiners, Number, Names, &c. (Ques.) 1213 (i).
Immigration Premiums, Amount expended (Ques.) 1212 (i).
Immigration Societies, State-Aid, Amounts expended, &c. (Ques.) 1211 (i).
I. C. R., Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, Fence Poles, Charges *re* Removal, Investigation, &c. (Ques.) 2586 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. Beland) to M. for 3°, 4966 (iii).
N. T. Ry., Inspector of Stations, Apptmt. of Mr. Goulet (Ques.) 3935 (ii).
Paris Exposition, Payments for Space, &c. (M. for stmnt.*) 582 (i).
SUPPLY—
Militia (annual drill) 5501 (iii).

PARDEE, Mr. F. F., *West Lambton.*
American Shoe Machinery Co., Discontinuance of Proceedings *re* (Ques.) 572 (i).
Dairying Industry in Canada, Complaints *re* Weighing at Montreal (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5730 (iv).
Civil Service Act (rural mail) Amt. B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 6088 (iv).
Coal for Govt. Steamers, Average Cost per Ton, &c. (Ques.) 1203 (i).
Fleming, Mr. Charles, Dismissal from Inland Revenue Dept., Petrolia (Ques.) 4259 (iii).
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burnham) 1376 (i).
P. E. I. Car Ferry, Tels., Letters, &c. (M. for copies*) 2458 (ii).
P. E. I. and Mainland Govt. Car Service, Tel. sent to A. A. McLean (Ques.) 1577 (i).
Rathburn Post Office, Removal of Postmaster, &c. (M. for papers*) 4262 (iii).
Sarnia Armoury, Erection of (M. for cor.*) 1589 (i); (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2208 (ii); (Ques.) 555 (i).
Sarnia Winter Harbour (M. for cor.*) 1589 (i); Inquiry for Ret., 5946 (ii).
Speaker, Dep., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to appoint, 519 (i).
SUPPLY—
Immigration (regulations) 3911 (ii).

PELLETIER, Hon. L. P. (Postmaster General), *Quebec County.*
Anse a Valeau, Charges against Postmistress Madame Proulx (Ans.) 2072 (ii).
Archambault, Emile, Letter Carrier, Dismissal (Ans.) 5950 (iv).
Australian Pacific Cable, Proposals *re* (Ans.) 576 (i).
Bedford Postmaster Dismissal, on Inquiry for Ret., 5161 (iii).
Boucher, Mr. F. O., Pet. *re* Dismissals (Ans.) 976 (i).
Brazeau, Mr. Emile, Postmaster at Cote Rouge, Dismissal (Ans.) 6337 (iv).
British Mails, Landing at North Sydney, Tests *re* (Ans.) 5948 (iv).
Brown, Wm., Postmaster at Point Fortune, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 4780 (iii).
Brown, William, Pet. from Dr. E. Montpetit *re* Dismissal (Ans.) 4977 (iii).
Buck, Mr. A. E., Postmaster at Crystal Beach, Dismissal of (remarks) 3910 (ii).
Cable Rates, Reduction of Fees, Tel. from Imp. P.M.G. (read) 931 (i).
See 'Australia.'
Cable Rates to G. B. (remarks) on M for Sup. 3238 (ii).
Cable Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lemieux) to M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 4114 (iii).
See 'Parcel Post,' &c.
Canada and Gulf Terminal Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. 6306 (iv).
Canadian Marine Insurance, Govt. Co-operation (Ans.) 1582 (i).
Canso Postmaster, Pet. *re* Dismissal (Ans.) 1207 (i).
Cap Chat P.O., Pet. *re* Change of Name (Ans.) 1204 (i).
Causapscal Post Office, Pet. *re* Site (Ans.) 1020 (i).
Charlemagne Mail Contract, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ans.) 1863 (i).
Chevrier, Isidore, Charges *re*, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 4039, 4780 (iii).
Civil Service Act (mail clerks) Amt. (B. 106) M. for Com. on Res., 3056; in Com. on Res., 3155 (ii); in Com., 4782; on M. for 3° (M.) to ref. back to Com., 5263 (iii).
See 'P. O. Bill 105.'
Civil Service Act (postmasters) Amt. (B. 124) M. for Com. on Res., 4042; in Com. on Res., 4583; 1°*, 4584 (iii).
Clouthier, Joseph, Postmaster at St. Adolphe de Dudswell, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 4550 (iii).
Coldbrook Postmaster, Name and Apptmt. (Ans.) 3148 (ii).

PELLETIER, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Dismissal of Conservative Postmasters *re* Political Partisanship (Ans.) 2295 (ii).
Dismissal of Public Officials, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Papers, 915 (i).
Doucet, Odilon, Postmaster at Notre Dame de Lourdes, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 1863 (i).
Douglas Road Post Office, Date of Opening, &c. (Ans.) 3754 (ii).
Dumelong, E., Postmaster at L'Assomption, Dismissal of (Ans.) 580 (i).
Dupré, Dr., Postmaster at St. Robert, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3753 (ii).
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amt. B. 180 (Mr. Monk) on prop. Res., 5560; in Com. on Res., 6051; in Com., 6201 (iv).
East Roman Valley Post Office, Dismissal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2028 (ii).
Farly, Mrs. Paul, Postmistress at St. Gabriel de Brandon, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 2579 (ii).
Franking Privilege: *See* 'Political Literature.'
Fraser, Mr. John, Postmaster at Stellarton, Dismissal of (Ans.) 546 (i).
Gaspé, Magdeleine and Chlorydormes Mail Contracts, Annulment of (Ans.) 1204 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal, Govt. Policy (remarks) 1971 (ii).
Glace Bay Mail Delivery, Delay, &c. (remarks) 804 (i).
Govt. Ownership: *See* 'Parcel Post,' 'Postal Regulations,' 'Rural Telephones.'
Henry, Norbert, Mail Contract between Scott Junction and Station (Ans.) 975 (i).
I. C. R. Branch Lines, in prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 1010 (i).
Investigations *re* Political Partisanships, Cost of (Ans.) 5951 (iv).
Jacques, Leander, Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3339 (ii).
Kirouac, Mr., Postmaster at Manseau, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 2579 (ii).
Laberge, Mr. H., Compensation *re* Death as Letter Carrier (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6284 (iv).
Lachenaie Postmaster, Charges *re* (Ans.) 5949 (iv).
Lacombe, J. A., Dismissal from St. Sebastien P. O., Inquiry *re* (Ans.) 975 (i).
Langevin Block, Condition of: *See* 'P. O. Deptl. Bldg.'
Lavoie, Mr. Calixte, Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3339 (ii).
Legault, Ophir, Postmaster at L'Ile Perrot, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 5950 (iv).
Leigh, Mr. W. M., Dismissal from Kirkton Post Office (Ans.) 5949 (iv).
Linwood and Grosvenor's Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6282 (iv).

PELLETIER, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Londonderry Postmaster, Dismissal (Ans.) 6337 (iv).
Lotbinière County Postmasters, Dismissed, Number, Names, &c. (Ans.) 972 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6294 (iv).
McEachren, Mr. Charles, Dismissal from Tatamagouche Post Office (Ans.) 2243 (ii).
McPherson, John H., Dismissal of (Ans.) 4259 (iii).
Mader, Mr. D., Dismissal from Mahone Bay P. O. (Ans.) 722 (i).
Magdalen Island Marconi News Service, Salary of Correspondent (Ans.) 4262 (iii).
——— (remarks) 4042 (iii).
Mail Bags Repairs, Names of Firms (Ans.) 4777 (iii).
Mail Clerks: *See* 'C. S. Act,' P. O. B. 105.'
Mail Contracts, Cancellation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6621 (iv).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 5693 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4426; on Amt. (Mr. Béland) to M. for 3°, 4946 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries, on M. (Mr. Macdonald) for Cor. (remarks) 780 (i).
Marconi Co., Negotiations *re* Wireless Message to all Dominions (Ans.) 2586 (ii).
See 'Magdalen.'
Marlin, Mrs. A. S., Postmistress, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3753 (ii).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1685 (i).
Marriage Bill, Correction *re* Speech, 3532 (ii).
Michaud, Mr. J., Dismissal from St. Moïse Station (Ans.) 1864 (i).
Montcalm Postmasters, Pets. *re* Removal (Ans.) 575 (i).
Moosejaw Post Office Inspector, on Inquiry for Ret., 4981 (iii).
Moosejaw Post Office, Proposed Sites, &c. (Ans.) 976 (i), 3342 (ii).
Moreau, Mr. J., Dismissal, on M. (Mr. Lapointe) for Cor., 1818 (i).
Mullaly, Mr., Emplymt. in P.O. Dept., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 1583 (i).
Naas and Skeena River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6321 (iv).
N. T. Ry. Station, Quebec City, Construction (remarks) 6786 (iv).
——— on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for O.Cs., &c., 760 (i).
Ne Temere Decree: *See* 'Marriage B. 3.'
Neuville Mail Contract and C. N. Ry. Station, Cancellation *re* (Ans.) 2067 (ii).
Newspaper Postage, Opinion from P. M. G. *re* Regulations (Ans.) 2291 (ii).
New Waterford Postal Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6630 (iv).

PELLETIER, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Nicolet and St. Monique Mail Contract, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 724 (i).
Northumberland Co., Mail Contracts, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ans.) 6186 (iv).
Notre Dame des Anges, Postmaster, Dismissal of (Ans.) 554 (i).
Parcel Post between Canada and France, Signature *re* (Ans.) 569 (i).
Parcel Post Extension, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 2354 (ii).
See 'Postal Regulations.'
Parcel Post, Rates to European Countries (Ans.) 4777 (iii).
Payson, W. W., Dismissal from Post Office at Deep Brook (Ans.) 2243 (ii).
Peloquin, Mr. F., Postmaster at St. Joseph de Sorel, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3753 (ii).
Pictou Mail Service, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 2580 (ii).
Political Literature, Application *re* Free Postage (Ans.) 1586 (i).
Postal Convention between Canada and France (remarks) 935 (i).
Postal Regulations, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Armstrong) 2258 (ii).
See 'Parcel Post.'
Postmaster dismissed (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6617 (iv).
Postmasters in Kamouraska County, Names, Dismissals (Ans.) 6781 (iv).
Postmasters, Rural, Salaries, &c. (remarks) 3060 (ii).
Postmasters in Temiscouata Co., Dismissals, &c., Ans., 549 (i).
Postmasters and Town Councillors, Acceptance *re* (Ans.) 2587 (ii).
Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. (B. 105) in Com. on Res., 3154; 2° m., 3349; in Com., 3355 (ii).
Post Offices, Change in Name (remarks) 3751 (ii).
Post Office Deptl. Buildings, Charges *re* Condition (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1857 (i), 2015 (ii).
Post Office Dismissals, Policy *re* (stmnt.) in Com. of Sup., 6299 (iv).
Pouliot, Louis, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 4459 (iii).
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6305 (iv).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners Act Amt. B. 31 (Mr. Hazen) on M. for 2°, 1030; on M. for 3°, 1711 (i).
Quebec and Saguenay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6214 (iv).
Ry. Mail Clerks: *See* 'C.S. Act,' 'P.O. Bill 105.'
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6214, 6305, 6321 (iv)

PELLETIER, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Returns, on Inquiry for, 4744 (iii), 5560 (iv).
Rigaud Postmaster, Applications *re* (Ans.) 2294 (ii).
River John Mail Carrier, Amount paid *re* (Ans.) 1579 (i).
Robert, Mr., Dismissal from Val des Eboulis Post Office (Ans.) 3537 (ii), 4778 (iii).
Rogers, J. M., Postmaster at East Roman Valley, Dismissal of (Ans.) 723 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery (B. 179) prop. Res., 5680; in Com. on Res., 5921; 1°m., 5922; in Com., 6084 (iv).
Rural Mail Delivery, Extension, &c. (remarks) 2061 (ii).
——— Number of Boxes in Ont. (Ans.) 6782 (iv).
——— Routes, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 4978 (iii).
——— Routes, &c. (remarks) 5561 (iv).
——— Tenders *re* Mail Boxes (Ans.) 1580 (i).
Rural Telephone System, Placing in Post Offices, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 2250 (ii).
St. Adelaide de Pabos Postmaster, Charges *re* R. Molloy, Investigation (Ques.) 2068 (ii).
St. Agathe des Monts, Post Office, Dismissal of Mrs. Bedard (Ans.) 973 (i).
——— Investigation *re* Charges, on M. (Mr. Lemieux) for Cor., 1592 (i).
St. Aldwyn Post Office, Change of Name from Broderick, on M. for Sup., 5926 (iv).
St. Amour Post Office, Changes since Jan. 1912 (Ans.) 2667 (ii).
St. Ancilet Postmaster, Request *re* Dismissal, on M. (Mr. E. Lapointe) for Cor., 2588 (ii).
St. Angele de Laval Postmaster, Charges *re* (Ans.) 3755 (ii); 4039 (iii).
Ste. Anne de Bellevue and L'Ile Perrot Mail Contracts, Expiry of (Ans.) 5952 (iv).
Ste. Anne de Bellevue, Non-delivery of Mail (Ans.) 5260 (iii).
St. Charles and Huron River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6308 (iv).
St. Germain, Dismissal of Postmaster C. Michaud, on M. (Mr. E. Lapointe) for Cor., 1594 (i).
——— Changes *re* Apptmt. (Ans.) 1579 (i).
St. Isidore Postmastership, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 3055 (ii).
St. Jacques Post Office, Plans, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 561 (i).
Ste. Monique Mail Contract, Annulment of (Ans.) 1584 (i).
St. Pascal Mail Contract, Cancellation *re* (Ans.) 2294 (ii).
St. Paul L'Ermite Mail Carrier, &c. (Ans.) 2583 (ii).

PELLETIER, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
St. Paul L'Ermite Mail Service, Cancellation of Contracts (Ans.) 3342 (ii).
St. Peter of Wakefield Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6288 (iv).
Ste. Therese and Laurentides Post Offices, Revenues, &c. (Ans.) 3336 (ii).
St. Tite Postmaster, Dismissal of (Ans.) 1210 (i).
Sayabec Postmistress, Apptmt. of Miss Boulay (Ans.) 2068 (ii).
——— Dismissal of Postmistress, and Apptmt. (Ans.) 2585 (ii).
Scotch Village Postmaster in 1903, Charges *re* &c. (Ans.) 2666 (ii).
Seamen St., Annapolis County, Post Office, Date of Opening (Ans.) 3755 (ii).
Small Pox in Ottawa Post Office (explanation) 1242 (i).
——— (remarks) 1280 (i).
Sorel and St. Victoria Mail Service, Date of Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 4248 (iii).
Spry Bay Post Office, Pet. *re* Removal (Ans.) 577 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Naval Dept. (salaries) 1064 (i); Post Office (H. B. Verret) 6278 (iv); (salaries) 1066 (i); 6278 (iv).
Inland Rev. (salaries) conc., 6770 (iv).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5306 (iii).
Post Office (mail service) 6282; Outside Service (inspectors) 6646; (salaries) 6616 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Quebec drill hall) 1851; (Quebec P.O.) 1852 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (French River) 6657 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (annuities act) 691 (i).
Sydney and Glace Bay Mail Service, Delay, &c. (stmnt.) 934 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2906 (ii).
Thibodeau, George, Resignation &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6618 (iv).
Val des Eboulis and Rigaud Mail Service, Contract *re* (Ans.) 4249 (iii).
Val des Eboulis Mail Service, Date of William Roberts' Contract (Ans.) 3537 (ii), 4778 (iii).
Vaudreuil Post Office, Dismissal of J. B. A. Valois (Ans.) 3537 (ii).
Weedon Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6656 (iv).
Whitehead, N. S., Dismissal of Postmaster (Ans.) 2855 (ii).

PERLEY, Hon. G. H., *Argenteuil.*
Dry Docks Subsidy Act (prop. res.) 5559 (iv).
St. John Harbour, Dredging Tenders *re* (remarks) 5695 (iv).

PORTER, Mr. E. G., *West Hastings.*
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1678 (i).

POWER, Mr. Wm., *West Quebec.*
Fast Atlantic Service and Halifax Terminals, on M. for Sup., 6510 (iv).
Mullaly, Mr., Emplymt. in P.O. Dept., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 1583 (i).
SUPPLY—
Post Office—Outside Service (salaries) 6631 (iv).

PROULX, Mr. E., *Prescott.*
Agricultural Committee, Personal Explanation (Mr. Best) *re* Par. in Toronto Globe, 2156 (ii).
Car Shortage *re* Transportation of Hay Crop (remarks) 2753 (ii).
Daoust, Done, Postmaster at Alfred, Dismissal of (M. for cor.*) 3945 (ii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3955 (ii).
Judges Act (additional) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5413 (iii), 6001 (iv); on M. for 3° (amt.) 6062 (iv).
Mail Contracts, Cancellation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6620 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4423; on Amt. (Mr. Beland) to M. for 3°, 4967 (ii).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1691 (i).
Peat Industry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6602 (iv).
Renfrew, N., Contracts awarded, &c. (Ques.) 2857 (ii).
——— Dismissal of Govt. Officials (Ques.) 2856 (ii).
Renfrew, S., Apptmts. to Public Service (Ques.) 3334 (ii).
——— Contracts awarded, &c. (Ques.) 2856 (ii).
——— Dismissal of Govt. Officials (Ques.) 2856 (ii).
St. Amour Postmaster, Changes since Jan., 1912 (Ques.) 2666 (ii).
——— Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 2861 (ii).
St. Isidore de Prescott Postmastership, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 3055 (ii).
SUPPLY.
Legislation—Senate (salaries) 6460 (iv).
Mines Branch (ore deposits) 6602 (iv).
Yukon Judges Annuities B. 123 (Mr. Doherty) in Com. on Res., 4561 (iii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. Wm., *St. John City.*
Address, The, on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 139 (i).
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5277 (iii); on M. for 3° (amt.) 5561 (iv).

PUGSLEY, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*
Anderson, Mr., Salary Increase (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1043 (i).
Bank Act Amt. B. 169 (Mr. White) on M. for 1°, 5555 (iv).
Bath, N.B., Dismissal of Postmistress (remarks) 966 (i).
Bathurst Harbour Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2363 (ii).
Battlefields Commission (remarks) *re* Vote, 5300 (iii).
Boundary Waterways Treaty, Apptmt. of Commissioners, Inquiry for Ret., 2589 (ii).
——— Negotiations *re* (remarks) 3833 (ii).
See 'Waterways.'
Brodie, Mr., Dismissal *re* St. John Drill Hall (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1529 (i).
Cable Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lemieux) to M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 4099, 4111 (iii).
Cap de la Magdeleine Ry. Co.'s B. 43 (Mr. Paquet) in Com., 2012 (ii).
Canadian Northern Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 187 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6350 (iv).
Census Enumerators and Commissioners, Payments to (remarks) 1020 (i), 3835 (ii).
Chance Harbour, N.B., Improvements *re* (Ques.) 554 (i).
Christmas Holidays, Adjournment *re* (remarks) 702, 927 (i).
Civil Service Act (private secretaries) Amt. B. 60 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 1435 (i).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 4577 (iii).
Collingwood Dry Dock Subsidy B. 111 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 3633 (ii).
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5868; on M. for 3° (amt.) to ref. back to Com., 5960 (iv).
Dismissal of Public Officials, on M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) for Papers, 963-4 (i).
Dismissals from Govt. Service *re* Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1166, 1562 (i).
Dry Dock Subsidies Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 5559; in Com. on Res., 6050 (iv).
See 'Collingwood.'
Elevators, &c., ref. to in debate on Address, 154 (i).
Estimates, Discussion of outside works (remarks) *re* Ruling of Mr. Deputy Speaker, 2443 (ii).
Estimates, Discussion *re* (remarks) *re* Adjournment, 5937 (iv).
Fast Atlantic Service and Halifax Terminals, on M. for Sup., 6510 (iv).
See 'G.B. & Can.'
Fenian Raid Veterans, Gratuity Res. (remarks) 5559 (iv).

PUGSLEY, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*
Fisheries, Contracts with Stewards *re* Boarding Crews (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 681 (i).
Fish Scrap, Price *re* for Fertilizer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 685 (i).
Flags, Use of, B. 74 (Mr. Bradbury) on M. for 1°, 1411 (i).
Fort Howe and Fort Cumberland, Improvements *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 620 (i).
Fort Osborne Barracks Transfer (Mr. Hughes) in Com. on Res., 5698 (iv).
——— Papers asked for, 5558 (iv.)
Gaspé Pier, Appropriation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2790 (ii).
Good Roads: *See* 'Highways.'
Gooseberry Cove, N.B., Improvements *re* (Ques.) 555 (i).
Govt. House Property, Toronto Transfer, B. 182 (Mr. Doherty) on M. for 1°, 5958 (iv).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 869, 871 (i), 3521 (ii).
G.B. and Canada Mail Service, Contracts *re* (remarks) 1846 (i).
See 'Fast Atlantic.'
Hampton Spur Line, Construction *re*, &c. (Ques.) 572 (i).
Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2366 (ii).
Harvey and Salisbury Ry., Negotiations *re* Supply of Rails, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4124, 4171 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 1843 (i).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) on M. for 2°, 3647 (ii).
Highways and Road Construction, ref. to in debate on Address, 152 (i).
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) on M. for 2°, 1021; in Com., 1284, 1415 (i).
I.C.R. Branch Lines, Acquisition by Govt., Tel. *re* (Ques.) 565 (i).
I.C.R. Branch Lines, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 994 (i).
Judges Act (salaries) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 6012 (iv).
Kennie, Capt. Edmund, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 6782 (iv).
'Labour Gazette' Correspondents, Dismissals, &c., on M. for Sup., 1443 (i).
Lake Temiskaming Dam, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (M. for copies*) 2459 (ii).
See 'Temiskaming.'
Langevin Block, Condition of: *See* 'P. O. Deptl. Bldg.'
Live Stock Records Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 6024 (iv).
Lorneville Breakwater, N.B., Tests *re* Foundation, &c. (Ques.) 555 (i).

PUGSLEY, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 3854; on M. for 1°, 3905 (ii); on M. for 2°, 4271; in Com., 4585; (amt.) *re* Subsidies, 4496; Amt. Neg. (Y. 62, N. 101) 4641; on Amts. (Mr. Borden) to M. for 3°, 4837; on Amt. (Mr. Oliver) 4708 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Extension of, Par. in 'Montreal Star' (remarks) 489 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries, Settlement *re*, on M. (Mr. Macdonald) for Cor., 781 (i).
——— Ques. of Privilege, Signing of Resolution, 801 (i).
Man. Grain Act Amt., on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 869; in Com. on Res., 871 (i).
Marcil, Mr. Tancrède, Application *re* Govt. Position (remarks) 2069 (ii).
National Ports (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2839 (ii).
N. T. Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1868 (i).
N. T. Ry. Commissioners, Notification of Dismissal (remarks) 1196 (i).
N.T. Ry., Moncton to Levis, Portion uncompleted (Ques.) 932 (i).
Naval Ships for Canada, Ref. of Min. of Marine *re* Completion (Ques.) 1206 (i).
Ne Temere Decree, Powers of Parlt. (remarks) *re* Answer to Questions, 797 (i).
——— Questions asked by the late Govt., Concurrence by present Govt., &c. (Ques.) 719 (i).
Ontario Boundaries Extension B. 152 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 6155 (iv).
Peace River and Ry. Belt Water Power B. 149 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 5968 (iv).
Post Office Deptl. Building, Charges *re* Condition (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1858 (i).
Preferential Tariff with G. B., prop. Res. (M.) to withdraw, 1390 (i).
P.E.I. Subsidy B. 178 (Mr. White) in Com., 6119, 6151 (iv).
Provincial Subsidies: *See* 'Highways,' 'Man. Boundaries,' &c.
Public Works Engineering Branch (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1059 (i).
Public Works, N.B., Appropriation last year (correction) 2436 (ii).
Public Works, now under construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 621 (i).
Quebec Boundaries Extension B. 151 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 6160 (iv).
Railway Bridges, N.B., Subsidy B. 188 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6374; on M. for 3°, 6394 (iv).
See 'St. John Valley.'
Railway Estimates, Annual Statement (remarks) 4123 (ii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*
Reciprocity, ref. to in debate on Address, 142 (i).
Reid, Mr. Watson E., Dismissal as Inspector of Hillsboro Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1528 (i).
Returns, Inquiry for, 2377 (ii).
Returning Officer W. H. Downey, Delay in Payments (remarks) 2057 (ii).
Rideau Hall, Expenditure *re*, Ques. of Priv., *re* Par. in 'Mail and Empire,' 799 (i).
—— Amount expended *re* H.R.H. Occupancy (Ques.) 547 (i).
—— Stmnt. of Hon. Mr. Kemp *re* Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 726 (i).
Rivière à la Prairie Improvements *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 622 (i).
Rooms alloted to Liberal Members, Complaints *re* (remarks) 670 (i).
St. John Harbour Dredging, Tenders *re* (remarks) 5694 (iv).
—— Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 623, 669 (i), 2371 (ii).
—— Improvements, Tel. *re* Terminal Facilities (Ques.) 566 (i).
—— Wharf Appropriation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2370 (ii).
St. John Harbour, Tugs employed, Amount paid per day (Ques.) 548 (i).
St. John Ry. Co.'s Crossing at Haymarket Square (M.) for Cor., &c., 1402 (i).
St. John Valley Ry., Agreement *re* Construction (remarks) 4461 (iii).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4232 (iii). *See* 'Ry. Bridges.'
Salisbury and Harvey Ry. Co., Cor. *re* Opening of Hillsborough Ry. (M. for copy*) 562 (i).
—— Inquiry for Papers, 938 (i).
Stenographic Assistance for Members (remarks) 1846 (i).
Sussex St. Property and Govt. Buildings Explanation *re* Abandonment, 2007 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census and statistics) 619 (i).
Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 1040; Charges of Management (dom. notes) 1033; (salaries) 619; Conservation Commission (salaries) 1069; Finance (contingencies) 1068 (i); Inland Revenue (promotions) conc., 6771 (iv); (salaries) 1062; Justice—Exchequer Court (salaries) 1036, 1039; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 1041; Militia (salaries) 1037; Naval Dept. (salaries) 1062; Public Works (salaries) 1064; Railways (salaries) 1064 (i).
Labour Dept. (Gazette) 1469; (inspection *re* shipping machinery) 1525 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Cuba) 4721; (Can. and G. B.) 4718 (iii); (Canada and Mexico) 5935 (iv); (Halifax and Nfld.) 4729; (Halifax and W. Indies, &c.) 4740 (iii); (Mar. Provs. and Porto Rico (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 686 (i); (Pelee Island) 678; (St. John and Cuba) 678; (St. John and W. Indies) 640 (i).
Militia (armouries) 5543; (automobiles) 5515; (customs dues) 5522 (iii); (public buildings) 620 (i).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5319, 5327 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 5187 (iii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (water storage dams, Temiskaming dam) 2827; (monuments) 2825 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings (generally) 623 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Hampton) 1527; (Hillsboro) 1528; (St. John drill hall) 1529 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Gananoque) 1855; (Kingston R.M.C.) 1855 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Quebec customs house) 1849; (Quebec P.O.) 1852; (St. Lambert) 1853; (Shawinigan) 1852 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (repairs, &c.) 2814 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (creosoted timber) 2441; (dredging) 2816 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Bathurst) 2363; (Goose Creek) 2372 (ii); (St. John) 623 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Burke's Head) 2045; (repairs, &c.) 2051 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Toronto Harbour) 2445; (York bridge) 2817 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Rivieres des Prairies) 2441; (Three Rivers) 2441 (ii).
Public Works—Telegraphs—Alta. (Athabasca Landing) 2819; (North Battleford) 2823 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (Chatham diversion) 4137; (construction) 4133 (iii); (extensions) 5639 (iv); (Hampton) 4225 (iii); (Hampton spur) 675 (i); (working expenses) 4165 (iii).
Trade and Commerce (annuities act) 689; (bounties act) 687 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 3044, 3541 (ii); 4080 (iii); on Senate Amts., 6668 (iv).
—— Appeal from Ruling (Mr. Bennett) 3615 (ii).
Temiskaming Dam, Inquiry for Ret., 5928, 6661 (iv).
See 'Lake Temiskaming.'
Transportation Question: *See* 'Fast Atlantic,' 'National Ports,' 'Dry Docks, St. John.'
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 6180 (iv).
Waterways Commission, Apptmt. of Commissioners (M. for O. Cs., &c.) 981 (i).

PUGSLEY, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*
Waterways Commission, Dismissal and Apptmts., on M. for Sup., 6680 (iv).
——— (remarks) 966 (i).
See 'Boundary.'
West Indies, Australia and Canada Trade Relations, on M. for Sup., 1971 (ii).

RAINVILLE, Mr. J. H., *Chambly Verchères.*
Address, The, 337 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) to M. for 3°, 4865 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Resignation of Messrs. Ballantyne and Geoffrion (remarks) 6554 (iv).
Postmasters, Dismissals by Liberal Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6296 (iv).

REID, Mr. J., *Restigouche.*
Storey, Wm., Dismissal, Investigation, &c. (Ques.) 5054 (iii).

REID, Hon. J. D. (Minister of Customs) *Grenville.*
American Goods shipped into Canada, Names of Firms (Ans.) 3533 (ii).
Asbestos Importations, Total Value, on M. (Mr. Beland) for Ret., 1818 (i).
Asbestos Manufactures, Imports, &c. Value &c., on M. (Mr. Beland) for Ret., 1591 (i).
Baldwin, Mr. E., Dismissal, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Cor., 1362 (i).
Beauchesne, Mr., Dismissal from Customs (Ans.) 3151 (ii).
Boots and Shoes, Imports and Prices into Canada for 1908-9-10, on M. (Mr. Carvell) for Ret., 1267 (i).
Bull, Mr. Robert, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3338 (ii).
Cement Importations, Quantity and Value, 1910-11 (Ans.) 3534 (ii).
Chubb, George, Customs Officer, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 4459 (ii).
Cigarettes, Manufactured and Imported in each prov. for 1905 (Ans.) 556 (i).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. (B. 116) (M. for Com. on Res.) 3829 (ii); in Com. on Res., 3971; 1°*, of Bill, 3972 (ii); 2°m., 4563; in Com., 4564 (iii).
Coasting Trade, O.C. extending Time (Ans.) 1815 (i).
Cockshutt Plough Co., Prices, (remarks) 854 (i).
Cream Exports into U.S., Quantity and Value for 1911 (Ans.) 3535 (ii).
Customs Contracts given without tender (Ques.) 877 (i).
Customs Deptl. Report (presented) 971 (i).
Customs Smuggling Case, Par. in Montreal 'Star' (Ans.) 2072 (ii).

REID, Hon. J. D.—*Con.*
Fishing Twine for Lobster Nets, on stmnt. (Mr. Sinclair) to M. for Sup., 5594 (iv).
Gerrior, Wm., Dismissal from Larry's River Customs Port (Ans.) 3052 (ii).
Grain Shipments from Port Arthur and Fort William (Ans.) 539 (i).
Hattie, Mr. W. A., Preventive Officer at Mulgrave, Dismissal (Ans.) 1815 (i).
Hefferman, Mr. F. S., Customs Officer at Spring Hill, Dismissal (Ans.) 4039 (iii).
Lebel, Mr. W., Dismissal from Customs, 1864 (i).
Lepage, M. J., Preventive Officer, Rimouski, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 4458 (iii).
Lobster Trap Twine, Change in Customs Tariff, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Papers, 1362 (i).
——— (remarks) 1071 (i).
See 'Twine.'
Lumber Duties, Interpretation and Enforcement, (amt.) suggested, 582; Reply to, 589 (i).
——— Violation of Customs Act, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) 1803 (i).
McLean, W. S., Dismissal from Customs at L'Etang (Ans.) 4780 (iii).
Miner, Bill, Escape (remarks) 939 (i).
Montreal Customs House, Dismissals, &c. (Ans.) 4040 (iii).
Mosher, Mr. G. A., Preventive Officer at Ship Harbour (Ans.) 4040 (iii).
Mundle, Mr. D. I., Dismissal from Customs at Richibucto (Ans.) 4780 (iii).
N.T.Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3366 (ii).
Oyster Pond Preventive Officer, Pet. *re* Dismissal (Ans.) 1207 (i).
Poulin, Mr. E., Dismissal from Quebec Customs (Ans.) 2071 (ii).
Rambaut, Thomas D., Patent Relief B. 83 (Mr. Ames) in Com., 3280 (ii).
Renfrew Election, Minister's speech *re* Georgian Bay Canal (remarks) 1573 (i).
Returns, on Inquiry for, 2057 (ii).
Robinson, Fred. P., Apptmt. as Preventive Officer, N.B. (Ans.) 4241 (iii).
Stoves, Ranges, Incubators exported to Argentine Republic, Value, &c. (Ans.) 561 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1040; Outside Ports (salaries) 1073 (i).
Marine (Govt. steamers) 1964 (i).
Railways—I.C.R. (branch lines) 622 (i).
Therrien, J. F., Dismissal from Inland Revenue (Ans.) 3152 (ii).
Twine Materials Importations (Ans.) 3536 (ii).
See 'Lobster.'

REID, Hon. J. D.—*Con.*
Yule, Andrew, Customs Collector at Aurora Dismissal (Ans.) 4779 (iii), 5950 (iv).

RHODES, Mr. E. N., *Cumberland.*
Fast Atlantic Service, and Halifax Terminals, on M. for Sup., 6501, 6516 (iv).
Guysborough Branch Line Subsidy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5628 (iv).
Immigration Policy *re* Mar. Provinces (prop. res.) 2072 (ii).
Molson, Kenneth Relief (B. 110) 1°*, 3449 (ii).
Political Literature, Distribution *re*, Racial Prejudices (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6516 (iv).
SUPPLY.
Railways—I.C.R. (branch lines) 5628; (double tracking) 5637; (extensions) 5639 (iv).

RICHARDS, Mr. J. W., *Prince, P.E.I.*
O'Leary to West Point Ry. Branch Lines, Construction *re* (Ques.) 721 (i).

ROBB, Mr. J. A., *Huntingdon.*
Cedar Rapids Power Co., Water Power Concessions to *re* St. Lawrence River, &c. (Ques.) 728 (i).
Cement Importations, Quantity and Value for 1910-11 (Ques.) 3534 (ii).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 4572 (iii).
Cream Exports into U.S., Quantity and Value for 1911 (Ques.) 3535 (ii).
Dairying Industry in Canada, Complaints *re* Weighing at Montreal (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5741 (iv).
Dynamite and Explosives, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 724 (i).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 2°, 2179; in Com., 2182, 2541, 3167, 3760 (ii).
Inspection and Sale Act (grain) Amt. B. 178 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 6190 (iv).
Live Stock Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 6032 (iv).
Railway Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6330 (iv).
SUPPLY.
Agriculture—Experimental Farms (branch stations) 6478; (farm bulletins) 6467; Miscellaneous (Toronto exhibition) 6482 (iv).
Militia (annual drill) 5488 (iii).

ROCHE, Hon. W. J., (Secretary of State) *Marquette.*
Advertisements for Govt. Contracts, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 2450 (ii).
Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., Apptmt. as Commissioner of Inquiry, &c. (Ans.) 2062 (ii).
Canadian Agents, Names of Appointees in Europe (Ans.) 5557 (iv).

ROCHE, Hon. W. J.—*Con.*
Canadian Missionaries in China, Stmnt. from Home Govt. (read) 6559 (iv).
C.P. Ry. Irrigation, Complaint from Alberta Farmers (Ans.) 5262 (iii).
Carleton County Electoral District, Issue of Writ, &c. (Ans.) 1810 (i).
Chinese and Japanese in B.C., Number naturalized, &c. (Ans.) 556 (i).
Civil Service List, on Inquiry for (remarks) 6187 (iv).
Commissioners of Investigation, Number employed by Govt., Remuneration, &c. (Ans.) 6336 (iv).
Companies Act Amt., Legislation *re* (Ans.) 529 (i).
Dunnville Customs and Postal Revenue for 1910-11 (Ans.) 2066 (ii).
Election Accounts, Delay *re* Payments (remarks) 2156 (ii), 4461 (iii).
Govt. Printing, Patronage to French Papers in Quebec (Ans.) 1357 (i).
Gutelius, Mr. F. P., Naturalization of (Ans.) 4978 (iii).
Joint Stock Companies Inspection, &c. (Ans.) 2857 (ii).
Joliette, Elections, Returning Officer (Ans.) 4979 (iii).
Keewatin, Pet. *re* Education Clauses (Ans.) 3149 (ii).
King's Printer, Apptmt. of Assistant (Ans.) 1809 (i).
Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6314 (iv).
Maritime Law, International Conference, &c. (Ans.) 2587 (ii).
Maskinonge Election Expenses, Settlement of (Ans.) 4776 (iii).
Public Officials, Inquiries *re* Conduct of, Apptmt. of Commissioners in Quebec District (Ans.) 2063 (ii).
Public Service Commission, Apptmt. of Messrs. Jackson and Schwitzer as assistants (Ans.) 5954 (iv).
Printing Bureau, Clocks, Number installed, Expenditure (Ans.) 2859 (ii).
——— Dismissals and Apptmts. (Ans.) 1809 (i).
——— Employees, Changes *re* Duties (Ans.) 2243 (i).
——— Salary Increases, &c. (Ans.) 2067 (ii).
——— Weekly Consultations (remarks) 2243 (ii).
Renfrew, N., Contracts awarded, &c. (Ans.) 2857 (ii).
——— Dismissal of Govt. Officials (Ans.) 2857 (ii).
Renfrew, S., Apptmts. to Govt. Service (Ans.) 3334 (ii).

ROCHE, Hon. W. J.—*Con.*
Renfrew, S., Contracts awarded, &c. (Ans.) 2856 (ii).
——— Dismissal of Govt. Officials (Ans.) 2856 (ii).
St. Patrick de Brandon, Population, Revenue, &c. *re* P.O. (Ans.) 725 (i).
Secretary of State, Report (presented) 565 (i).
SUPPLY.
Civil Govt.—Secretary of State (salaries) 1038 (i).
Labour Dept. (*Gazette*) 1472 (i).
Miscellaneous (additional commissioner) 6615; Parliamentary Documents (translation) 6614 (iv).
Printing Bureau (plant, &c.) 6611 (iv).
Tuberculosis in St. Jean and Iberville, Information *re* (Ans.) 3533 (ii).
Typewriters and Supplies, Names of Firms, &c. (Ans.) 1809 (i).
Vickers-Maxim Co., Contract *re* Montreal Dry Dock (Ans.) 2450 (ii).
Yamaska Electoral Agent, &c. (Ans.) 1584 (i.).

ROGERS, Hon. R. (Minister of the Interior) *Winnipeg.*
Abenakis Indian Agent, Apptmt. and Salary (Ans.) 1587 (i).
Asselin, Mr. Oliver, Emplymt. by Immigration Dept. (Ans.) 1814 (i).
Braine, Dr. Lawrence, Medical Indian Attendant at Chester, N.S., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 4976 (iii).
B. C. Railway Belt Lands, O. C. *re* Transfer (remarks) 1200 (i).
British News, &c., Purchase of by Int. Dept. (Ans.) 6660 (iv).
See 'Hawke.'
Can. Northern Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 187 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6371 (iv).
Carpet Weavers Union, Violation of Immigration Act by J. C. Murray (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1514 (i).
Census Enumerators, Payments to (remarks) 2668 (ii).
Chard, Mr. J. A., Indian Agent at Grand View, Charges *re* (Ans.) 2458 (ii).
Coal Supply in the West, Remission of Duties (remarks) 230 (i).
Combines in Trade, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1519 (i).
Crown Lands in Man., Alberta and Sask., Number of Acres, Reservations for School Lands (Ans.) 1588 (i).
Dom. Lands Agent at Medicine Hat, Suspension or Dismissal (Ans.) 552 (i).
Dupont, Rene, Dismissal at Immigration Agent (Ans.) 1864 (i).
Eastern Township, Field for Immigration (remarks) 6558 (iv).

ROGERS, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Farm Labourers Immigration: *See* 'Immigration.'
Forts and Military Property, Improvements *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 620 (i).
Freight Rates on Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3212 (ii).
French Canadian Repatriation (remarks) 619 (i).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2781 (ii).
Grain Congestion in the West, Car Distribution (remarks) 6557 (iv).
——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6205 (iv).
Grain Shipments to Terminal Elevators (remarks) 6792 (iv).
Ham, Robt., Dismissal from Trachoma Hospital at Halifax (Ans.) 875 (i).
Hawkes, Mr. Arthur, Apptmt. in Immigration Dept. (Ans.) 527 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. Oliver) for O. C., 615 (i).
See 'British News,' 'Immigration.'
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3727 (ii).
Homestead Inspectors in Sask., Number dismissed, &c. (Ans.) 1588 (i).
House of Commons Desks, Change of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 623 (i).
Immigrants deported, Number, Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 1213 (i).
Immigration Agents in Belgium, Number, &c. (Ans.) 878 (i).
Immigration Agents, Dismissals, Number and Names (Ans.) 877 (i).
Immigration Agents *re* Farm Labourers, Number appointed (Ans.) 874 (i).
——— in Quebec, Number, &c. (Ans.) 1359 (i).
Immigration Agents in France, Names and Salaries (Ans.) 878, 1212 (i).
Immigration Agents, Notification to Booking Agents *re* Bonus (Ans.) 875 (i).
Immigration Agents and Ontario Farm Labourers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3928 (ii).
Immigration from U.S., Opposition of Govt. (remarks) 3154 (ii).
Immigration Hospitals, Number and Location (Ans.) 1210 (i).
Immigrant Inspection before sailing for Canada (remarks) 618 (i).
Immigration Literature, French Publications (Ans.) 1212 (i).
Immigration Medical Examiners, Number, Names, &c. (Ans.) 1213 (i).
Immigration, Money expended, Number of Immigrants, &c. (Ans.) 1211 (i).
Immigration Office in London, Ont. (Ans.) 2451 (ii).

ROGERS, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Immigration Policy *re* Mar. Provs., on prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2143 (ii).
Immigration Premiums, Amount expended (Ans.) 1212 (i).
Immigration, Rep. of Mr. Hawkes, 6551 (iv). *See* 'Hawkes.'
Immigration Societies, State-Aid, Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 1211 (i).
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1319 (i).
Japanese, &c., Immigration, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 875 (i).
Laforce, Mr. J. W., Emplymt. as Immigration Agent (Ans.) 2242 (ii).
Land Grant to Railways in Western Provs., prior to 1896 (Ans.) 726 (i).
Laurier, R., Immigration Agent at Detroit, (Ans.) 2454 (ii).
Laurier, C. A., Immigration Agent at Marquette (Ans.) 2454 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to M. for 2°, 4375; in Com., 4537; on Amt. (Mr. Béland) to M. for 3°, 4934; on Amt. (Mr. Oliver) 4682 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Settlement, on M. (Mr. Macdonald) for Cor., 787 (i).
Manitoba Grain Act (prop. res.) 793 (i).
Man. Swamp Lands, Sale of by Auction (remarks) 4308 (iii).
Mining Rights Administration, O. Cs. *re* Resolution (remarks) 6792 (iv).
Municipal Elections and Civil Servants (Ans.) 1813 (i).
Murray, J. P., Breach of Immigration Regulations *re* Carpet Employees (Ans.) 550 (i).
North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6244 (iv).
O'Brien, A. J., Dismissal from Immigration Buildings at Halifax (Ans.) 717 (i).
Oriental Immigration into B. C., Total Number (Ans.) 4779 (iii).
Peace River Railway Belt and Block (B. 149) 1°*, 5257 (iii); in Com., 5968, 6175; 3° m., 6188, 6338; (M.) to ref. back to Com., 6401; 3° m., 6401 (iv).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6244 (iv).
Rambaut, Thomas D., Patent Relief B. 84 (Mr. Ames) in Com., 2855 (ii).
Sevigny, Mr., Apptmt. *re* Immigration Office (Ans.) 1205, 1588, 1814 (i).
S. A. Veterans' Bounty Bill (remarks) 2061 (ii).
S. A. Bounty Scrip, Delay *re* Decision (remarks) 3154 (ii).
Statue erected on Govt. Lands in Quebec City by Provl. Govt. (Ans.) 2668 (ii).

ROGERS, Hon. R.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Indians (salaries) 1039; Interior (salaries) 1038 (i).
Immigration (agencies) 3306, 3915; (regulations *re*) 3912 (ii).
Labour Dept—(Gazette) 1468 (i).
Militia—(public buildings) 620 (i).
Miscellaneous (Paris agency) 6615 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (London, Eng.) 6655 (iv).
Svaigher, A., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 6186 (iv).
Syrian Immigration, Pet. *re* Cancellation (Ans.) 1209 (i).
Volunteer Bounty Act, 1908 Amt. (B. 137) 1° m., 4974 (iii); 2° m., 5968 (iv); in Com., 6176, 6450 (iv).
Volunteer Bounty Act (remarks) 1577 (i).
Voters' Lists, Preparation of by Federal Govt., Stmnt. of Min. of the Int. (Ans.) 553 (i).
Water Rights in Ry. Belt.: *See* 'Peace River.'
Webster, Mr., Immigration Agent at Edmonton, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3922 (ii).
White, Mr. James, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3338 (ii).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Harbour Commissioners incorp. B. 138 (Mr. Hazen) in Com., 5989 (iv).
Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. (B. 181) 1° m., 5939; in Com., 6182 (iv).

SCHAFFNER, Mr. F. L., *Souris.*
Adjournment, on M. (Mr. Borden) 928 (i).
Canadian Public Health Association incorp. (B. 127) 1°*, 4835 (iii).
Cockshutt Plough Co., Stmnt. *re* Prices (remarks) 814 (i).
Grain Act. Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2170, 2181, 2304, 2383, 2535, 2759, 3157, 3458, 3473 (ii), 4069 (iii).
Grain Carriage to Duluth, &c., Ref. to Washington Despatch (remarks) 2576 (ii).
Grain Shipments from the West, Regulation of Freight Rates, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3978 (ii).
Hudson Bay Railway Construction, on M. (Mr. Aikins) for Papers, 1248 (i).
Hudson Bay Ry., Contract *re*, on M. (Mr. Neely) for O. Cs., &c., 734 (i).
Lumber Duties, Violation of Customs Act, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) 1731 (i).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 4763 (iii).
Railway Rates, Transportation, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1945 (i).

SCHAFFNER, Mr. F. L.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (rentals, &c.) 1331 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2967 (ii).
Wheat Grades, &c. (remarks) on Public Ownership debate, 663 (i).

SEGUIN, Mr. P. A., *L'Assomption.*
Archambault, Emile, Letter Carrier, Montreal, Dismissal (Ques.) 5950 (iv); (M. for cor.*) 5957 (iv).
Can. Northern Quebec Ry. Co., Maintenance of Road on L'Ile Bourdon (Ques.) 5261 (iii).
Charlemagne Mail Contract, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 1862 (i).
Coffin, Henry, Apptmt. as Messenger H. of C., Dismissal of M. Picotte (M. for cor.*) 2459 (ii).
Dumelong, M. E., Dismissal from L'Assomption P. O. (Ques.) 580, 720 (i).
Forest, Mr. Medard, Excise Officer at L'Epiphanie, Dismissal, Charges (Ques.) 726 (i).
Ice-Breaker at St. Gerard, Tenders *re* Construction (Ques.) 2451 (ii).
Lachenaie Postmaster, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 5949 (iv).
L'Achigan Ice-Breaker, Tenders *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 2294 (ii).
L'Assomption Public Works, Votes in Estimates (Ques.) 5951, 6781 (iv).
L'Assomption Wharf, Appropriation *re* (Ques.) 2451, 2579 (ii).
Laurentides Public Building, Acquisition of Property (Ques.) 2451 (ii).
Lighthouse Keepers at Repentigny, Charges *re* &c. (Ques.) 3752 (ii), 5949 (iv).
——— (M. for cor.*) 6784 (iv).
Locas, Mr. Henri, Dismissal, &c (Ques.) 3338 (ii).
Picotte, Mederic, Messenger H. of C., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 2065 (ii).
St. Paul L'Ermite &c., Mail Carrier, &c. (Ques.) 2583 (ii).
——— Mail Service, Cancellation of Contracts (Ques.) 3341 (ii).
Ste. Therese and Laurentides Post Office, Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 3335 (ii).

SEVIGNY, Mr. A., *Dorchester.*
Address, The, in Answer to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 27 (v).
Dugas, Hon. Mr. Justice, Date of Apptmt., &c. (Ques.) 2858 (ii).
Ha Ha Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6213 (iv).
Joint Stock Companies, Inspection, &c. (Ques.) 2857 (ii).

SEVIGNY, Mr. A.—*Con.*
Man. Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. Beland) to M. for 3°, 4945, 4956 (iii).
N. T. Ry. Commission, Payments to Mr. E. Taschereau (Ques.) 2244 (ii).
——— Payments to Taschereau, Cannan & Co. (Ques.) 2245 (ii).
N. T. Ry., Damages in Dorchester Co., Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 6184 (iv).
Railway Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6213 (iv).
Vickers-Maxim Co., Contract *re* Construction of Dry Dock at Montreal (Ques.) 2450 (ii).

SEXSMITH, Mr. J. A., *East Peterborough.*
Agriculture and Colonization Com., 1st. Rep., Ref. to Printing Com. (M.) 3933 (ii).
——— Reports (presented) 2375 (ii).
Cockshutt Plough Co., Prices *re* (remarks) 818 (i).
Grain Act B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2557 (ii).

SHARPE, Mr. S., *North Ontario.*
Chats Falls Timber Slide, Date of Deed to D. O'Connor, &c. (Ques.) 4549 (iii).
Civil Service Act (rural mail) Amt. B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 6089 (iv).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6458 (iv).
Imperial Loan and Investment Co.'s (B. 184) 1°*, 6061 (iv).
Live Stock Records Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 6038 (iv).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1665 (i).
N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1890 (i).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 4759 (iii).
Rambaut, Thomas D., Patent Relief B. 84 (Mr. Ames) in Com., 2987, 3490 (ii).
Senate Amendments to Railway Bills, on M. for Sup., 6549 (iv).
SUPPLY.
Labour Dept. (*Gazette*) 1493 (i); Militia (customs dues) 5525 (iii); Railways—P.E.I. (car ferry) 5672 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 3018, 3557 (ii).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 6451 (iv).
Wadge, Thomas, Patent Relief B. 16 (Mr. Aikins) in Com., 2984 (ii).

SHARPE, Mr. W. H., *Lisgar.*
Budget, The, 5109 (iii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2312, 2777, 3165, 3498, 3520 (ii), 4159 (iii).

SHARPE, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2894 (ii).

SHEPHERD, Mr. F. H., *Nanaimo.*
B. C. Herring Fishing, Authority *re* Close Season (Ques.) 4256 (iii).
Fish Hatcheries, B.C., Cost of Construction (Ques.) 4256 (iii) .
Fisheries Protection Service on Pacific Coast, on M. (Mr. Clements) for Papers, 2481 (ii).
Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 105 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 3360 (ii).

SINCLAIR, Mr. J. H., *Guysborough.*
Address, The, 323 (i).
Appropriations omitted from Estimates of 1913 (M. for ret.) 1819 (i).
Barss, Mr. Archibald, Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 6784 (iv).
Biological Board of Canada B. 118 (Mr. Hazen) in Com., 4552 (iii).
Biological Board, Names, Salaries, &c., (Ques.) 4257 (iii).
Blind River Post Office, Change of Name (M. for cor.*) 4262 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Papers, 5928 (iv).
B. C. Fishing Licenses, Transfer, &c. (M. for pets.*) 3945 (ii).
Canadian Coal for Govt. Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3288 (ii).
Canals, Capital Expenditure, Total Cost (Ques.) 1811 (i).
Canal Tolls, Abolition of, O.Cs., &c. (M. for copies*) 2861 (ii).
Canso Public Buildings, Dismissal of Caretaker (remarks) 581 (i).
——— Dismissal of R. Sutherland (M. for cor.*) 1409 (i).
——— Pet. *re* (Ques.) 1207 (i).
See 'Sutherland.'
Canso Reduction Works, Dismissals, Names, &c. (Ques.) 974 (i).
Carleton County Electoral Vacancy, Issue of Writ, &c. (Ques.) 1810 (i).
Charlos Cove Breakwater (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2040 (ii).
Charlos Cove Lightkeeper, Dismissal, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 1208 (i).
Christmas Adjournment, on M. (Mr. Borden) 928 (i).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 4572 (iii) .
Civil Service Investigation *re* Political Partisanship (Ques.) 1581 (i).
Coasting Trade, O.C. extending Time (Ques.) 1814 (i).
Commissioners appointed by Govt. *re* Investigations, Number, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 5680, 6336 (iv).

SINCLAIR, Mr. J. H.—*Con.*
Conciliation Board, Apptmt. of *re* International Disputes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1508 (i).
Conway, Patrick J., Lightkeeper at White Head Island, Dismissal, &c. (M. for cor.*) 2587, 3342 (ii).
See 'Whitehead.'
Cox, Mr. A. B., Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 6784 (iv).
Cresine, Geo., Quarter Master on SS. 'Scotia,' Dismissal (Ques.) 1582 (i).
Crown Lands in Man. Sask. and Alberta, Number of Acres, Reservations for School Lands, &c. (Ques.) 1587 (i).
Davis, John, Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 6783 (iv).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Taylor) to conc., 2845 (ii).
Debt of Canada, Average Interest (Ques.) 1811 (i).
Decoste, Capt., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3271 (ii).
Dismissals from Govt. Service *re* Political partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1088, 1557 (i), 2018, 3248, (ii),4187 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. Carvell) for Papers, 944 (i).
Dogfish Scrap, Price *re* (M. for cor.) 1391 (i).
Fast Atlantic Service and Halifax Terminals, on M. for Sup., 6514 (iv).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6255 (iv).
Ferguson, S. M., Dismissal of (M. for cor.*) 2459 (ii).
Fish, Fresh, Expenditure *re* Transportation (Ques.) 2666 (ii).
Fisheries Act (leases) Amt. B. 140 (Mr. Hazen) on M. for 2°, 5273 (iii).
Fisheries Department, Reorganization of (remarks) 936 (i).
Fishery Guardians in Guysborough County, Names, Dismissals, &c. (Ques.) 3053 (ii).
——— (M. for cor.*) 3055 (ii).
Fishery Inspectors, N.S., Names, &c. (Ques.) 4257 (iii).
Fishery Protection Service on Pacific Coast, on M. (Mr. Clements) for Papers, 2470 (ii).
Fish Scrap sold as Fertilizer, Increase in Price (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 684 (i).
Fishing Twine for Lobster Nets, Duties *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5587 (iv).
Gasolene Engines on Fishing Boats, Number, &c. (Ques.) 2666 (ii).
Gass, Trueman, Emplymt. and Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 2242 (ii).
Gerrior, Mr. William, Dismissal from Customs at Larry's River, N.S. (Ques.) 3051 (ii).

SINCLAIR, Mr. J. H.—*Con.*
Gerrior, Mr. William, (M. for cor.*) 3056 (ii).
Glenelg, N.S. Postmaster, Complaints *re* Pets., &c. (M. for papers*) 1817 (i).
Guysborough Branch Line Subsidy (remarks) 1445 (i), 5261 (iv).
Hagerty, S. W., Dismissal from Inspector ship of Ry. Station (Ques.) 4976 (iii).
Halifax Terminal Facilities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4205 (iii).
Harris, W. H., Postmaster at White Head. Dismissal, &c. (M. for papers*) 2588 (ii).
Hattie, Mr. W. A., Preventive Office, Mulgrave, Dismissal (Ques.) 1815 (i).
——— (M. for cor.*) 2460 (ii) .
Hendsbee, David S., Dismissal from Marine and Fisheries Dept. (M. for cor.*) 3342 (ii).
Highways Improvements B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3703 (ii).
House of Commons, Improvements *re* Acoustics (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1335 (i).
I.C.R., Guysborough Branch, Construction *re* (Ques.) 571 (i).
Judges Act (salaries) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 6006 (iv).
Kelly, Edward, Dismissal from Canso Reduction Works (M. for cor.*) 3341 (ii).
Land Grants to Railways in Western Provs. prior to 1896 (Ques.) 725 (i).
Larry's River Dredging, Apptmt. of Inspector (Ques.) 5055 (ii).
Linwood and Grosvenor's Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6281 (iv).
McGrath, James, Postmaster at Aspen, N.S. (M. for cor.*) 2587 (ii).
McPherson, John H., Complaints *re* as Postmaster at Tracadie Road (Ques.) 4259 (iii).
Mail Contracts, Cancellation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6622 (iv).
Man. and N.S., Federal Subsidies, &c. (Ques.) 4258 (iii).
Marine Hospitals, Ships for Fishermen (remarks) 6787 (iv).
Melford, N.S., Wharf, Notice to suspend Work, &c. (Ques.) 549 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners B. 97 (Mr. Hazen) 2416 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Total Debenture *re* Debt. (Ques.) 1357 (i).
N.T. Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1871 (i).
N.T. Ry. (P. C. judgment) B. 95 (Mr. White) on M. for 2°, 3102 (ii).
Naval Policy of Govt., Ref. to in debate on Address, 331 (i).
Ne Temere Decree, Stmnt. of Member for Peterborough (Ques.) 731 (i).

SINCLAIR, Mr. J. H.—*Con.*
New Harbour Breakwater (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2044 (ii).
Oyster Ponds, Preventive Officer, Dismissal of (Ques.) 1207 (i).
Panama Canal, Tolls, &c., Repts. of U.S. Papers (remarks) 2446 (ii).
Political Partisanship, Letter sent to Officers Inland Rev. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5820 (iv).
Post Office Dismissals, Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6302 (iv).
Public Works under construction, Estimates *re* (remarks in Com. of Sup., 1343 (i).
Public Works, Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1343 (i).
Public Works in Mar. Provs., Appropriations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2436 (ii).
Public Works for N.S., omitted from Estimates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2794 (ii).
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6305 (iv).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 4769 (iii).
Railway Contracts, Terms *re*, Applicable to N.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4233 (iii).
Railway Estimates, Annual Statement (remarks) 4122 (iii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6228, 6305 (iv).
Reciprocity Treaty, Ref. to in debate on Address, 323 (i).
Reciprocity with U.S. from 1890 to 1891 (M. for cor.*) 5263 (iii).
Richards, Mr., Dismissal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5821, 6652 (iv).
Roberts, Capt. Alex., Postmaster at Canso, Dismissals, &c. (M. for cor.*) 3341 (ii).
Rogers, J. M., Dismissal from East Roman Valley Post Office, N.S. (Ques.) 722 (i).
——— (M. for pets.*) 1409 (i).
Senate Vacancy, Apptmt. of Acadian in N.B. (Ques.) 541 (i).
Smith, Lyman C., Customs Collector at Oshawa, Dismissal of (M. for cor.*) 2861 (ii).
——— Letter (read) in Com. on Bill, 4575 (iii).
Steam Trawling on Can., Coasts and Outside (M.) for Papers, 2461 (ii).
Steam Trawlers and Fisheries Bounties, (M. for pets.*) 5957 (iv).
Steam Trawlers, Protection against (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5388 (iii).
Steel and Iron Bounties, *re* Budget Speech (Ques.) 4249 (iii).
Sunnybrae and Guysborough Branch Ry., I.C.R., Appropriation *re* (Ques.) 2289 (ii).
——— (M. for cor.*) 4262 (iii).

SINCLAIR, Mr. J. H.—*Con.*
Sunnybrae to Country Harbour Ry. Subsidy (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Bill, 6228 (iv).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4213 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture—Experimental Farms (bulletins) 6468; (fumigating stations) 6479; (Toronto exhibition) 6481 (iv).
Civil Govt. — Customs — Outside Ports (salaries) 1088 (i); Post Office (salaries) 6278 (iv).
Fisheries (lighthouse keepers) 6650 (iv); (protection service) 5387 (iii); (scrap as fertilizer) 684 (i).
Labour Dept. (combines investigation act) 1503 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Australia) 4714; Can. and G.B.) 4719; (Can. and S. Africa) 4727; (Halifax and Nfld.) 4728 (iii); (North Sydney) 679 (i); (Sydney and Wycocomagh) 4742 (iii).
Marine (Govt. steamers) 1964 (i).
Miscellaneous (Champlain monument) 6486; (pelagic sealing) 5811 (iv).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5308, 5383 (iii).
Post Office (mail service) 6281, 6294; Outside Service (salaries) 6622 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Wolfville) 1343; Ont. (Sarnia) 1952; Ottawa (leases) 1324 (i); Ottawa (rents, &c.) 3290 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (creosoted timber) 2440; (Cole Harbour) 2055; (Melford) 2056 (ii).
Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 6606 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (board of management) 4136 (iii); (branch lines) 5621 (iv); (Dartmouth) 671 (i); (double tracking) 5638 (iv); (highways) 4226; (Mulgrave) 4225 (iii); (SS. Scotia) 5655; (wages) 5809; (Wallace Harbour spur line) 6604 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (annuities act) 695; (bounties act) 687 (i).
Sutherland, Mr., Dismissal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2018; Cor., &c. (read) 2022 (ii).
——— (remarks) 1274 (i).
See 'Canso.'
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 3549 (ii).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6418 (iv).
Tory, H. L., Dismissal, &c. (M. for cor.*) 6783 (iv).
Tracadie Road Post Office, Charges *re* (M. for cor.*) 4459 (iii).
Twine Materials Importations, &c. (Ques.) 3536 (ii).
Webber, James, Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 6783 (iv).
White Head Island Lighthouse, Dismissal of Patrick Conway, Investigation, &c. (Ques.) 2857 (ii).
See 'Conway.'
SINCLAIR, Mr. J. H.—*Con.*
Whitehead, N. S., Dismissal of Postmaster, &c. (Ques.) 2855 (ii).
——— Cor., &c. (read) in Com. of Sup., 6302 (iv).
Williams, Mr., Dismissal from H. of C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3279 (ii).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Harbour Commissioners incorp. B. 138 (Mr. Hazen) in Com., 5999 (iv).
SMITH, Mr. Wm., *South Ontario.*
Live Stock Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 6038 (iv).
SPEAKER, Mr. (Hon. T. S. Sproule) *East Grey.*
Address, The, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Blondin) 372 (i).
Address, The, 'Trusts and Mergers,' applied to Min. of Fin., Member asked to withdraw, 63 (i).
Agriculture, 1st Rep. of Com., Irregularity *re* (remarks) 2375 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Sexsmith) to ref. to Printing Com., 3934 (ii).
Banking Act Amt. Bill (Mr. Demers) on M. to introduce (remarks) 407 (i).
Barcelona Tramway Light and Power Co.'s B. 36, on M. for 3°, 2413 (ii).
Bills, Royal Assent, Com. from Gov. Gen's. Sec. (read) 794 (i); 3236 (ii); 4775 (iii).
Bills, Royal Assent, 4849 (iii).
Cable Rates to G.B., on M. for Sup., Members remarks checked, 3237 (ii).
Cable Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lemieux), Irrelevancy of debate, 4108 (iii).
——— Members remarks checked, 4104 (iii).
Canada Shipping Act (pilotage dues) Amt. Bill (Mr. Edwards) on M. to introduce (remarks) 229, 267 (i).
Can. Northern Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 187 (Mr. Cochrane) on M. for 3°, (ruling) 6371 (iv).
Canso Public Building, Dismissal of Caretaker (remarks) 581 (i).
Car Shortage in the West, Members remarks checked, 1709 (i); 2754 (ii).
Christmas Adjournment, on M. (Mr. Borden) 930 (i).
Chicoutimi Electoral District, Controverted Election Certificate of Judge (presented) 11 (iv).
Cockshutt Plough Co., Prices *re* (remarks) 820 (i).
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) on Amt. (Mr. Pugsley) to M. for 3°, 5962; on M. for 3°, 5892 (iv).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Taylor) to conc., 2847 (ii).

SPEAKER, Mr. (Hon. T. S. Sproule)—*Con.*
Dismissals, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fowler) 952 (i).
Documents handed in to 'Hansard,' not read (ruling) 6718 (iv).
Dom. Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 1°, 644 (i).
Dom. Notes Printing Contract, Members remarks checked, 1843 (i).
Educational Bills, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Bickerdike) *re* Dom. Jurisdiction, 3873 (ii). *See* 'Queens.'
Estimates, Discussion in Conc., (remarks) 6805 (iv).
Fenian Raid Vets., Gratuity (remarks) *re* Resolution, 5559 (iv).
Fishery Treaty with U.S. (remarks) *re* Notice of Question, 408 (i).
Flags, Use of, B. 74 (Mr. Bradbury) on M. for 1°, 1411 (i).
Freight Rates on Rys., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Guthrie) 3213 (ii).
—— (ruling) *re* permission to insert table in 'Hansard', without reading, 3222 (ii).
Georgian Bay Route and French River, Members's remarks checked, 6785 (iv).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 3°, members remarks checked, 4813 (iii).
—— (ruling) *re* irrelevancy of debate, 4800 (ii).
Grain Shipments in the West, Regulation of Freight Rates, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3996 (ii).
G.T.P.Ry. Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) on M. for 1°, 711; on M. for 2° (remarks) 796 (i).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) on Amt. (Mr. Barker) 6576 (iv).
Gutelius, Mr. Fred., Apptmt. *re* Improper form of Question (remarks) 3934 (ii).
Hamilton Harbour B. 32 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 2449 (ii).
Highlands Bridge Construction, Member called to Order, 1197 (i).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) on Objection (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to 2°, 3640 (ii); Senate Amendments (presented) 6731 (iv).
Immigration from U.S., Members remarks checked, 3154 (ii).
Immigration from the U.S., *re* Wm. Pearson Co., Members remarks checked, 3152 (ii).
Inquiries Act. Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) on M. for 2° (remarks) 1025 (i).
—— (ruling) *re* Procedure, 1281 (i).
Judges Act Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) on M. for Com. on Res., 5958 (iv).

SPEAKER, Mr. (Hon. T. S. Sproule)—*Con.*
Juvenile Delinquents B. 2 (Mr. Bickerdike) on M. for Com. (remarks) 939 (i).
Labour Gazette Correspondents, Dismissals, &c., Members remarks checked, 1412 (i).
Lobster Twine, Customs Duties, Members remarks checked, 1072 (i).
Lumber Combine in B. C., Distribution in Member's Boxes (personal explanation) 2299 (ii).
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Knowles) Members remarks checked, 2297 (ii).
Lumber Duties, Rep. *re* Winnipeg 'Free Press' (remarks) *re* Question, 2446 (ii).
Man. Boundaries B. 115, on M. for 1°, Members remarks checked, 3902 (ii).
—— Ques. *re* Voting (Mr. Mondou) on 2°, 4398 (iii).
—— Remarks *re* Vote on 3°, 4984 (iii).
—— (remarks) *re* M. to ref. back to Com., 4890 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Cor. *re* Settlement, &c., on M. (Mr. Macdonald) for cor. (remarks) 777 (i).
—— Eastern Boundary Extension (ruling) *re* Question (Mr. Oliver) 3936 (ii).
—— Members remarks checked, 490 (i).
Man. Grain Act, on M. for Com. on Res., 869 (i).
Marine Hospital Ships, Members remarks checked, 6787 (iv).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, Members Remarks checked, 1604 (i).
Marriage Law, Par. in Toronto 'Star,' (ruling) *re* Question, 3942 (ii).
Members remarks checked, 177 (i).
Mess from His Ex. Estimates, 1911-12 (presented) 525 (i).
Moosejaw Armoury Site, Members remarks checked, 3974 (ii).
Moosejaw Inspector, on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Knowles) Ruling, 4982 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Dismissal of (remarks) 1708 (i).
Morine, A. B., Charges *re* as candidate for election (remarks) 6185 (iv).
—— Correction *re* Ruling on Question, 6335 (iv).
Napierville Post Office Site, Members remarks checked, 3153 (ii).
National Art Gallery, Question *re* Ownership (remarks) 6337 (iv).
N. T. Ry. Station at Quebec, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for O. Cs. (remarks) 760 (i).
Naval Service Act, Repeal of (ruling) *re* Question (Mr. Mondou) 3943 (ii).
Ne Temere Decree, Questions asked, Members remarks checked, 720 (i).

SPEAKER, Mr. (Hon. T. S. Sproule)—*Con.*
Newspaper Articles, Reading of, &c. (ruling) 3059 (ii).
Ontario and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s B. 50 (Mr. Currie) on M. for 3°, (remarks) 2414 (ii).
Ottawa, Montreal and Eastern Ry. B. 99, on Senate Amts. (ruling) 5679 (iv).
Panama Canal, Tolls, Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) checked, 2447 (ii).
Parcel Post Extension, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) members remarks checked, 2346 (ii).
—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Armstrong) 2348 (ii).
Parliament Opening, Com. from Gov. Gen's Sec., 6 (v).
Peace Memorial Monument, Members remarks checked, 2590 (ii).
Peace River and Ry. Belt Water Power B. 149 (Mr. Rogers) on M. for 3°, 6188 (iv).
Piper, E. F., Patent Relief B. 53 (Mr. Fripp) on M. for 2°, 1202 (i).
Political Literature, Application *re* Free Postage, Ques. of Order, 1587 (i).
P. E. I., Better Terms, Member (Mr. J. J. Hughes) remarks checked, 5172 (iii).
Printing Com., 1st Rep. of Joint Com., on M. (Mr. Currie) to conc., 3330 (ii).
Private Bills, Rep. of Examiner of Pets., &c., Divergency *re* Rules (remarks) 643 (i).
Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 6780 (iv).
—— Mess from the Senate, 6824 (iv).
Public Accounts Com., 2nd Rep., Ques. of Order., 5839 (iv).
Public Ownership, Members remarks checked, 666 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners Act Amt. B. 31 (Mr. Hazen) on M. for 1°, 869 (i).
Quebec West Electoral District, Controverted Election Certificate of Judge (presented) 407 (i).
Queen's College B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) on Senate Amts., 6770 (iv).
See 'Educational.'
Questions to be asked, Proper Form, &c. (remarks) 4983, 5054 (iii).
Questions and Notices of Motions, Rules *re* Standing (remarks) 1015 (i).
Question *re* (Mr. Lemieux) ruled out of Order, 2580 (ii).
Railway Com., Reports of (remarks) 5999 (iv).
Renfrew S., Election, Issue of Writ, Members remarks checked, 2059 (ii).
—— Vacancy (notification) 926 (i).
Rideau Hall Expenditure, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pugsley) Members Remarks checked, 800 (i).

SPEAKER, Mr. (Hon. T. S. Sproule)—*Con.*
Rural Telephone System, prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) Ruled out of Order, 2250 (ii).
—— Further Ruling, 2287 (ii).
St. John Harbour Dredging, Members remarks checked, 5695 (iv).
Seed Grain Distribution, Members remarks checked, 2300 (ii).
Senate Amendments Railway Bills (remarks) 6550-1 (iv).
Soulanges Canal, Charges *re* Damien Lalonde, Objection *re* Question, 4249 (iii).
Speaker, (remarks) *re* Election, 6 (v).
Speaker, Dep., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to appoint, Member asked to withdraw Stmt., 522 (i).
Speech from the Throne (read) 8 (i).
Stenographic Assistance for Members (remarks) 1847 (i).
Shipping Act Amt. Bill, Ruling *re* M. to introduce, 229, 267 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt—Inland Revenue (promotions) conc., 6771, 6772 (iv).
Dismissals, &c., members remarks checked, 2039 (ii).
Public Works—Bridges (Ottawa River) 6806 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Louiseville) Members remarks checked, on conc., 6797 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 on Appeal from Chairman (Mr. Pugsley) 3616 (ii).
—— Member (Mr. Oliver) cannot impute motives, 2688 (ii).
—— Senate Amendments (presented) 6808 (iv).
—— on Senate Amts., Irrelevancy of debate, 6674 (iv).
Wadge, Thomas, Patent Relief B. 16, on M. for 3°, 3280 (ii).

SPEAKER, Mr. DEPUTY (Mr. P. E. Blondin) *Champlain.*
Address, The, Ques. of Order *re* Quotations from 'Le Devoir,' 371 (i).
Barcelona Tramway Light and Power Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. Macdonnell) in Com., amt. (Mr. Nesbitt) (ruling) 2412 (ii).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com., on Ques. of Order, 4578 (iii).
Dismissals &c., Irrelevancy of Debate, in Com. of Sup., 3253 (ii).
—— Members remarks checked, 1960 (i).
—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Maclean) 1184 (i).
Estimates, Members remarks checked, 2439 (ii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., Members remarks checked, 3711 (ii).

SPEAKER, Mr. DEPUTY (Mr. P. E. Blondin) —*Con.*
I. C. Ry. Estimates, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Stevens) 4219 (iii).
Napierville Post Office Site, Payments *re* Members remarks checked, 2373 (ii).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com. on Amt. (Mr. Foster) 4759 (iii).
——— (ruling) *re* Amts., 4774 (iii).
Rambaut, Thomas D., Patent Relief B. 84 (Mr. Ames) in Com., 2992 (ii).
St. Jacques de l'Achigan Post Office Site, Members remarks checked, 2442 (ii).
Sterling Life Assurance Co.'s B. 72 (Mr. Blain) in Com., 2448 (ii).
SUPPLY.
Members remarks checked, 2043 (ii).
Militia, Member called to Order, 5538 (iii).
Naval Service (maintenance), Member called to order, 5317 (iii).
Post Office, Irrelevancy of debate (ruling) 6299 (iv).
Tariff Bill, Amt. (Mr. Pugsley) ruled out of Order, 3615 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. H. Clark) 2997 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Currie) 3617 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Lennox) 3619 (ii).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., Irrelevancy of debate 6423 (iv).

STANFIELD, Mr. J., *Colchester.*
Albert Mines and Hillsborough Ry. Subsidy, in Com., 6304 (iv).
Dismissals from Public Service, Apptmt. of Commissioners (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3249 (ii).
Inspection and Sale Act (grain) Amt. B. 178 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 6190 (iv).
I. C. R., Provident Fund, Payments to Dismissed Officials (remarks) 5933 (iv).
——— Market Tickets to Employees (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5810 (iv).
Railway Com., G.T. Ry. Bill, Apptmt. of sub-Committee, Liberals omitted (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5617 (iv).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6304 (iv).
Returns, Inquiry for, 2057 (ii).
SUPPLY.
Immigration (agencies, &c.) 3306 (ii); Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (H. of C., addition) 1951 (i); Weights and Measures (inspectors) 5830 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 3012 (ii).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D., *Macdonald.*
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 38) 1°*, 970 (i); in Com., 5201 (iii).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D.—*Con.*
Cockshutt Plough Co.'s Prices (remarks) 850 (i).
Freight Rates on Rys., Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3195 (ii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2309, 2541, 2759, 3168, 3187, 3467, 3781 (ii).
Grain Shipments in the West, Freight Rates, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3985 (ii).
Lumber Duties, Violation of Customs Act, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) 1726 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 3893 (ii); on M. for 2°, 4308; on Amt. (Mr. Oliver) 4679 (iii).
Rural Mail Delivery, Tenders *re* Mail Boxes, &c. (Ques.) 1580 (i).
St. Lorette, Lake Man. Pier (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2813 (ii).
SUPPLY.
Miscellaneous (art gallery) 2826 (ii); Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (repairs, &c.) 2813 (ii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2909 (ii).
Voters' Lists for Man., Distribution from Printing Office (M. for cor.*) 3056 (ii).
Wadge, Thomas, Patent Relief B. 16, on M. for 3°, 3281 (ii).

STEELE, Mr. M., *South Perth.*
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6266 (iv).
Highways Improvements B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3684 (ii).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 4762 (iii).

STEVENS, Mr. H. H., *Vancouver.*
Address, The, 281 (i).
Agriculture, 1st Rep. of Com. (remarks) 2375 (ii).
Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6318 (iv).
Can. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 98 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 5200 (iii).
Chinese entering B.C., Total Number (Ques.) 4778 (iii).
Chinese Tax in B.C., Ref. to in debate on Address, 285 (i).
Chinese and Japanese in B.C., Number naturalized (Ques.) 555 (i).
See 'Oriental.'
Coal Combine in B.C., Investigation *re* (Ques.) 4240 (iii).
Cockshutt Plough Co.'s Prices (remarks) 853 (i).
Criminal Code (piracy of logs) Amt. (B. 9) 1°m., 407; 2°m., 944, 1821 (i); in Com., 2532 (ii).

STEVENS, Mr. H. H.—*Con.*
Elevators, Terminal, ref. to in debate on Address, 287 (i).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6222 (iv).
Fishery Protection Service on Pacific Coast, on M. (Mr. Clements) for Papers, 2473 (ii).
Fisheries Question in B.C., ref. to in debate on Address, 290 (i).
Freight Rates on Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3232 (ii).
See 'Ry. Rates.'
Good Roads, ref. to in debate on Address, 284 (i).
Grain Shipments in the West, Regulations of Freight Rates, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3986, 3998 (ii).
I. C. Ry. Estimates, Ques. of Order, 4218 (iii).
'Kestrel' Fishery Cruiser, Condemnation of (Ques.) 549 (i).
Logs, Stealing of: *See* 'Criminal Code B. 9.'
Lumber Duties, Violation of Customs Act, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) 1747 (i).
N.T. Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3423 (ii).
Naval Policy, ref. to in debate on Address, 291 (i).
North Arm Bridge and Ry. Co.'s (B. 14) 1°*, 643 (i).
Oriental Immigration into B.C., Total Number (Ques.) 4779 (iii).
See 'Chinese.'
Railway Rates, Transportation, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1925 (i).
See 'Freight Rates.'
Railway Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6218, 6318 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2936 (ii).
Vancouver, Fraser Valley and Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 135) 1°*, 4976 (iii).
Vancouver Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 15) 1°*, 643 (i).
Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6218 (iv).
——— Bridge Subsidy, in Com., 6325 (iv).

STEWART, Mr. T. J., *West Hamilton.*
Hamilton Harbour (B. 23) 1°*, 794 (i); in Com., 2449 (ii).

SUTHERLAND, Mr. D., *South Oxford.*
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6265 (iv).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2554, 2767 (ii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3695 (ii).

SUTHERLAND, Mr. D.—*Con.*
Immigration Agents *re* Farm Labourers Number appointed, &c. (Ques.) 874 (i).
——— Notification to Booking Agents *re* Bonus, &c. (Ques.) 875 (i).
Immigration Agents for Placing Farm Labourers in Ont., Complaints *re* (M. for papers*) 4781 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3923 (ii).
——— (M. for cor.*) 5263 (iii).
Immigration Policy *re* Mar. Provs., on prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2126 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture—Experimental farms (branch stations) 6485 (iv); Immigration (agencies, &c.) 3923 (ii); Railways—I. C. R. (branch lines) 5624 (iv).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6412 (iv).

TAYLOR, Mr. J. D., *New Westminster.*
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com. (M.) to conc., 2840 (ii).
Lumber Duties, Interpretation and Enforcement, on M. (Mr. Knowles) for Papers, 594 (i).
——— Violation of Customs Act, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) 1766 (i).

THOBURN, Mr. Wm., *North Lanark.*
Civil Service Act (rural mail) Amt. B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 6090 (iv).
Cockshutt Plough Co., Prices *re* (remarks) 828 (i).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6264 (iv).
Grain Congestion in the West, Transportation, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6206 (iv).
Negro Immigration (remarks) on Immigration Question, 608 (i).

THOMPSON, Mr. A., *Yukon Territory.*
Fishery Protection Service on Pacific Coast, on M. (Mr. Clements) for Papers, 2484 (ii).
Mounted Police, Annuities to families of Messrs. Fitzgerald, and others (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5177 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Mines (ore deposits) 6490 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2741 (ii).
Yukon Act (judges) Amt. B. 123 (Mr. Doherty) in Com. on Res., 4562 (iii); in Com., 5568 (iv).
Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 6182 (iv).

THOMSON, Mr. L., *Qu'Appelle.*
Gold Coinage by Mint (Ques.) 1213 (i).

THOMSON, Mr. L.—*Con.*
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2183, 2304, 2323, 2397, 2536, 2783, 3794 (ii), 4064, 4158 (iii).
Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 96 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 3°, 2576 (ii).
Grain Act B. 32 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 3° (amt.) 4794, Neg. (Y. 46; N. 92) 4801 (iii).
Homestead Inspectors, Number employed in Sask., Number dismissed, &c. (Ques.) 1588 i).
Lumber Duties, Violation of Customs Act, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) 1742 (i).
Railway Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 2°, 2519 (ii).

THORNTON, Mr. C. J., *Durham.*
Live Stock Records Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 6045 (iv).

TOBIN, Mr. E. W., *Richmond and Wolfe.*
Animals destroyed at North Ham, Pet. *re* Compensation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6472 (iv).
Capital Trust Corporation incorp. (B. 177) 1°*, 5831 (iv).
Carrier, Mr., Postmaster at St. Francis Xavier de Brampton, Investigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6616 (iv).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 4578 (iii).
Clouthier, Joseph, Postmaster at St. Adolphe de Dudswell, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 4549 (iii).
——— (M. for papers*) 4781 (iii).
Desmarais, Mr., Dismissal *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5817 (iv).
Disraeli Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6616 (iv).
Garthby, Lake Aylmer Wharf Construction (M. for papers, &c.*) 4781 (iii).
Ham Nord Postmaster, Dismissal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6616 (iv).
Lapointe, Mr. Joseph, Apptmt. as Overseer on Lake Aylmer (Ques.) 4550 (iii).
Postmasters dismissed, Investigation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6617 (iv).
Shurtleff, Dr., Investigation *re* J. Clouthier (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6629 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture (animals health) 6472 (iv).
Militia (headquarters staff) 5537 (iii).
Post Office—Outside Service (salaries, &c.) 6615 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings, Generally (London, Eng.) 6656 (iv).
Weedon Public Building, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 4550 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6656 (iv).
——— (M. for cor.*) 4781 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 6492 (iv).

TREMAIN, Mr. H. B., *Hants.*
Fast Atlantic Service and Halifax Terminals, on M. for Sup., 6512 (iv).

TURGEON, Mr. O., *Gloucester.*
Address, The, 388 (i).
Annuities Branch Lecturers, Charges *re* J. B. Leger &c. (Ques.) 1413 (i).
Caraquet North Shore Ry. Branch Line (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4192 (iii).
Customs Collector P. J. Venoit, Dismissal of (M. for cor.*) 1590 (i).
Fishery Overseer, J. A. Doucet, Dismissal, &c. (M. for cor.*) 1590 (i).
Fishery Overseer, W. C. Robichaud, Dismissal, &c. (M. for cor.*) 1589 (i).
——— Dismissal of, Inquiry for Ret., 5259 (iii).
Fishing Twine for Lobster Nets, Duty *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5594 (iv).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3965 (ii).
I.C.R. Branch Lines, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 1003 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 4585 (iii).
Petite Lameque Wharf, Construction *re* (Ques.) 1358 (i).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6230 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Bathurst) 2364 (ii).

TURRIFF, Mr. J. G., *Assiniboia.*
Alberta Peace River and Eastern Ry. Co.'s B. 129 (Mr. Chabot) in Com., 5945 (iv).
Canadian Northern Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 187 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6368 (iv).
Census Enumerators, Delay *re* Payments (remarks) 4460 (iii).
Cockshutt Plough Co.'s Prices, &c. (remarks) 842 (i).
Customs Tariff, Changes *re* Jute Cloth, Dressed Lumber, &c. Rulings, &c. (M. for copies*) 2459 (ii).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1176 (i).
Election Accounts, Payments of (remarks) 4460 (iii).
Flaxseed, Shipment of, Excessive Freight Rates (remarks) 661 (i).
Freight Rates, Discrimination in the West (amt.) on M. for Sup., 3194 (ii).
——— Notice of Discussion, 3048 (ii).
See 'Grain Shipments.'
Govt. Ownership: *See* 'Public.'
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2317, 2535, 2758, 3169, 3502, 3761 (ii), 4065 (iii).

TURRIFF, Mr. J. G.—*Con.*
Grain Congestion in the West, Transportation, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6207 (iv).
Grain Shipments in the West, Regulation of Freight Rates, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 4012 (ii).
Hudson Bay Railway Construction, on M. (Mr. Aikins) for Papers, 1252 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. Neely) for O.Cs., &c. 742 (i).
Immigration from U.S., Opposition of Govt. (remarks) 3154 (ii).
——— *re* Wm. Pearson Co. (remarks) 3152 (ii).
I.C.R. Branch Lines, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 1008 (i).
Lumber Duties, Inspection as reported in Winnipeg 'Free Press' (remarks) 2446 (ii).
Lumber Duties, Violation of Customs Act (amt.) 1723; neg. (Y. 62; N. 107) 1806 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 3869 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Settlement *re*, on M. (Mr. Macdonald) for Cor., 781 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Inquiry for, 1820 (i).
N.T.Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3140 (ii).
Ontario and Minnesota Pulp and Paper Co., Prohibition *re* Grinding Machines (re, marks) 2059 (ii).
Parcel Post Extension, on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 2350 (ii).
Post Office Dismissals, Policy of Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6303 (iv).
Public Ownership of Govt. Utilities, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 660 (i).
See 'Parcel.'
Railway Act (tariffs) Amt. (B. 6) 1°m., 176 (i).
Ry. Act. Amt. (B. 6) 2°m., 944; 2°m., 1015 (i).
——— resmd. adjourned debate on 2°, 2499 (ii).
——— on M. for adjnd. debate, 1821 (i).
Railway Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 2°, 2529 (ii).
Ry. Construction in the West, Shortage of Steel Rails (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6543 (iv).
Rambaut, Thomas D., Patent Relief B. 84 (Mr. Ames) in Com., 3491 (ii).
Railway Question, Transportation, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1921 (i).
See 'Freight Rates.'
Seed Grain Distribution, Res. from Wilcox Board of Trade (remarks) 2301 (ii).

TURRIFF, Mr. J. G.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—
Post Office (mail service) 6303 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2928, 2969, 3024 (ii); on Senate Amts. 6673 (iv).
Yukon Judges Annuities B. 123 (Mr Doherty) in Com. on Res., 4557 (iii).

VERVILLE, Mr. A., *Maisonneuve.*
Address, The, 276 (i).
Budget, The, 5056 (iii).
Campeau, Michel, Dismissal from P.O. at St. Louis du Mile End (Ques.) 1414 (i).
Cold Storage Establishments in Canada, Number, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3343 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 5561 (iv).
Cote, Mrs. J. N., Dismissal as Charwoman (Ques.) 2667 (ii).
I.C.R., Freight on Fish, Aid *re* Transportation (Ques.) 6748 (iv).
Labour Gazette Correspondents, Apptmt. in Richelieu County (Ques.) 2292 (ii).
Labour Gazette Correspondents, Names of Apptmts. (Ques.) 1865 (i).
——— Dismissals, &c. (Ques.) 1411 (i).
——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1441 (i).
Lord's Day Act (musicians) Amt. (B. 85) 1°m., 2057 (ii).
Maisonneuve Postal Station, Erection of (Ques.) 550 (i).
Meredith, Hon. Sir William, Application for Leave (Ques.) 5954 (iv).
Murray, J. P., Carpet Co., Breach of Immigration Regulations (Ques.) 550 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co., ref. to in debate on Address, 279 (i).
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burnham) 1375 (i).
Parliamentary Restaurant, Payments to Waiters, &c. (Ques.) 2861 (ii).
Reciprocity, ref. to in debate on Address, 277 (i).
SUPPLY—
Labour Dept. (Gazette) 1471 (i).
Militia (annual drill) 5502 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Maisonneuve, 1347 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 3041 (ii).
Waiters in Restaurants, &c., Minimum Wages paid to (Ques.) 3049 (ii).

WALLACE, Mr. T. G., *Center York, Ont*
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1630 (i).

WARNOCK, Mr. D., *Macleod.*
Alberta Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6315 (iv).

WARNOCK, Mr. D.—*Con.*
Alberta, Peace River and Eastern Ry. Co.'s B. 129 (Mr. Chabot) in Com., 5906 (iv).
Coal Shortage in the West, for Household Consumption, &c. (Ques.) 568 (i).
Coal Strike in Fernie, B. C., Information *re* (Ques.) 568 (i).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 3504 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4790 (iii).
Railway Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 2°, 2530 (ii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. 6315 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Lethbridge) 2212 (ii).

WEBSTER, Mr. J., *Brockville.*
Address, The, 372 (i).
Dairying Industry, Complaints *re* Weighing at Montreal, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5727 (iv).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6574 (iv).
Inspection and Sale Act (grain) Amt. B. 178 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 6197 (iv).

WEICHEL, Mr. W. G., *North Waterloo.*
Address, The, 401 (i).
Customs Weighing of Goods, Decree of French Govt. (Ques.) 721 (i).

WHITE, Mr. G. V., *North Renfrew.*
Canal Traffic, Total Tonnage for 1911 (Ques.) 3051 (ii).
Interprovincial and James Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 67) 1°*, 1409 (i).
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s (B. 30) 1°*, 795 (i); in Com., 4699 (iii).
Stoves, Ranges, Incubators, &c., Exported to Argentine Republic, Value, &c. (Ques.) 561 (i).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Welland (surveys) 5789 (iv).
Militia (annual drill) 5470 (iii).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy, B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6422 (iv).
Welland Canal, Quantity of American Freight passing through (Ques.) 3535 (ii).
—— Water Power, Diversion, &c. (Ques.) 6747 (iv).

WHITE, Mr. Wm. H., *Victoria, Alberta.*
Grain Act Amt., B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 3519 (ii).
Grain Shipments in the West, Regulations of Freight Rates, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 4001 (ii).
Green, John B., Homestead Inspector, Dismissal (Ques.) 6183 (iv).

WHITE, Mr. Wm. H.—*Con.*
Public Buildings in Alberta and Sask., Purchase of Sites, Govt. Policy, &c. (Ques.) 2068 (ii).
Printing Bureau, Clocks, Number installed, Expenditure (Ques.) 2859 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Telegraphs—Alta. (Moose to Durlingville) 2820 (ii).
R. N. W. M. P. (pay of force) 5180 (iii).
Vegreville and Lloydminster Public Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2214 (ii).

WHITE, Hon. W. T., (Minister of Finance) *Leeds.*
Address, The, 440 (i).
Auditor General's Rep. (presented) 970 (i).
Bank Act Amt. (B. 169) 1° m., 5555; in Com., 5846 (iv).
Banking Act Legislation (remarks) 938 (i).
Bank Note Contract: *See* 'Dom. Notes.'
Battlefields Commission, (M.) to strike out vote (remarks) 5299 (iii).
Bounties on Steel Rods, &c. (Ans.) 529 (i). *See* 'Steel.'
British American Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 155 (Mr. Blain) in Com., 5946 (iv).
British Empire Trust Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. Cromwell) on M. for 2°, 1201 (i).
Budget, The, Financial Statement, 4985 (iii). *See* 'Financial Review.'
Canadian Northern Alberta Ry. Subsidy (B. 144) M. for Com. on Res., 4140; in Com. on Res., 5162; in Com., 5404 (iii).
Can. Northern Ry. Bonds, Govt. Guarantee &c. (Ans.) 4248 (iii).
Civil Service Act (Aud. Gen.) Amt. (B. 113) prop. Res., 3539; in Com. on Res., 3632 (ii); 1°* of Bill, 3633 (ii); in Com., 4081 (iii).
Cote, Mrs. J. N., Dismissal as Charwoman (Ans.) 2667 (ii).
Debt of Canada, Average Interest (Ans.) 1811 (i).
Dom. Notes, Engraving, Contracts *re* (Ans.) 4778 (iii).
—— Limitations *re* Tenders (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1841 (i).
—— Complaints of British Companies (explanation) 5843 (iv).
Estimates, The (1911-12) presented, 525 (i).
Estimates (1912-13) presented, 971 (i).
Estimates Supply (remarks) 1576 (i), 6154 (iv).
Estimates, Supply (1912) M. to ref. to Com., 4974 (iii).
Farmers' Bank Failure, Reimbursements *re* (Ans.) 528 (i).
Farmers' Bank and Banque St. Jean, Indemnity to Depositors (Ans.) 551 (i).

WHITE, Hon. W. T.—*Con.*
Financial Review (reply) to Mr. A. K. Maclean, 6722 (iv).
See '*Budget.*'
Gold Coinage, by Mint (Ans.) 1213 (i).
Govt. Loans, Rate of Interest, &c. (Ans.) 4778 (iii).
G. T. P. Ry. Implementing Judgment (B. 95) prop. Res., 2296; in Com. on Res., 2378; 1°*, of B., 2381, 2°m., 3060, 3115 (ii).
See 'N. T. Ry.'
Hull City Hall Square Improvements *re* (Ans.) 2293 (ii).
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1304 (i).
La Banque de St. Hyacinthe, Investigation *re* Liquidation (Ans.) 2069 (ii).
La Banque de St. Hyacinthe and La Banque St. Jean, Reimbursements *re* (Ans.) 528, 551 (i).
Loans: *See* 'Govt.'
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 3848 (ii); in Com., 4530 (iii).
Man. and N.S. Federal Subsidies, &c. (Ans.) 4259 (iii).
Marriage Act, Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, and M. (Mr. Borden) to adjn. debate, 1665 (i).
Montreal Athletic Association, Pet. *re* Govt. Aid (remarks) 1723 (i).
National Battlefields Rep. (presented) 565 (i).
N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3366, 3395 (ii).
N. T. Ry. Bill 95 (remarks) *re* Factum, 2589 (ii).
Notes, Printing of: *See* 'Dom. Notes.'
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burnham) 1368 (i).
Ottawa Improvement Commission Rep. (presented) 565 (i).
Preferential Tariff to G.B., Increase of (Ans.) 554 (i).
P.E.I. Subsidy (B. 178) (prop. res.) 5558; in Com. on Res., 5859; 1°*, 5862; in Com., 6114, 6128 (iv).
Provincial Subsidies: *See* 'Man. Boundaries,' 'P.E.I. Subsidy.'
Public Accounts Rep. (presented) 11 (i).
Quebec Savings Bank Act Amt. (B. 170) 1° m., 5556; in Com. and 3°*, 5859 (iv).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 3878 (ii).
Reciprocity Treaty, ref. to in debate on Address, 447 (i).
Royal Society of Canada Rep. (presented) 565 (i).
Steel and Iron Bounties, *re* Budget Speech (Ans.) 529 (i); 4249 (iii).

WHITE, Hon. W. T.—*Con.*
Steel and Iron Bounties, Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' (remarks) 2589 (ii).
Supply (M.) for Com., 525 (i).
Supply (B. 18) prop. Res., 702; 1°*, 2°*, 3°*, 703 (i).
Supply (B. 193) in Com. on Ways and Means, 6807 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen. (salaries) 1040, 1061 (i); Charges of Management (coin circulation) 1034; (dom. notes) 1033; (salaries) 619; Conservation Commission (salaries) 1069; Finance (salaries) 1068 (i).
Labour Gazette (Gazette) 1488 (i).
Tariff Commission (B. 88) Res. prop.., 1839 (i); in Com. on Res. 2157; 2° m., 2591; in Com., 2862, 2939, 3026, 3540 (ii), 4079; 3° m., 4144 (iii); on Senate Amts. (M.) *re* concurrence, 6663; (objections) 6808 (iv).
Travelling Allowance to Members during adjournments (remarks) 1849 (i).
Ways and Means—The Budget, 4985 (iii).
Ways and Means (M.) for Com., 525, 702 (i).

WILCOX, Mr. O. J., *North Essex.*
Brian, Mr., Dismissal for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1077 (i).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1077, 1169 (i).
G. T. Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6752 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Customs Outside Ports (salaries) 1077 (i); Militia (automobiles) 5508 (iii).
Windsor, Chatham and London Ry. Co.'s (B. 94) 1°*, 2217 (ii).

WILSON, Mr. C. A., *Laval.*
Bibeau, Mr. A., Sessional Clerk, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 4248 (iii).
Civil Service List, Inquiry for, 6187 (iv).
Copyright Law, Legislation *re* Uniformity (Ques.) 557, 1208 (i).
——— (remarks) 935 (i).
Dismissals from Ottawa Depts., Inquiry for Ret., 3834 (ii).
Govt. Employees, Dismissal, resigned, &c. (M. for ret.) 1818 (i).
G.T.P. Workshops at Quebec, Site for Building (Ques.) 3050 (ii).
House of Commons Dismissals, Inquiry for Ret., 6807 (iv).
Ile Bezard and Ste. Geneviève Wharfs, Completion of Repairs (Ques.) 557 (i).
Inspection and Sale Act (grain) Amt. B. 178 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 6194 (iv).
Maple Sugar, O.C. *re* Standard, Annullment of (Ques.) 716 (i).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1691 (i).

WILSON, Mr. C. A.—*Con.*
Penitentiary Employees Salaries, Increase *re* (Ques.) 1205 (i).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 3876 (ii).
Rivières des Prairies, Drainage, Continuation of, Amount voted *re* (Ques.) 714 (i).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 621 (i).
SUPPLY—
Justice—Penitentiaries (St. Vincent de Paul) 6586 (iv).
Public Works—Roads and Bridges (Doncaster Indian Reserve) 6807 (iv).

WILSON, Mr. C. A.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Railways—I.C.R. (locomotives) 5657 (iv).
Yukon Act (judges) Amt. B. 123 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5571 (iv).

WILSON, Mr. G. C., *Wentworth.*
N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3420 (ii).

WRIGHT, Mr. Wm., *Muskoka.*
Cockshutt Plough Co.'s Prices (remarks) 853, 861 (i).

INDEX—SUBJECTS

Abenakis Indian Agent, Apptmt. and Salary: Ques. (Mr. Mondou) 1587 (i).

'Aboukir' Cruiser, Paying off of Crew: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 408 (i).

——— Stmnt. (Mr. Hazen) 489 (i).

Adams, Mr., Resignation as Examiner of Pilots: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 5227 (iii) .

Adams, Wm. Holloway, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 122.'

Address, The, in Answer to His Royal Highness' Speech: Moved (Mr. R. B. Bennett) 14; Seconded (Mr. Sevigny) 27 (i).

DEBATE.

(Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 33 (amt.) 49; Neg. (Y. 77, N. 121) 517; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 50; (Mr. Guthrie) 62; (Mr. Foster) 72; (Mr. Carvell) 82; (Mr. Aikins) 94; (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 107; (Mr. W. H. Bennett) 127; (Mr. Pugsley) 139; (Mr. Hazen) 162; (Mr. McKenzie) 178; (Mr. A. DeWitt Foster) 201; (Mr. M. Clark) 210; (Mr. Monk) 223, 231; (Mr. Lemieux) 241; (Mr. Mondou) 263, 270; (Mr. Verville) 276; (Mr. Stevens) 281; (Mr. Ethier) 295; (Mr. Burnham) 318; (Mr. Sinclair) 323; (Mr. Rainville) 337; (Mr. Devlin) 348; (Mr. Northrup) 357; (Mr. German) 364; (Mr. Webster) 372; (Mr. Turgeon) 388; (Mr. Weichel) 401; (Mr. Buchanan) 403; (Mr. Fripp) 409; (Mr. Emmerson) 413; (Mr. W. T. White) 440; (Mr. Oliver) 448; (Mr. W. M. Martin) 464; (Mr. Gauthier) 475; (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 482; (Mr. Loggie) 487, 491; (Mr. Boivin) 497; (Mr. Murphy) 501 (i).

Address, The, Precedence: M. (Rt. Hon. Mr. Borden) 9 (i).

——— M. to Present (Mr. Borden) 519 (i).

——— Reply from H.R.H.: Presented (Mr. Borden) 932 (i).

Advertisements for Govt. Contracts, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 2449 (ii).

See 'Public Works.'

Agriculture, Govt. Aid to: *See* 'B. No. 100.'

AGRICULTURE.

Agriculture, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1041 (i), 6485 (iv).

Agricultural and Colonization Com., 1st Rep.: M. (Mr. Sexsmith) to ref. to Printing Com., 3933 (ii) .

——— M. (Mr. Sexsmith) to conc., 2375; objection (Mr. Speaker) 2375 (ii).

——— Personal Explanation (Mr. Best) *re* Par. in Toronto 'Globe,' 2155 (ii).

Animals destroyed at North Ham, Pet. *re* Compensation: Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 6472 (iv).

AGRICULTURE—*Con.*

Animals Health, Inspection, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6469 (iv).

Apples and Fruit Growers Association, N.S., Resolution *re* Industry: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) 1719 (i).

Archives Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6461 (iv).

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics: in Com. of Sup., 6462 (iv).

Cattle Diseased, Compensation *re* Damages: Remarks (Mr. Morphy) in Com. of Sup., 6471 (iv).

Cattle Embargo by G.B., Abolition of: Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 557 (i).

Cattle Quarantine at Beauceville, Res. from Chamber of Commerce: Remarks (Mr. Beland) 4984 (iii).

Dom. Exhibition, Grant to Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 6479 (iv).

Experimental Branch Stations for Farms: in Com. of Sup., 6477 (iv).

Experimental Farm Bulletins, Distribution, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6465 (iv).

Fumigating Stations: in Com. of Sup., 6479 (iv).

Horses imported from U.S., Destruction of for Glanders: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 5693, 5939, 6790 (iv).

International Institute of Agriculture: in Com. of Sup., 6478 (iv) .

Live Stock Industry: in Com. of Sup., 6469 (iv).

Nursery Stock, Purchase of for Experimental Farm, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3333 (ii).

Paris Exposition, Payments for Space: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Paquet) 582 (i).

Pictou Cattle Disease, Compensation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 6472 (iv).

Tobacco Growing, Aid to: in Com. of Sup., 6478 (iv).

Toronto Exhibition Grant: in Com. of Sup., 6480 (iv) .

Wheeler, Seager, Congratulations *re* Prize Wheat at N.Y. Exhibition: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 542 (i).

Year-book: in Com. of Sup., 6465 (iv).

Aids to Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 5236 (iii).

See 'Marine.'

Air Brakes, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4136 (iii).

Airships for Military Purposes, Purchase by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 533 (i).
Alabama Traction Light and Power Co.: *See* 'B. No. 160.'
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 33.'
Alberta Great Waterways Ry., Disallowance of: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 1575 (i).
Alberta Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6314 (iv).
Alberta, Peace River and Eastern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 129.'
Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.: *See* 'B. No. 79.'
Albert Mines and Hillsborough Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6246, 6304 (iv).
See 'Harvey.'
Alder Point Lobster Hatchery, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McKenzie) 3053 (ii).
Aldershot Rifle Range, Caretaker, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 3536 (ii).
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 5897, 6216, 6312 (iv).
Algoma Eastern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 34."
American Freight passing through Welland Canal: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 3535 (ii).
American Goods shipped into Canada, Names of Firms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Demers) 3533 (ii).
American Shoe Machinery Co., Discontinuance of Proceedings *re*: Ques. (Mr. Pardee) 572 (i).
See 'United Shoe.'
Anderson, Mr., Salary Increase: in Com. of Sup., 1043 (i).
Animals destroyed at North Ham, Pet. *re* Compensation: Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 6472 (iv).
Animals Health, Inspection, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6469 (iv).
Annual Drill: in Com. of Sup., 5452 (iii).
Annuities Branch: in Com. of Sup., 688 (i).
Annuities Branch Lecturers, Charges *re* J. B. Leger, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Turgeon) 1413 (i).
—— Extra Payment to Agents: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 973 (i).
—— Transfer to P. O. Dept., Dismissal of Agents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 727 (i).
Anse aux Canards Breakwater, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 878 (i).
Anse au Canard Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 2785 (ii).
Anse à Valeau Postmistress, Charges *re* Madame Proulx: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2072 (ii).
Antigonish County Public Works Appropriations: Remarks (Mr. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 2438 (ii).
Antigonish Harbour Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 2022 (ii).
Antigonish to Country Harbour Ry. Subsidy: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) in Com. on Ry. Bill, 6227 (iv).
See 'Railways.'
Apples and Fruit Growers' Association, N.S., Resolutions *re* Industry: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) 1719 (i).
Appropriations omitted from Estimates of 1913: M. for Ret. (Mr. Sinclair) 1819 (i).
See 'Public Works.'
Archambault, Mr. Emile, Dismissal *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Séguin) 5957 (iii).
—— Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Séguin) 5950 (iv).
Archibald, Mr. P. S., Emplymt. by Ry. Dept.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 933 (i).
Architectural Institute of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 35.'
Archives Dept.: *See* 'B. No. 66.'
Archives, Dep. Minister: in Com. of Sup., 6460 (iv).
Archives Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6461 (iv).
'Arctic' Steamship, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5398 (iii).
Arichat and Canso Mail Subsidy: Remarks (Mr. Kyte) in Com. of Sup., 4733 (iii).
Arichat, Retaining Wall: in Com. of Sup., 2039 (ii).
Armouries and Public Buildings, Militia: in Com. of Sup., 620 (i).
Armouries: in Com. of Sup., 5541 (iii).
See 'Public Works.'
Art Gallery: in Com. of Sup., 2825 (ii).
—— Purchase of Paintings: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 1865 (i).
See 'National Art Gallery.'
Asbestos Manufacture Imports, Total Value, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Béland) 1590, 1817 (i).
Ash, Mr. Earl, Claims *re* Damages for Fire on I.C.R.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Emmerson) 2246 (ii).
Ash Wednesday, Adjournment for: M. (Mr. Borden) 3343 (ii).
Asselin, Mr. Oliver, Emplymt. by Immigration Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 1813 (i).
Assent to Bills: *See* 'Bills.'
Athabasca Landing to Grand Prairie Tel. Lines: in Com. of Sup., 2819 (ii).
Athabaska River Landing: in Com. of Sup., 2814 (ii).
Atlantic Coast Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 5399 (iii).
Aud. Gen.'s Office, Temporary Clerks: *See* 'B. No. 113.'
Aud. Gen.'s Report: Presented (Mr. W. T. White) 970 (i).

Aurora Public Building, Papers, Reports, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Armstrong) 561 (i).

Australian Pacific Cable, Proposals *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 576 (i).
See 'Cable.'

Australian Trade Possibilities: Remarks (Mr. Ames) 1981 (ii).

Automobiles purchased for Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5492 (iii).
See 'Militia.'

Baddeck, Grand Narrows and Iona Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 4714 (iii).

Baddeck Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6658 (iv).

Bait, Cold Storage: in Com. of Sup., 6653 (iv).
See 'Fisheries.'

Baldwin, Mr. E., Dismissal from Customs at Coaticooke: M. for Cor. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1361 (i).

Ballots, Voting by Divisions: Ques. (Mr. Burnham) 4979 (iii).

Bands, and Associations Grants, *re* Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5528 (iii), 6653 (iv).

Banking Act Amt. Bill (Mr. Demers) on M. to introduce (Mr. Speaker) 407 (i).

Bank Act (extension of charters) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 169.'

Banking Act, Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 1820 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 938 (i).

Barcelona Tramway, Light and Power Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 36.'

Barss, Mr. Archibald, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 6784 (iv).

Bassano Post Office, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Buchanan) 5557 (iv).

Bath Postmistress, Dismissal: in Com. of Sup., 6282 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 966 (i).
See 'Boham.'

Bathurst Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2363 (ii).

Battlefields Commission: M. (Mr. White) to strike out vote, 5299 (iii).

Battleford Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2204 (ii).

Bayfield Breakwater: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 2041 (ii).

Beauchemin, J. A., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boivin) 3337 (ii).

Beauchesne, Mr., Dismissal from Customs: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 3151 (ii).

Beaumont Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 2366 (ii).

Beaver Bank Station Mail Contract, Cancellation of: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 6286 (iv).

Bedford Mail Contract, Cancellation of: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 6616 (iv).

Bedford Postmaster, Dismissal: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Kay) 5161 (iii).
See 'Jones.'

Belanger, Amedee, Dismissal from I. C. Ry.: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 3050 (ii).

Benoit, Mr. Joseph, Complaints *re* Suspension, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1817 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 4184 (iii).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., Apptmt. as Commissioner of Inquiry: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2062 (ii).
See 'Dismissals.'

Berlin P. O. Clock: Remarks (Mr. Clare) in Com. of Sup., 1346 (i).

Berthier-en-Haut Post Office, Purchase, Repairs, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Barrette) 1409 (i).

——— Desmarais, Mr., Dismissal *re*: Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 5817 (iv).

Bibeau, Mr. A., Sessional Clerk, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 4248 (iii).

Bills, Sen. Amts., 6493, 6544, 6577 (iv).

Bills, Royal Assent, 819 (i), 3241 (ii), 4849 (iii), 6824 (iv).

Bills, Royal Assent, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 794 (i), 3236 (ii), 4775 (iii).

BILLS:

Bill (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Mr. Borden).
1°*, 9 (i).

Bill (No. 2) To amend the Juvenile Delinquents Act, 1908.—(Mr. Bickerdike).
1°*, 12; 2°, 939; in Com., 939; 3°*, 1596 (i).

Bill (No. 3) To amend the Marriage Act.—(Mr. Lancaster).
1°, 12; on Order for 2°, 581; 2° m., 1597; Amt. (Mr. Borden) to adjn. debate, agreed to (Y. 87; N. 61) 1707 (i).

Bill (No. 4) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Lancaster).
1°, 12 (i).

Bill (No. 5) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Lancaster).
1°, 13 (i).

Bill (No. 6) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Turriff).
1°, 176; 2° m., 944, 1015, 1821 (i); 2499 (ii).

Bill (No. 7) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Meighen).
1°, 267 (i); 2°, 2500 (ii).

Bill (No. 8) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Burnham).
1°, 337; 2° m., 1017 (i).

Bill (No. 9) To amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. Stevens).
1°, 407; 2° m., 944; 2°, 1821 (i); in Com., 2532; 3°, 2535 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 10) Respecting the British Colonial Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Coderre).
1°*, 643; 2°*, 1120; in Com., and 3°*, 1577 (i).

Bill (No. 11) Respecting the Canadian Birkbeck Investment and Savings Company, and to change its name to The Canadian Mortgage Investment Company.—(Mr. Osler).
1°, 643, 2°*, 1120 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2061 (ii).

Bill (No. 12) Respecting the Erie, London and Tilsonburg Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).
1°, 643; 2°*, 1120 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2015 (ii).

Bill (No. 13) To incorporate the Liverpool-Manitoba Assurance Company.—(Mr. Bickerdike).
1°, 643; 2°*, 795 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2062 (ii).

Bill (No. 14) To incorporate the North Arm Bridge and Railway Company.—(Mr. Stevens).
1°, 643; 2°*, 1530 (i).

Bill (No. 15) To incorporate the Vancouver Life Insurance Company, of Vancouver, B.C.—(Mr. Stevens).
1°, 643; 2°*, 1121 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2062 (ii).

Bill (No. 16) Respecting certain Patents of Thomas Wadge.—(Mr. Aikins).
1°, 643; 2°*, 1200 (i); in Com., 2854, 2983, 3280; 3°*, 3283 (ii).

Bill (No. 17) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°, 644 (i).

Bill (No. 18) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1912.—(Mr. White, Leeds).
In Com. on Ways and Means, 702, 1°*, 2°* in Com., and 3°*, 703 (i).

Bill (No. 19) To amend the Inquiries Act.—(Mr. Doherty).
1°, 710; 2m., 1021; ruling, 1281; 2° and in Com., 1283, 1318, 1414; 3°*, 1494 (i).

Bill (No. 20) Respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.— (Mr. Macdonald).
M. for leave to introduce, 711; 1°*, 713; 2°, 795; in Com., and 3°*, 797 (i).

Bill (No. 21) Respecting the National Transcontinental Railway.—(Mr. Cochrane).
1°*, 713; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 797 (i).

Bill (No. 22) Respecting the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Jameson).
1°*, 794; 2°*, 1121 (i); in Com., 2011; 3°*, 2012 (ii).

Bill (No. 23) Respecting the Harbour of Hamilton.—(Mr. Stewart, Hamilton).
1°*, 794; 2°*, 1121 (i); in Com., 2449; in Com., and 3°*, 3672 (ii).

Bill (No. 24) Respecting the Montreal Terminal Railway Company.—(Mr. Coderre).
1°*, 794; 2°*, 1121 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 25) Respecting the Ottawa Northern and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Fripp).
1°*, 794; 2°*, 1121 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2015 (ii).

Bill (No. 26) To incorporate the Saskatchewan Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. McKay).
1°*, 794; 2°*, 1121; in Com., and 3°*, 1577 (i).

Bill (No. 27) Respecting the Security Life Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Coderre).
1°*, 794; 2°*, 1121 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2062 (ii).

Bill (No. 28) Respecting the West Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Nesbitt).
1°*, 795; 2°*, 1121 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2015 (ii).

Bill (No. 29) Respecting the Dominion Guarantee Company, Limited, and to change its name to the Dominion Gresham Guarantee and Casualty Company.—(Mr. Barker).
1°*, 795; 2°*, 1121 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2449 (ii).

Bill (No. 30) Respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company. —(Mr. White, Renfrew).
1°*, 795; 2°*, 1121 (i); in Com., 4699; 3°*, 4701 (iii).

Bill (No. 31) To amend the Quebec Harbour Commissioners Act, 1899.—(Mr. Hazen).
1°, 869; 2°, 1025; in Com., 1032; 3°, 1709 (i).

Bill (No. 32) Respecting Grain.—(Mr. Foster).
Res. prop., 793, 869; in Com. on Res., 870; 1°* of Bill, 874 (i); 2°, 2161; in Com., 2179, 2186, 2302, 2382, 2535, 2560, 2755, 3156, 3451, 3491, 3630, 3757 (ii); 4042, 4153, 4787; 3°m., 4788; agreed to, 4835 (iii).

Bill (No. 33) Respecting the Alberta Electric Railway Company, and to change its name to 'The Alberta Interurban Railway Company.'—(Mr. Bennett, Calgary).
1°*, 969; 2°*, 1200 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2015 (ii).

Bill (No. 34) Respecting the Algoma Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Boyce).
1°*, 969; 2°*, 1200 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2015 (ii).

Bill (No. 35) Respecting the Architectural Institute of Canada.—(Sir Edmund Osler).
1°*, 969; 2°*, 1530 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2449 (ii).

Bill (No. 36) Respecting Barcelona Traction, Light and Power Company, Limited, and to change its name to 'Barcelona Tramway, Light and Power Company, Limited.'—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°*, 969; 2°*, 1201 (i); in Com., 2410; 3°* 2413 (ii).

Bill (No. 37) Respecting the Calgary and Fernie Railway Company.—(Mr. Goodeve).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1201 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2015 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 38) Respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Staples).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1318 (i); in Com., 5201; 3°*, 5202 (iii).

Bill (No. 39) Respecting the Canadian Northern Montreal Tunnel and Terminal Company, Limited.—(Mr. Guilbault).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1201 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4701 (iii).

Bill (No. 40) Respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. Currie).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1318 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2415 (ii).

Bill (No. 41) Respecting the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Guilbault).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1318 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2415 (ii).

Bill (No. 42) Respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company and the Carillon and Grenville Railway Company.—(Mr. Achim).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1201 (i).

Bill (No. 43) Respecting the Cap de la Magdeleine Railway Company.—(Mr. Paquet).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1201 (i); in Com., 2012; 3°*, 2015 (ii).

Bill (No. 44) Respecting the Central Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Baker).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1201 (i).

Bill (No. 45) Respecting *La Compagnie du Chemin de fer de Colonisation du Nord.*—(Mr. Achim).
1°*, 970, 2°*, 1201 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2015 (ii).

Bill (No. 46) Respecting the Dominion Trust Company, and to change its nome to 'British Empire Trust Company.'—(Mr. Cromwell).
1°*, 970; 2°, 1201 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4237 (iii).

Bill (No. 47) Respecting the Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Railway Company.—(Mr. Barker).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1201 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2415 (ii).

Bill (No. 48) Respecting the Kootenay and Alberta Railway Company.—(Mr. Coderre).
1°*, 970; 2*, 1318 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2415 (ii).

Bill (No. 49) Respecting the Montreal Central Terminal Company.—(Mr. Ames).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1318 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2415 (ii).

Bill (No. 50) Respecting the Ontario and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Currie).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1318 (i); in Com., 2413; 3°m., 2414; 3°*, 2784 (ii).

Bill (No. 51) Respecting the Pacific and Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Boyce).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1318 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2015 (ii).

Bill (No. 52) To incorporate the Pacific Trans-Canada and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1318 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3284 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 53) Respecting certain Patents of Edmund F. Piper.—(Mr. Fripp).
1°*, 970; 2°m., 1201; 2°*, 1318 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2449 (ii).

Bill (No. 54) To incorporate the Quinze River and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Brabazon).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1318 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4171 (iii).

Bill (No. 55) Respecting certain Patents of Thomas D. Rambaut.—(Mr. Ames).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1530 (i).

Bill (No. 56) Respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Nesbitt).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1318 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3284 (ii).

Bill (No. 57) Respecting the Union Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Barker).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1318 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2062 (ii).

Bill (No. 58) Respecting the Department of External Affairs.—(Mr. Borden).
1°, 971; 2°*, 1434; in Com., and 3°*, 1434 (i).

Bill (No. 59) To amend the Patent Act.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°, 1020 (i).

Bill (No. 60) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Borden).
Res. Prop., 1018; in Com. on Res., 1032; 1°* of B., 1033; 2° and in Com., 1434 (i); 3343, 3540; 3°*, 3631 (ii).

Bill (No. 61) Respecting the Gatineau and Ungava Railway Company, and to change its name to The Ottawa and Ungava Railway Company.—(Mr. Chabot).
1°*, 1069; 2°*, 1530 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3284 (ii).

Bill (No. 62) Respecting the Kettle Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Goodeve).
1°*, 1069; 2°*, 1530 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3284 (ii).

Bill (No. 63) To incorporate the Premier Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Bennett, Calgary).
1°*, 1069; 2°*, 1530 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2449 (ii).

Bill (No. 64) To amend the Navigable Waters Protection Act.—(Mr. Bradbury).
1°, 1069 (i).

Bill (No. 65) To correct certain Clerical Errors in the French Version of the Revised Statutes, 1906.—(Mr. Doherty).
1°, 1197; 2° and in Com., 1438; 3°*, 1440 (i).

Bill (No. 66) Respecting the Public Archives.—(Mr. Borden).
In Com. on Res., 1282; 1°* of B., 1282; 2°, 1440; in Com., 1494; 3°*, 1713 (i).

Bill (No. 67) Respecting the Interprovincial and James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. White, Renfrew).
1°*, 1409; 2°*, 1577 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3284 (ii).

Bill (No. 68) Respecting Queen's College at Kingston, and to change its name to 'Queen's University at Kingston.'—(Mr. Nickle).
1°*, 1410 (i); 2°*, 2560; Remarks, 3730, 3873; in Com., 3874 (ii), 4237, 4745; 3°, 4869 (iii); Sen. Amts., 6770 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 69) To incorporate Queen's Theological College.—(Mr. Nickle).
1°*, 1410 (i); 2°*, 2560 (ii); in Com., 4237, 4775; 3°*, 4869 (iii).

Bill (No. 70) To incorporate the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Keewatin.—(Mr. McKay).
1°*, 1410; 2°*, 1577 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3672 (ii).

Bill (No. 71) Respecting a certain patent of the Spirella Company of Canada, Limited.—(Mr. German).
1°*, 1410; 2°*, 1577 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2449 (ii).

Bill (No. 72) To incorporate the Sterling Life Assurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Blain).
1°*, 1410; 2°*, 1577 (i); in Com., 2448; 3°*, 2559 (ii).

Bill (No. 73) Respecting the Vancouver Island and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Barnard).
1°*, 1410; 2°*, 1577 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3284 (ii).

Bill (No. 74) Respecting the use of Flags.—(Mr. Bradbury).
1°, 1411 (i).

Bill (No. 75) To amend the Senate and House of Commons Act.—(Mr. Doherty).
Res. prop., 1414; in Com. on Res., 1497; 1°* of B., 1498; 2° and in Com., 1713; 3°*, 1714 (i).

Bill (No. 76) To amend The National Transcontinental Railway Act.—(Mr. Cochrane).
1°, 1571; 2° and in Com., 1866 (i); 3126, 3364; 3°*, 3539 (ii).

Bill (No. 77) To Encourage and Assist the Improvement of Highways.—(Mr. Cochrane).
1°, 1571 (i); 2°, 3633; in Com., 3667, 3672, 3946 (ii); 3°, 4140 (iii); Sen. Amts., 6397, 6731 (iv).

Bill (No. 78) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—(Mr. Foster).
In Com. on Res., 1839; 1°* of B., 1839 (i); 2° and in Com., 6188, 6678; 3°*, 6680 (iv).

Bill (No. 79) Respecting the Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company—(Mr. Buchanan).
1°*, 1862 (i); 2°*, 2186; in Com., and 3°*, 3284 (ii).

Bill (No. 80) Respecting the Dominion Trust Company, Limited, and to change its name to Dominion Trust Company.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°*, 1862 (i); 2°*, 2062 (ii); in Com., 4237; 3°*, 4238 (iii).

Bill (No. 81) To incorporate the High River, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).
1°*, 1862 (i); 2°*, 2186; in Com., and 3°*, 3284 (ii).

Bill (No. 82) To incorporate the Northern Territorial Railway Company.—(Mr. McKay).
1°*, 1862 (i); 2°*, 2415; in Com., and 3°*, 3284 (ii).

Bill (No. 83) Respecting the Saskatchewan Power Company.—(Mr. McKay).
1°*, 1862 (i); 2°*, 2186; in Com., and 3°*, 3672 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 84) Respecting certain Patents of Thomas D. Rambaut.—(Mr. Ames).
1°*, 1862 (i); 2°*, 2186; in Com., 2855, 2985, 3280, 3284, 3332, 3479; 3°*, 3491 (ii).

Bill (No. 85) To amend the Lord's Day Act.—(Mr. Verville).
1°, 2057 (ii).

Bill (No. 86) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°, 2058 (ii).

Bill (No. 87) To amend the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1907.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°, 2058 (ii).

Bill (No. 88) To provide for the appointment of a Tariff Commission.—(Mr. White, Leeds).
Res. prop., 1839 (i); in Com. on Res., 2157; 1°* of B., 2161; 2°m., 2591, 2668; Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) 2614, Neg. (Y. 52; N. 104) 2752; in Com., 2862, 2939, 2994, 3540 (ii), 4079; 3° m., 4144 (iii); Sen. Amts., 6663, 6808 (iv).

Bill (No. 89) To incorporate the Bank of Saskatchewan.—(Mr. Knowles).
1°*, 2216; 2°*, 2415; in Com., and 3°*, 2854 (ii).

Bill (No. 90) Respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company.—(Mr. Clements).
1°*, 2216; 2°*, 2415; in Com., and 3°*, 3284 (ii).

Bill (No. 91) Respecting the Kootenay Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Clements)
1°*, 2217; 2°*, 2415; in Com., and 3°*, 3284 (ii).

Bill (No. 92) Respecting the Manitoba and North Western Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Cash).
1°*, 2217. 2°*, 2415; in Com., and 3°*, 3284 (ii).

Bill (No. 93) Respecting the United Gold Fields of British Columbia (Limited).—(Mr. Buchanan).
1°*, 2217; 2°*, 2415; in Com., and 3°*, 3284 (ii).

Bill (No. 94) Respecting the Windsor, Chatham and London Railway Company.—(Mr. Wilcox.)
1°*, 2217; 2°*, 2784 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4171 (iii).

Bill (No. 95) Respecting the National Transcontinental Railway.—(Mr. White, Leeds).
Res. prop., 2296; in Com. on Res., 2378; 1°* of B., 2381; 2°, 3060; in Com., and 3°*, 3126 (ii).

Bill (No. 96) To amend the Manitoba Grain Act.—(Mr. Foster, Toronto).
Res. prop., 793 (i); in Com. on Res., 2405; 1°*, of B., 2°*, and in Com., 2406; 3°, 2575 (ii).

Bill (No. 97) To provide for further Advances to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. Hazen.)
Res. prop., 2295; M. for Com. on Res., 2406, 2415; in Com. on Res., 2420; 1°* of B., 2420; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 3632 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 98) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. McCraney).
1°*, 2664; 2°*, 3284 (ii); in Com., 5198; 3°*, 5201 (iii).

Bill (No. 99) Respecting the Ottawa, Montreal and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Bickerdike).
1°*, 2664; 2°*, 3284 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4171 (iii).

Bill (No. 100) For the Aid and Encouragement of Agriculture.—(Mr. Burrell).
1° m., 2849 (ii); 2° and in Com., 5277 (iii); 3° m., 5561 (iv).

Bill (No. 101, from the Senate) To incorporate the British Western Loan Company.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).
1°*, 3049; 2°*, 3284 (ii).

Bill (No. 102, from the Senate) For the Relief of Edna Wells.—(Mr. Beattie).
1°*, 3049; 2°*, 3285; in Com., and 3°*, 3672 (ii).

Bill (No. 103) To amend the Government Works Tolls Act.—(Mr. Monk).
1°, 3049; 2° and in Com., 3450; 3°*, 3539 (ii).

Bill (No. 104) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Borden).
Res. prop., 2862; in Com. on Res., 3143; 1°* of B., 3146; 2°, 3347; in Com., 3349; 3°*, 3539 (ii).

Bill (No. 105) To amend the Post Office Act.—(Mr. Pelletier).
Res. prop., 3056; in Com. on Res., 3154; 1°* of B., 3155; 2°, 3349; in Com., 3355; 3°*, 3364 (ii).

Bill (No. 106) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Pelletier).
Res. prop., 3056; in Com. on Res., 3155; 1° of B., 3155 (ii); 2° and in Com., 4782, 5264; 3°*, 5268 (iii).

Bill (No. 107, from the Senate) Respecting the Pollution of Navigable Waters.—(Mr. Bennett, Simcoe).
1°*, 3449 (ii).

Bill (No. 108, from the Senate) Respecting The Trust and Loan Company of Canada.—(Mr. Baker).
1°*, 3349; 2°*, 3672 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4237 (iii).

Bill (No. 109, from the Senate) For the relief of Herbert Horsfall.—(Mr. Kay).
1°*, 3449; 2°*, 3672 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4701 (iii).

Bill (No. 110, from the Senate) For the relief of Kenneth Molson.—(Mr. Rhodes).
1°*, 3449; 2°*, 3672 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4701 (iii).

Bill (No. 111) To authorize the payment of a subsidy to the Collingwood Ship-Building Company, Ltd.—(Mr. Monk).
Res. prop., 3343; in Com. on Res., 3450; 1°* of B., 3451; 2°, 3633; in Com., and 3°*, 3633 (ii).

Bill (No. 112, from the Senate) For the relief of James Denny.—(Mr. Aikins).
1°*, 3630 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4701 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 113) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. White, Leeds).
Res. prop., 3539; in Com. on Res., 3632; 1°* of B., 3633 (ii); 2° and in Com., 4081; 3°*, 4082 (iii).

Bill (No. 114, from the Senate) To incorporate Révillon Frères Trading Company, Limited.—(Mr. Barker).
1°*, 3828 (ii); 2°*, 4171; in Com., 5202; 3°*, 5204 (iii).

Bill (No. 115) To provide for the Extension of the Boundaries of the Province of Manitoba.—(Mr. Borden).
Res. prop., 3538; in Com. on Res., 3835; 1° of B., 3898 (ii); 2°m., 4263, 4353; Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6 m. h., 3886, 4375; Amt. Neg. (Y. 65; N. 103) 4395; 2° resmd. 4397, 4461; agreed to (Y. 114; N. 76) 4495; in Com., 4496, 4584, 4656, 4701, 4836; 3°m., 4838; Amt. (Mr. Mondou) Separate Schools, 4839; Neg. (Y. 24; N. 160) 4925; Amt. (Mr. Beland) 4934; Neg. (Y. 52; N. 108) 4973; 3° agreed to, 4974 (iii).

Bill (No. 116) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Reid, Grenville).
Res. prop., 3829, in Com. on Res., 3971; 1° of B., 3972 (ii); 2°, 4563; in Com., 4564; 3°*, 4787 (iii).

Bill (No. 117, from the Senate) To change the name of Ezra Butler Eddy Bessey.—(Mr. Fripp.)
1°*, 4139; 2°, 4238; in Com., and 3°*, 4701 (iii).

Bill (No. 118) To create the Biological Board of Canada.—(Mr. Hazen).
1°, 4037; 2° and in Com., 4551; 3°*, 4555 (iii); Sen. Amdts., 5690 (iv).

Bill (No. 119, from the Senate) Respecting certain Patents of the Continental Can Company.—(Mr. Fripp).
1°*, 4236; 2°, 4395; in Com., 5204, 5483 (iii); 5903; in Com., and 3°*, 5947 (iv).

Bill (No. 120, from the Senate) For the relief of Ethel May Stewart.—(Mr. Clark).
1°*, 4237; 2°*, 4397; in Com., and 3°* 5259 (iii).

Bill (No. 121, from the Senate) Respecting the Rainy River Radial Railway Company.—(Mr. Beattie).
1°*, 4457; 2°*, 4701; in Com., 5198; 3°*, 5198 (iii).

Bill (No. 122, from the Senate) For the relief of William Holloway Adams.—(Mr. MacNutt).
1°*, 4457; 2°*, 4701; in Com., and 3°*, 5259 (iii).

Bill (No. 123) To amend the Yukon Act.—(Mr. Doherty).
Res. prop., 3630 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4555; 1°* of B., 4563; 2° and in Com., 5405; (iii); 5567; 3°*, 5571 (iv).

Bill (No. 124) Respecting the Civil Service —(Mr. Pelletier).
Res. prop., 4042; in Com. on Res., 4583; 1°* of B., 4584; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 4787 (iii).

Bill (No. 125, from the Senate) To incorporate the Western Dominion Railway Company.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).
1°*, 4835; 2°*, 5259 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5911 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 126, from the Senate) To incorporate the Universal Eyesight Insurance Company.—(Mr. McLean, Queens).
1°*, 4835; 2°*, 5259 (iii); in Com., 5907, 5940; 3°*, 5942 (iv).

Bill (No. 127, from the Senate) To incorporate the Canadian Public Health Association.—(Mr. Schaffner).
1°*, 4835; 2°*, 5260 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5947 (iv).

Bill (No. 128, from the Senate) To incorporate the Montreal Transcontinental Railway Company.—(Mr. Coderre).
1°*, 4835; 2°*, 5260 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5948 (iv).

Bill (No. 129, from the Senate) Respecting the Alberta, Peace River and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Chabot).
1°*, 4835; 2°*, 5260 (iii); in Com., 5904, 5942; 3°*, 5946 (iv).

Bill (No. 130, from the Senate) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Currie).
1°*, 4835; 2°*, 5260 (iii); in Com., 5947, 6563, 6749; 3°*, 6769 (iv).

Bill (No. 131, from the Senate) For the relief of Isabell Isaac.—(Mr. MacNutt).
1°*, 4835; 2°*, 5260 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5948 (iv).

Bill (No. 132, from the Senate) Respecting Mexican Interurban Electric Traction Company, Limited, and to change its name to Mexican Interurban Electric Railway Company, Limited.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°*, 4835; 2°*, 5260 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5948 (iv).

Bill (No. 133, from the Senate) Respecting the Methodist Church.—(Mr. Aikins).
1°*, 4975; 2°*, 5260 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5948 (iv).

Bill (No. 134, from the Senate) Respecting the British Columbia and Dawson Railway Company.—(Mr. Goodeve).
1°*, 4976; 2°*, 5260 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5911 (iv).

Bill (No. 135, from the Senate) Respecting the Vancouver, Fraser Valley and Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Stevens).
1°*, 4976; 2°*, 5260 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5911 (iv).

Bill (No. 136, from the Senate) To incorporate the Prince Edward and Hastings Railway Company.—(Mr. Hepburn).
1°*, 4976; 2°*, 5260 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5911 (iv).

Bill (No. 137) To amend the Volunteer Bounty Act, 1908.—(Mr. Rogers).
1°, 4974 (iii); 2°, 5968; in Com., 6176, 6450; 3°*, 6454 (iv).

Bill (No. 138) To incorporate the Winnipeg and St. Boniface Harbour Commissioners.—(Mr. Hazen).
1°, 4976 (iii); 2° and in Com., 5988; 3°*, 6062 (iv).

Bill (No. 139, from the Senate) To incorporate the Ottawa and Lake McGregor Railway Company.—(Mr. Devlin).
2°*, 5260 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5911 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 140) To amend the Fisheries Act.—(Mr. Hazen).
1°, 5053; 2°, 5271; in Com., 5276; 3°*, 5277 (iii).

Bill (No. 141, from the Senate) To incorporate The Interprovincial Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Lesperance).
1°*, 5156; 2°*, 5260 (iii); in Com. ,and 3°*, 5911 (iv).

Bill (No. 142, from the Senate) For the relief of Alvena Bell Leaitch.—(Mr. Macdonald).
1°*, 5156; 2°*, 5260 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5947 (iv).

Bill (No. 143) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Hazen).
Res. prop., 5156; in Com. on Res., 5161; 1°* of B., 5161; 2° and in Com., 5400; 3°*, 5404 (iii).

Bill (No. 144) Respecting Aid toward the construction of the Canadian Northern Alberta Railway.—(Mr. White, Leeds).
Res. prop., 4140; in Com. on Res., 5162; 1°* of B., 5166; 2° and in Com., 5404; 3°*, 5405 (iii).

Bill (No. 145, from the Senate) To ratify and confirm certain Agreements between the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway Commission and the Grand Trunk Railway Company.—(Mr. Currie).
1°*, 5257; 2°*, 5484 (iii); in Com., 5947, 6769; 3°*, 6770 (iv).

Bill (No. 146, from the Senate) Respecting the Saskatchewan Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).
1°*, 5257; 2°*, 5484 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5948 (iv).

Bill (No. 147, from the Senate) For the relief of Isabella Helen Horncastle.—(Mr. Clark, Red Deer).
1°*, 5257; 2°*, 5484 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5947 (iv).

Bill (No. 148, from the Senate) To incorcorporate International Guarantee Company.—(Mr. McCraney).
1°*, 5257; 2°*, 5484 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5947 (iv).

Bill (No. 149) Respecting Water in the Railway Belt and Peace River Block of Land.—(Mr. Rogers).
1°, 5257 (iii); 2° and in Com., 5968, 6175; 3° m., 6188, 6338, 6401 (iv).

Bill (No. 150) Respecting the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. Hazen).
1°, 5258 (iii); 2° and in Com., 5690; 3°*, 5960 (iv).

Bill (No. 151) To extend the Boundaries of the Province of Quebec.—(Mr. Borden).
Res. prop., 3944 (ii); in Com. on Res., 5268; 1°* of B., 5270 (iii); 2° and in Com., 6160, 3°, 6188, 6338 (iv).

Bill (No. 152) To extend the Boundaries of the Province of Ontario.—(Mr. Borden).
Res. prop., 3944 (ii); in Com. on Res., 5270; 1°* of B., 5271 (iii); 2°, 6155; in Com., 6155; 3°*, 6188 (iv).

Bill (No. 153, from the Senate) For the relief of George MacKay Sutherland.—(Mr. MacNutt).
1°*, 5400; 2°*, 5484 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5947 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 154, from the Senate) To incorporate The Guarantee Life Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. MacNutt).
1°*, 5400; 2°*, 5484 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5948 (iv).

Bill (No. 155, from the Senate), To incorporate the British American Trust Company.—(Mr. Blain).
1°*, 5400; 2°*, 5484 (iii); in Com., 5946; 3°*, 5947 (iv).

Bill (No. 156) To amend the Judges Act.—(Mr. Doherty).
In Com. on Res., 5407, 5958; 1°* of B., 5415 (iii); 2° and in Com., 6000; 3° m., 6062 (iv).

Bill (No. 157, from the Senate) Respecting the Subsidiary High Court of the Ancient Order of Foresters in the Dominion of Canada.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°*, 5550 (iii); 2°*, 5903; in Com., and 3°*, 6770 (iv).

Bill (No. 158, from the Senate) To incorporate the Grand Lodge of the Loyal Order of Moose in the Dominion of Canada.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°*, 5550 (iii); 2°*, 5903; in Com., 6126; 3°*, 6127 (iv).

Bill (No. 159, from the Senate) Respecting the Mexico Northwestern Transportation Company, Limited, and to change its name to Mexico Northwestern Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°*, 2°*, 5550 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5948 (iv).

Bill (No. 160, from the Senate) Respecting Alabama Traction, Light and Power Company, Limited.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°*, 2°*, 5550 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5948 (iv).

Bill (No. 161, from the Senate) Respecting the Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Railway Company.—(Mr. Fripp).
1°*, 5550 (iii); 2°*, 5903; in Com., 6127; 3°*, 6127 (iv).

Bill (No. 162, from the Senate) For the relief of William Alexander Hunt Jenkins.—(Mr. Beattie).
1°*, 5550 (iii); 2°*, 5903; in Com., and 3°*, 6128 (iv).

Bill (No. 163, from the Senate) For the relief of Edith Harriet Duffy.—(Mr. Wallace).
1°*, 5549 (iii); 2°*, 5903; in Com., and 3°*, 6128 (iv).

Bill (No. 164, from the Senate) For the relief of John Angus Kennedy.—(Mr. McCraney).
1°*, 5550 (iii); 2°*, 5903; in Com., and 3°*, 6128 (iv).

Bill (No. 165) To amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. Doherty).
1°, 5549; 2° and in Com., 5862; 3°m., 5892, 5960 (iv).

Bill (No. 166) To amend the Prisons and Reformatories Act.—(Mr. Doherty).
1°, 5552; 2° and in Com., 5892; 3°*, 5893 (iv).

Bill (No. 167) Respecting the Incorporation of Live Stock Record Associations.—(Mr. Burrell).
1°, 5553; 2°, 6021; in Com., 6023; 3°*, 6062 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 168) To amend the Exchequer Court Act.—(Mr. Doherty).
1°, 5553; 2° and in Com., 5893; 3°*, 5894 (iv).

Bill (No. 169) To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. White, Leeds).
1°, 5555; 2° and in Com., 5846; 3°*, 5859 (iv).

Bill (No. 170) To amend the Quebec Savings Bank Act.—(Mr. White, Leeds).
1°, 5556; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 5859 (iv).

Bill (No. 171) To amend the Militia Act.—(Mr. Hughes, Victoria).
1°, 5556; 2° and in Com., 6061; 3°*, 6062 (iv).

Bill (No. 172, from the Senate) Respecting the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. Lalor).
1°*, 5680; 2°*, 5903; in Com., 6127; 3°*, 6128 (iv).

Bill (No. 173, from the Senate) For the relief of Henry Greek Wills.—(Mr. Beattie).
1°*, 5680; 2°*, 5903; in Com., and 3°*, 6128 (iv).

Bill (No. 174, from the Senate) For the relief of Keitha Seeley.—(Mr. Wallace).
1°*, 5831; 2°*, 5903; in Com., and 3°*, 6128 (iv).

Bill (No. 175, from the Senate) For the relief of David George Davidson.—(Mr. Lennox).
1°*, 5831; 2°*, 5903; in Com., and 3°*, 6128 (iv).

Bill (No. 176, from the Senate) To consolidate and amend the Acts relating to the Dominion Gresham Guarantee and Casualty Company.—(Mr. Barker).
1°*, 5831; 2°*, 5903; in Com., and 3°*, 6128 (iv).

Bill (No. 177, from the Senate) To incorporate Capital Trust Corporation, Limited.—(Mr. Tobin).
1°*, 5831; 2°*, 5903; in Com., and 3°*, 6128 (iv).

Bill (No. 178) To provide an additional Annual Grant to the Province of Prince Edward Island.—(Mr. White, Leeds).
Res. prop., 5558; in Com. on Res., 5859; 1°* of B., 5862; 2° and in Com., 6114, 6128; 3°*, 6154 (iv).

Bill (No. 179) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Pelletier).
Res. prop., 5680; in Com. on Res., 5921; 1°* of B., 5921; 2° and in Com., 6083; 3°*, 6114 (iv).

Bill (No. 180) To amend the Dry Dock Subsidies Act, 1910.—(Mr. Monk).
Res. prop., 5559; in Com. on Res., 6047; 1°* of B., 5939; 2° and in Com., 6201; 3°*, 6203 (iv).

Bill (No. 181) To amend the Yukon Placer Mining Act.—(Mr. Rogers).
1°, 5939; 2°, 6181; in Com., 6182; 3°*, 6182 (iv).

Bill (No. 182) Respecting the Government House property, Toronto.—(Mr. Doherty).
In Com. on Res., 5957; 1° of B., 5957; 2° and in Com., 6181; 3°*, 6181 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 183) To authorize the granting of Subsidies in aid of the Lines of the Railways and Bridges therein mentioned.—(Mr. Cochrane).
Res. prop., 5681; in Com. on Res., 5894, 5911, 6060; 1°* of B., 6061; 2° and in Com., 6211, 6304, 6395; 3°m., 6395 (iv).

Bill (No. 184) Respecting the Imperial Loan and Investment Company of Canada —(Mr. Sharpe, Ontario).
1°*, 6061; 2°*, 6128; in Com., and 3°*, 6770 (iv).

Bill (No. 185) To authorize the sale to the Province of Manitoba of certain Ordnance Lands, in the city of Winnipeg. —(Mr. Hughes, Victoria).
In Com. on Res., 5690, 6064; 1°* of B., 6080; 2° and in Com., 6203; 3°*, 6203 (iv).

Bill (No. 186) To authorize the granting of Subsidies to the Government of the Province of Ontario in aid of the construction of the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway.—(Mr. Cochrane).
Res. prop., 5681; in Com. on Res., 6080; 1°* of B., 6082; 2° and in Com., 6401; 3°*, 6449 (iv).

Bill (No. 187) To authorize the granting of a Subsidy to the Canadian Northern Pacific Railway Company, in aid of the construction of the Railway therein mentioned.—(Mr. Cochrane).
Res. prop., 5690; in Com. on Res., 6081; 1°* of B., 6082; 2°m., 6331; in Com., 6338; 3°, 6495 (iv).

Bill (No. 188) To aid the construction of certain Bridges on the Railway of the Saint John and Quebec Railway Company, and to confirm an agreement between the Company and the Governments of Canada and New Brunswick. —(Mr. Cochrane).
Res. prop., 5691; in Com. on Res., 6083; 1°* of B., 6083; 2°, and in Com., 6373; 3°, 6496 (iv).

Bill (No. 189) To aid the construction of the Canadian Northern Alberta Railway.—(Mr. Cochrane).
Res. prop., 5841; in Com. on Res., 6083; 1°* of B., 6083; 2° and in Com., 6372; 3°*, 6373 (iv).

Bill (No. 190) To authorize a Bounty to Volunteers who served the Crown during the Fenian Raids.—(Mr. Hughes, Victoria).
Res. prop., 5558; in Com. on Res., 6083; 1°* of B., 6083; 2° and in Com., 6252, 6454; 3°*, 6460 (iv).

Bill (No. 191, from the Senate) To provide for the Incorporation of Railway Companies.—(Mr. Maclean, Halifax).
1°, 6492 (iv).

Bill (No. 192, from the Senate) To incorporate the Ottawa and Lake McGregor Railway Company.—(Mr. Barker).
1°, 6495; 2°, 6576; in Com., and 3°*, 6770 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 193) To grant to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service for the Financial Years ending respectively 31st of March, 1912, and 31st March, 1913.—(Mr. White, Leeds).
In Com. on Ways and Means, 6807; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 6808 (iv).

Bill (No. 194) To amend an Act of the present Session intituled An Act respecting the Montreal Central Terminal Company.—(Mr. Lennox).
1°, 6577; 2° and in Com. 6578; in Com., and 3°*, 6770 (iv).

Bill (No. 195) Respecting the Montreal and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Lennox).
1°, 2°, 6578; in Com., and 3°*, 6770 (iv).

Binks, Mr., Promotion to Dead Letter Office M. for Cor.* (Mr. Henderson) 3946 (ii).

Biological Board of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 118.'

Biological Board, Names, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4257 (iii).

Bird Rocks Lighthouse, Drowning of Keeper: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 5258 (iii).

Bisley Rules: *See* 'N. R. A.'

Blind River Post Office, Change of Name: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 4262 (iii).

—— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Sinclair) 5928 (iv).

Blue Rocks Island Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2041 (ii).

Board of Management, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 4136 (iii), 5800 (iv).

Bohan, John W., Dismissal from Customs at Bath: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 3055 (ii).

Boots and Shoes, Imports and Prices into Canada for 1908-9-10: M. for Ret. (Mr. Carvell) 1267 (i).

Boucher, Mr. O. F., Pet. *re* Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 975 (i).

Boundary Waters Treaty, Apptmt.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Pugsley) 2589 (ii).

—— Negotiations *re* Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 3833 (ii).
See 'Waterways.'

Bounties on Steel and Iron, Administration of Act: in Com. of Sup., 687 (i), 5934 (iv).

Bounties on Steel Rods, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Neely) 529 (i).
See 'Steel.'

Bounties to Veterans: *See* 'B. Nos. 137 & 190.'

Bourassa, Capt., Pet. *re* Dep. Harbour Master: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1814 (i).

Bourgoin, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 5557 (iv).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lemieux) 5259 (iii); 6188 (iv).

Bourque, Geoffrey, Accident on I. C. Ry., Inquiry *re* M. for Reps.* (Mr. Boulay) 2459 (ii).

Bourque, Geoffrey: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 5610 (iv).
——— Claims *re* Damages on I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2243 (ii).
Boyle, D. R., Fishery Overseer at Arichat, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Kyte) 3945 (ii).
Braine, Dr. Lawrence, Indian Medical Attendant at Chester, N.S.: Dismissal, &c. Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4976 (iii).
Branch Lines, I C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 622 (i).
——— Subsidies to &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5618 (iv).
See 'I. C. R.'
Bras D'Or Lakes Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 4734 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 5936 (iv).
Brazeau, Mr. Emile, Postmaster at Cote Rouge, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 6337 (iv).
Breakwaters, N. S.: Inquiry for Rets. (Mr. Kyte) 4460 (iii).
Brian, Mr., Dismissals for Political Partisanship: Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com. of Sup., 1077 (i).
Bridge Strengthening I. C. R.: in Com of Sup., 4137 (iii).
British Admiralty, Memo *re* Conference between Can. and Australia, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 559 (i).
British American Trust Co.: *See* 'B. No. 155.'
British Colonial Fire Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 10.'
B. C. and Dawson Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 134.'
B. C. Boundary Agreement *re* Subsidy: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 971 (i).
B. C. Fishing Licenses, Transfers, &c.: M. for Pets.* (Mr. Sinclair) 3945 (ii).
B. C. Fishing Rights: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 6277 (iv).
B. C. Herring Fishing, Authority *re* Close Season: Ques. (Mr. Shepherd) 4256 (iii).
B. C. International Boundary Line, Par. from Washington: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 2754 (ii).
B. C. Lumber Combine, Challenge of Mr. A. E. Watts: Remarks (Mr. Knowles) 2297 (ii).
B. C. Provincial Subsidy, Consultations with other Provs.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 573 (i).
B. C. Public Buildings, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 2215 (ii).
B. C. Railway Belt Lands, O. C. *re* Transfer: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1200 (i).
British Empire Trust Co.: *See* 'B. No. 46.'
British Mails, Landing at North Sydney, Tests *re*: Ques. (Mr. McKenzie) 5948 (iv).
'British News,' &c., Purchase by Dept. of Int.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 6660 (iv).
See 'Immigration.'
Britiish Preference, Increase of: Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 553 (i).
British Western Loan Co.: *See* 'B. No. 101.'
B. W. India Trade Arrangements, Negotiations *re*: M. for Papers* (Mr. Murphy) 977 (i).
Broderick Post Office, Change of Name: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McCraney) 5263 (iii).
See 'St. Aldwyn.'
Bronte Village, Lease of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 3151 (ii).
Brown, Wm., Pet. from Dr. E. Montpetit, *re* Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4977 (iii).
——— Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4779 (iii).
Brown, Mr., M.P., Smuggling: *See* 'Customs Smuggling.'
Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6314 (iv).
Brymer, Arthur, Fishery Officer at Lower L'Ardoise, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 3752 (ii).
——— M. for Papers* (Mr. Kyte) 4781 (iii).
Buck, A. E., Postmaster at Crystal Beach, Dismissal, &c.: Remarks (Mr. German) 3908 (ii), 5960 (iv).
Budget, The (annual statement) 4985:
Debate: (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 5011; (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 5041; (Mr. Verville) 5056; (Mr. Broder) 5083; (Mr. M. Clark) 5085; (Mr. Lalor) 5070; (Mr. Oliver) 5093; (Mr. Marshall) 5102; (Mr. Burnham) 5101; (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 5109; (Mr. Cockshutt) 5118 (iii); (Mr. Nesbitt) 5134; (Mr. Bellemare) 5146; (Mr. R. Lanctot) 5147; (Mr. Paquet) 5151; (Mr. M. Martin) 5154 (iii).
Budget: *See* 'Financial Review.'
Buildings leased by Govt., Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 1358 (i).
See 'Public Works.'
Bull, Mr. Robert, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 3338 (ii).
Burke's Head Breakwater: Remarks (Mr. Carroll) in Com. of Sup., 2045 (ii).
Burrard Inlet and Tunnel Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6318 (iv).
Burrard Power Co. v. The King, Judgment of Judicial Com.: M. for Copy* (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1409 (i).
Business of the House, Morning Sittings: M. (Mr. Borden) 4980 (iii).
See 'Govt. Business,' &c.
Cabinet, Constitution of: Remarks in Debate on Address (Mr. Borden) 56 (i).
Cabinet Dissensions: Remarks in Debate on Address (Mr. Monk) 233 (i).

Cabinet Ministers from Quebec, Stmnt. by Hon. Mr. Monk: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 526 (i)

See 'Ministers,' 'Que. Minister.'

Cable Rates Exchange: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 5557 (iv).

Cable Rates to G. B. on M. for Sup.: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 3237 (ii).

——— Members remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 3237 (ii).

——— Res. on Order Paper, Withdrawal of: Remarks (Mr. Borden) 3448; M. (Mr. Armstrong) 3448 (ii).

——— Parcel Post, &c.: M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 4082; Amt. (Mr. Lemieux) 4097; Neg. (Y. 40; N. 70) 4120 (iii).

——— Papers laid on Table (Mr. Borden) 931 (i).

See 'Australian,' 'Telegraph.'

Cadet Corps, Drill: in Com. of Sup., 5452 (iii).

Calgary and Fernie Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 37.'

Calgary and Fernie Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6323 (iv).

Calgary Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2204 (ii).

Campaign Literature, Franking: *See* 'Political.'

Campeau, Michel, Dismissal from P.O. at St. Louis du Mile End: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 1414 (i).

——— M. for Pets.* (Mr. Lemieux) 2460 (ii).

Campbellton Ry. Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 4162 (iii).

Camps for Militia Training: in Com. of Sup., 5521 (iii).

See 'Militia.'

Camrose Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Douglas) in Com. of Sup., 2214 (ii).

Canada and Australia Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 4714 (iii).

Canada-Australia Trade: M. for Papers* (Mr. Ames) 582 (i).

See 'Trade Relations.'

Canada and Cuba Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 4721 (iii).

Canada and G.B. Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 4715 (iii).

——— Renewal of Contract: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 547 (i).

See 'Post Office,' 'Fast Atlantic.'

Canada, Mexico and S. America Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 5934 (iv).

Canada and Newfoundland Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 4725 (iii).

Canada and South Africa Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 4726 (iii).

Canada-France Steamship Service; Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 5262 (iii).

——— Notice of Discussion (Mr. Lemieux) 4742 (iii).

See 'Franco-Canadian.'

Canada and Gulf Terminal Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6305 (iv).

Canadian Agencies in Europe, Names of Appointees: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 5261 (iii), 5557 (iv).

Can. Birkbeck Investment and Savings Co.: *See* 'B. No. 11.'

Canadian Coal used to heat Govt. Buildings: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 3286 (ii).

Canadian Marine Insurance, Govt. Co-operation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1582 (i).

Canadian Missionaries in China, Refusal of British Gunboat for Protection, Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 1198 (i).

——— Relief *re* Dangers: Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 229 (i).

——— Stmnt. (Mr. Borden) 268 (i).

——— Stmnt. from Home Govt.: Read (Mr. Roche) 6559 (iv).

Canadian Navy, Repudiation by Nationalists: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 714 (i).

——— Speeches *re* Election Campaign, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 552 (i).

——— Tenders *re* Construction of Ships, Deposits, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 526 (i).

See 'Naval.'

Can. Northern Alta. Ry., Aid to: *See* 'B. No. 144.'

Can. Northern Alta. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 189.'

Can. Northern Montreal Tunnel and Terminal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 39.'

Can. Northern Ont. and Carillon and Grenville Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 42.'

Can. Northern Ont. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 40.'

Can. Northern Ont. Ry., Subsidy, Guarantee, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4781 (iii).

Can. Northern Pacific Ry. Co., Aid to: *See* 'B. No. 187.'

Can. Northern Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 6081 (iii).

Can. Northern Que. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 41.'

Can. Northern and Quebec Ry. Co.'s Maintenance of Road in L'Ile Bourdon: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 5261 (iii).

Can. Northern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 38.'

Canadian Northern Ry. Bonds, Govt. Guarantees *re* Montreal Terminals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. Martin) 4247 (iii).

Can. Northern Ry. Bridge at Morris, Representations *re* Objections: Ques. (Mr. Molloy) 2587 (ii).

Canadian Offices in London, Cor. *re* Accommodation: M. (Mr. Bradbury) for Copies, 1396 (i).
See London.'
C.P. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 98.'
C.P. Ry. (Toulon) Subsidy: in Com., 6217 (iv).
C.P. Ry., Irrigation, Complaint from Alberta Farmers: Ques. (Mr. Buchanan) 5262 (iii).
Can. Public Health Assn.; *See* 'B. No. 127.'
Can. Shipping Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 143.'
Canada Shipping Act (pilotage) Amt.: M. for Com. on Prop. Res. (Mr. Edwards) 1817 (i).
Canada Shipping Act (pilotage dues) Amt. Bill (Mr. Edwards) on M. to Introduce: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 229; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 267 (i).
CANALS:
American Freight passing through Welland Canal: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 3535 (ii).
Canals, Capital Expenditure, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1811 (i).
Canal Staff, Dismissals: Remarks (Mr. Kyte, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 5801 (iv).
Canal Tolls, Abolition of, O. Cs.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Sinclair) 2861 (ii).
Canal Traffic, Total Tonnage for 1911: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 3051 (ii).
Carillon Canal, Hydraulic Power Lease, Name of Lessee: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2293 (ii).
Chicago Canal, Rep., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6579 (iv).
Cornwall Canal, Lower Lock: in Com. of Sup., 5797 (iv).
Galops Canal, Upper Lock: in Com. of Sup., 5797 (iv).
Lachine Canal Lock Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6611 (iv).
—— Rockfield Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 5790 (iv).
Murray Canal, Levelling High Spots: in Com. of Sup., 5798 (iv).
Newmarket Canal, Commission *re* Investigation: Remarks (Mr. J. A. M. Armstrong) 1319 (i).
—— Meeting at Newmarket: Par. in Press (Mr. Emmerson) 3057 (ii).
Rideau Canal, Bank St. Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 5791 (iv).
—— New Dredging Plant: in Com. of Sup., 5798 (iv).
St. Peters Canal Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5798 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal Locks: in Com. of Sup., 5791 (iv).
Soulanges Canal, Claim of Denis Martin for Damages: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2292 (ii).
—— Charges *re* Damien Lalonde: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4249 (iii).
CANALS—*Con.*
Soulanges Canal, Cueillerrier, Jos., Investigation *re* Charges: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 6183 (iv).
—— Employees, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4250 (iii).
—— Guard Pier: in Com. of Sup., 5798 (iv).
—— Houle, Stanislas, Emplymt.: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 3537 (ii).
—— Methot, Denis, Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4255 (iii).
—— Patronage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 3536 (ii).
—— Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 5791 (iv).
Trent Canal Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5799 (iv).
—— Newmarket: in Com. of Sup., 5792 (iv).
—— Water Power, Claims of Prov. of Ont.: Remarks (Mr. Graham) in Com. of Sup., 5794 (iv).
Welland Canal, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 6607 (iv).
—— Quantity of American Freight passing through: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 3535 (ii).
—— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 5786 (iv).
—— Water Power, Diversion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 6747 (iv).
Canso Post Office, Dismissal of R. Sutherland: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 1409 (i).
—— Pet. *re* Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1207 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) 581; Members remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 581 (i).
See 'Dismissals.'
Canso Reduction Works, Dismissals, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 974 (i).
Cap Chat P.O., Pet *re* Change of Name: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1204 (i).
Cap de la Magdeleine Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 43.'
Cape Breton Public Works: Remarks (Mr. Carroll) in Com. of Sup., 2052 (ii).
Cape Breton Tel. Lines: in Com. of Sup., 2817 (ii).
Capital Trust Corporation, Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 177.'
Caraquet and North Shore Branch Line, I.C. Ry., Inspection *re* Subsidy: Remarks (Mr. Turgeon) 4192 (iii).
Caretakers for Militia, Wages, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5546 (iii).
Caribou, Barkerville and Willow River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6320 (iv).
Carillon Canal Hydraulic Power Lease, Name of Lessee: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2293 (ii).
Carillon and Que. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 42.'
Carleton County Electoral Vacancy, Issue of Writ: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1810 (i).

Carmichael, Dr. A. G., Supt. of Fish Hatchery, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A.W. Chisholm) 3757 (ii).
Carriere and Laine Property, Lévis, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lesperance) 731 (i).
Carrier, Mr., Postmaster at St. François Xavier de Brompton, Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 6616 (iv).
Car Shortage in Grain Shipments: Remarks (Mr. W. M. Martin) 802 (i).
Car Shortage *re* Transportation of Hay Crop: Remarks (Mr. Proulx) 2753 (ii).
Car Shortage in the West: Remarks (Mr. Buchanan) 1709 (i).
—— Members remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 1709 (i).
—— Govtl. Action *re*: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Buchanan) 1714 (i).
See 'Grain Congestion,' &c.
Cattle and Stock Pedigree Records: *See* 'B. No. 167.'
Cattle diseased, Compensation *re* Damages: Remarks (Mr. Morphy) in Com. of Sup., 6471 (iv).
Cattle Embargo by G.B., Abolition of: Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 557 (i).
Cattle killed by Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 7.'
Cattle Quarantine at Beauceville, Res. from Chamber of Commerce: Remarks (Mr. Béland) 4984 (iii).
Causapscal Post Office, Pet. *re* Site: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1020 (i).
Cavanagh, Geo., Dismissal from Customs Service: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3342 (ii).
Cedar Rapids Power Co., Water Power Concessions to *re* St. Lawrence River: Ques. (Mr. Robb) 728 (i).
Cement Importations, Quantity and Value for 1910-11: Ques. (Mr. Robb) 3534 (ii).
Cement supplied to Ry. Dept., Tenders, Contract Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4244 (iii).
Census Employees, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Demers) 3335 (ii).
—— Delay in Payments: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 1971 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 2668 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 935 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 933 (i), 2244 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1199 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 1020 (i), 3835 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Turriff) 4460 (iii).
Census Population of Canada and Quebec Cities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lanctot) 3336 (ii).
Census in Regina, Complaints *re* Correctness: Remarks (Mr. Knowles) 1440, 1574 (i).
—— M. for Stmnt. (Mr. Knowles) 563 (i).
Census Enumerators and Returning Officers, Delays in Payment: Remarks (Mr. Neely) 2156 (ii).
Census Returns, Number of Males, Females, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 561 (i).
Census of Saskatchewan, Completion of: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 5261 (iii).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. W. M. Martin) 4983 (iii).
Census Report: Presented (Mr. Burrell) 4037 (iii).
Census and Statistics: in Com. of Sup. 619 (i), 6462 (iv).
Central Ry. Co. of Canada: *See* 'B. No. 44.'
Champlain Monument: in Com. of Sup., 6485 (iv).
Chance Harbour, N.B., Improvements *re*: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 554 (i).
Chapel Cove Breakwater, Pet. *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 1585 (i).
Chard, Mr. J. A., Indian Agent at Grand View, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. Cruise) 2458 (ii).
Charges of Management, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 619, 1033 (i),
Charlemagne Mail Contract, Name of Contractor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 1862 (i).
Charles Forest's Cove Breakwater, Contract *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 1584 (i).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Kyte) 2460 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Kyte) in Com. of Sup., 2039 (ii).
Charlos Cove Breakwater, in Com. of Sup., 2040 (ii).
Charlos Cove Lightkeeper, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1208 (i).
Charwomen, Pay, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1061 (i).
Chateauguay County Inundated Lands, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Brown) 6660 (iv).
Chatham, I.C.R. Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 4137 (iii).
Chatham, N.B., Public Building: Conc., 6804 (iv).
Chatham and Newcastle Ry. Service, Pets. from Boards of Trade: Remarks (Mr. Loggie) 4190 (iii).
Chats Falls Timber Slides, Date of Deed with D. O'Connor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 4549 (iii).
Chauvin, Hector, K.C., Apptmt. *re* Investigation by Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 1414 (i).
See 'Hull.'
Cheese Weighing at Montreal: *See* 'Dairying.'
Chester Canal Cutting: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 2049 (ii).

Chester Canal Cutting, Discontinuance of Work: Ques. (Mr. A. K. McLean) 716 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 806 (i).
Chevrier, Isidore, Charges *re*, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4039, 4780 (iii).
Chicago Drainage Canal, Damage to Navigation: Ques. (Mr. Lavalee) 4260 (iii).
——— Rep. *re*, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6579 (iv).
Chicoutimi Controverted Election, Certificate of Judge: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 11 (i).
Chinese Entering B.C., Total Number: Ques. (Mr. Stevens) 4778 (iii).
Chinese and Japanese in B.C., Number naturalized, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stevens) 555 (i).
Chinese Tax in B.C.: Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Stevens) 285 (i).
See 'Immigration.'
Christmas Holidays Adjournment for: M. (Mr. Borden) 927 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 702 (i).
Chubb, George, Customs Officer, N.B., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 4459 (iii).
Cigarettes, Quantity manufactured and imported in each Prov. for 1905, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 556 (i).
Civil Service Act, Private Secretaries, Amts.: *See* 'B. No. 60'
Civil Service Act (C.S. commission) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 104 and 106.'
Civil Service Act (customs, P.O. depts.) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 113, 116, 124.'
Civil Service Act (rural mail) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 179.'
Civil Service Apptmts. between Dissolution of Parlt. and Sept. 21st: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Edwards) 562 (i).
Civil Service Association, Representations to Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Carroll) 3334 (ii).
Civil Service Commission, Addition to: *See* 'B. No. 104.'
Civil Service Commission, Additional Apptmt: in Com. of Sup., 6615 (iv).
——— Increase in Number: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 728 (i).
Civil Service Commission of Investigation Apptmts., &c.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 283 (ii).
Civil Service Competitive Examination, Extension *re*: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 533 (i).
Civil Service Increases since 1900: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Aikins) 561 (i).
Civil Service Investigation *re* Political Partisanship: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1581 (i).
See 'Dismissals.'
Civil Service List: Inquiry for (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 6187 (iv).
Civil Service Reform, and Outside Service: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 727 (i).
Clarkboro, Sask., C.N.R. Right of Way, Title *re*: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 934 (i).
Clifford, Private: *See* 'N.R.A.'
Clock Towers on Public Buildings: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 1344 (i).
Clothing for Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5521 (iii).
Clouthier, Jos., Dismissal, Postmaster at St. Alphonse Dudswell, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Tobin) 4781 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Tobin) 4549 (iii).
Coal Combine in B.C., Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stevens) 4240 (iii).
Coal Contracts for I.C.Ry.: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 5611 (iv).
See 'Can. Coal.'
Coal for Govt. Steamers, Average Cost per Ton, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pardee) 1203 (i).
Coal Shortage in the West for Household Consumption, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Warnock) 568 (i).
Coal Strike in Alberta Settlement: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 1502 (i).
Coal Strike in Fernie, B.C., Information *re*: Ques. (Mr. Warnock) 568 (i).
Coal Strike in the West, Stmnt. of Min. of Int. *re* Settlement: Ques. (Mr. Buchanan) 571 (i).
——— Strikes in the West, Settlement of: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 567 (i).
——— Remission of Duties: Remarks (Mr. McCraney) 178, 230; Stmnt. (Mr. Rogers) 230 (i).
Coasting Trade, Foreign Shipping, Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Kyte) 2861 (ii).
——— O.C., Extending Time: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1814 (i).
Cockshutt Plough Co., Stmnt. of Member for Edmonton *re* Prices in East and West: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Cockshutt) 807 (i).
Codd, Staff Sergeant, Retiring Gratuity: in Com. of Sup., 5811 (iv).
Coffin, Henry, Apptmt. to H. of C., Dismissal of M. Picotte: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Seguin) 2459 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Guilbault) 2289 (ii).
Coin Circulation: in Com. of Sup., 1034 (i).
See 'Finance.'
Coldbrook Postmaster, Name and Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 3148 (ii).
Cold Storage for Bait *re* Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 5256 (iii).
See 'Fisheries.'
Cold Storage Establishments in Canada, Number, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Verville) 3343 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Verville) 5561 (iv).

Cole Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2055 (ii).
Collingwood Dry Dock: *See* 'B. No. 111.'
Combines Investigation Act, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 1515 (i).
Commercial Agent in France as Successor to Mr. A. Poindron: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4041 (iii).
Commissioners *re* Investigations, Number of Appointees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 5680, 6336 (iv).
See 'Dismissals.'
Committees, Sel. Standing: M. (Mr. Borden) 10 (i).
——— Lists: Presented (Mr. Borden) 703 (i).
——— M. to present Rep. (Mr. Borden) 794 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Borden) to add Names, 1019 (i), 2217 (ii).
Companies Act Amt., Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 529 (i).
Companies Incorporation, Ref. to Supreme Court, Withdrawal by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 529 (i).
Connolly, John, Coal Inspector, Complaints *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2588 (ii).
Conservation Commission, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1069 (i), 6579 (iv).
——— Water Powers Report: Presented (Mr. Burrell) 407 (i).
Continental Can Co., Patent Relief: *See* 'B. No. 119.'
Conway, Patrick J., Lightkeeper at White Island, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 2587, 3342 (ii).
Copper Cliff Post Office, Dismissals, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 2034 (ii).
Copyright Bill, Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 557, 1208 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 935 (i).
Cornwall Canal, Lower Lock: in Com. of Sup., 5797 (iv).
Cote, Mrs. J. N., Dismissal as Charwoman: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 2667 (ii).
Courchesne, Mr. P. E. C., Dismissal from Inland Revenue: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 1864 (i).
Courcy, Mr. P., Apptmt. at St. Pacome de Kamouraska: Remarks (Mr. E. Lapointe) 5821 (iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 5952 (iv).
Courtenay Bay Harbour Works, Contracts *re*: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 4743 (iii).
See 'St. John.'
Couture, Mr. A., Dismissal from I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2242 (ii).
Cow Bay Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 2055 (ii).
Cox, Mr. A. B., Dismissals, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 6784 (iv).
Cream Exports into U.S., Quantity and Value for 1911: Ques. (Mr. Robb) 3535 (ii).
Creosoted Timber *re* Public Works: in Com. of Sup., 2440 (ii).
Cresine, Geo., Quarter Master on SS. 'Scotia,' Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1582 (i).
Cribbin's Point Breakwater: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 2046 (ii).
Criminal Code (log stealing) Amts.: *See* 'B. No. 9.'
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 165.'
Crown Lands in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Number of Acres, Reservations for School Lands: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1587 (i).
Crystal Beach Post Office, Dismissal of Mr. A. E. Buck: Remarks (Mr. German) 3908 (ii), 5960 (iv).
Cuillier, Ass't. Electrician, Soulanges Canal, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4457 (iii).
——— Investigation *re* Charges on Soulanges Canal: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 6183 (iv).
Customs, Outside Service, Salary Increases: *See* 'B. No. 116.'
Customs Collector, P. J. Venoit, Dismissal of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Turgeon) 1590 (i).
Customs Contracts given without Tender: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 877 (i).
Customs Deptl. Report: Presented (Mr. J. D. Reid) 971 (i).
Customs Dues *re* Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5522 (iii).
Customs Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1040 (i).
——— Outside Ports Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1073 (i).
Customs Smuggling Case by M.P., Par. in Montreal 'Star': Ques. (Mr. Baker) 2072 (ii).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Brown) 2216 (ii).
Customs Tariff, Changes *re* Jute Cloth Dressed Lumber, &c., Rulings, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Turriff) 2459 (ii).
Customs Tariff: *See* 'Tariff Commission B. 88.'
Customs Weighing of Goods, Decree of French Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Weichel) 721 (i).
Dairying Industry in Canada, Grievances *re* Weighing at Montreal: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) on M. for Sup., 5711 (iv).
Dalaire, Mr. L. P., Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Béland) 2454 (ii).
Dartmouth Branch Line, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 670 (i).
Dartmouth to Denus Branch Line, I.C.R., Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 543 (i).
Daoust, Done, Postmaster at Alfred, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Proulx) 3945 (ii).

Dauphin Custom House: Remarks (Mr. Cruise) in Com. of Sup., 3244 (ii).
Davidson, David George, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 175.'
Davis, John, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 6783 (iv).
Day, Luke, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McKenzie) 2861 (ii).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Taylor) to conc., 2841 (ii).
——— Correction (Mr. Ethier) *re* Man. Bill Voting on 3°, 4983 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 6613 (iv).
——— Reporters' Examination Papers, 6338 (iv).
Debt of Canada, Average Interest: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1811 (i).
Decoste, Peter, Dismissal from Dredge Cape Breton: Ques. (Mr. W. Chisholm) 548 (i).
——— Defective Answer to Question: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) 803 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) for Cor., 1268 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 3256 (ii).
Delisle, L. Trefflé, of Trois Pistoles, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Gauvreau) 4781 (iii).
Denny, James, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 112.'
Deputy Minister of Justice, Travelling Expenses: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 3150 (ii).
See 'Justice.'
Deschenes, Louis, Dismissal: Remarks (Mr. E. Lapointe) in Com. of Sup., 6651 (iv).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 3756 (ii).
See 'Dismissals.'
Deschamps, Mr. R., Apptmt. by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 6277 (iv).
Deschamps, Raoul, Apptmt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2667 (ii).
Desjardins, Baptiste, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 6784 (iv).
Devils Island Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 2055 (i).
Diamond Light and Heating Co., Investigation *re*: on M. to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Public Accounts Com., 5832 (iv).
See 'Pub. Accounts Com.'
Digby Clock Keeper, Dismissal, &c.: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 3272 (ii).
Dionne, Thos., Dismissal of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Gauvreau) 2460 (ii).
Dismissals of Govt. Employees, Investigation *re*: *See* 'B. No. 19.'
DISMISSALS—
Anse a Valeau Postmistress, Charges *re* Madame Proulx: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2072 (ii).
DISMISSALS—*Con.*
Archambault, Emile, Letter Carrier, Montreal, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 5950 (iv).
——— M. for Cor* (Mr. Seguin) 5957 (iii).
Baldwin, Mr. E., Dismissal from Customs at Coaticooke: M. for Cor. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1361 (i).
Barss, Mr. Archibald, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 6784 (iv)
Bath Postmistress, Dismissal: in Com of Sup., 6282 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 966 (i).
Beauchemin, J. A., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boivin) 3337 (ii).
Beauchesne, Mr., Dismissal from Customs: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 3151 (ii).
Belanger, Amedee, Dismissal from I. C. Ry.: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 3050 (ii).
Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., Apptmt. as Commissioner of Inquiry: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2062 (ii).
Bohan, John W., Dismissal from Customs at Bath: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 3055 (ii).
Boucher, Mr. O. F., Pet. *re* Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 975 (i).
Bourgoin, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 5557 (iv).
Boyle, D. R., Fishery Overseer at Arichat, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Kyte) 3945 (ii).
Braine, Dr. Lawrence, Indian Medical Attendant at Chester, N.S.: Dismissal, &c., Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4976 (iii).
Brazeau, Mr. Emile, Postmaster at Cote Rouge, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 6337 (iv).
Brian, Mr., Dismissals for Political Partisanship: Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com. of Sup., 1077 (i).
Brown, Wm., Pet. from Dr. E. Montpetit, *re* Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4977 (iii).
Brymer, Arthur, Fishery Officer at Lower L'Ardoise, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 3752 (ii).
——— M. for Papers* (Mr. Kyte) 4781 (iii).
Buck, A. E., Postmaster at Crystal Beach, Dismissal, &c.: Remarks (Mr. German) 3908 (ii), 5960 (iv).
Bull, Mr. Robert, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 3338 (ii).
Campeau, Michel, Dismissal from P. O. at St. Louis du Mile End: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 1414 (i).
——— M. for Pets.* (Mr. Lemieux) 2460 (ii).
Canals Staffs, Dismissals: Remarks (Mr. Kyte, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 5801 (iv).
Canso Postmaster, Pet. *re* Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1207 (i).

DISMISSALS—*Con.*

Canso Postmaster, Dismissal of R. Sutherland: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 1409 (i).
See 'Sutherland.'

Canso Public Buildings, Dismissal of Caretaker: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) 581; Members remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 581 (i).

Carmichael, Dr. A. G., Supt. of Fish Hatchery, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 3757 (ii).

Cavanagh, Geo., Dismissal from Customs Service: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3342 (ii).

Chard, Mr. J. A., Indian Agent at Grand View, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. Cruise) 2458 (ii).

Charlos Cove Lightkeeper, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1208 (i).

Chauvin, Hector, K.C., Apptmt. *re* Investigation by Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 1414 (i).

Chevrier, Isidore, Charges *re*, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4039, 4780 (iii).

Chubb, George, Customs Officer, N.B., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 4459 (iii).

Clouthier, Joseph, Postmaster at St. Adolphe de Dudswell, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Tobin) 4549 (iii).

——— M. for Papers* (Mr. Tobin) 4781 (iii).

Commissioners, Number employed by Govt., Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 5680, 6336 (iv).

——— Apptmt. of Commissioners in Quebec: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 2063 (ii).

Civil Service Investigation: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1581 (i).

——— Investigation *re* Dismissals, Cost of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 5950 (iv).

——— Public Service Commission, Apptmt. of Messrs. Jackson and Schwitzer as Assistants: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 5954 (iv).
See 'Public Service,' 'Morine,' &c.

Connolly, John, Coal Inspector, Complaints *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2588 (ii).

Conway, Patrick, Lightkeeper at White Head Island: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 2587, 3342 (ii).

Copper Cliff Post Office, Dismissals, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 2034 (ii).

Cote, Mrs. J. N., Dismissal as Charwoman: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 2667 (ii).

Courchesne, Mr. P. E. C., Dismissal from Inland Revenue: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 1864 (i).

Couture, Mr. A., Dismissal from I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2242 (ii).

DISMISSALS—*Con.*

Cox, Mr., Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr Sinclair) 6784 (iv).

Cresine, Geo., Quartermaster on SS. 'Scotia,' Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1582 (i).

Crystal Beach Post Office, Dismissal of Mr. A. E. Buck: Remarks (Mr. German) 3908 (ii), 5960 (iv)

Cuillier, Ass't Electrician, Soulanges Canal, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4457 (iii).

Dalaire, Mr. L. P., Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 2454 (ii).

Davis, John, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 6783 (iv).

Day, Luke, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McKenzie) 2861 (ii).

Decoste, Capt. Peter, Dismissal from Dredge 'Cape Breton': Ques. (Mr. W. Chisholm) 548 (i).

——— Answer to Question: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) 803 (i).

——— M. (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) for Cor., 1268 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 3256 (ii).

Delisle, L. Treffle, Trois Pistoles, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Gauvreau) 4781 (iii).

Deschenes, Louis, Wharfinger at River Ouelle, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 3756 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. E. Lapointe) in Com. of Sup., 6651 (iv).

Desjardins, Baptiste, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 6784 (iv).

Desmarais, Mr., Dismissal *re*: Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 5817 (iv).

Digby Clock Keeper, Dismissal, &c.: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 3272 (ii).

Dionne, Thos., Dismissal of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Gauvreau) 2460 (ii).

Dismissals, &c., Apptmt. of Commissioners: Remarks (Mr. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 3247 (ii).

——— Irrelevancy of Debate (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 3253 (ii).

——— Objection to Ruling (Mr. Macdonald) 3254 (ii).

Dismissal of Conservative Postmaster *re* Political Partisanship: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2295 (ii).

Dismissals Generally, Govt. Policy: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 5803 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 2018 (ii), 4187 (iii).

Dismissals from Govt. Service: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 1955 (i).

DISMISSALS—*Con.*

Dismissals in Hull, Official Inquiry *re*: Ques. 550 (i); Remarks (Mr. Devlin) 4140 (iii).

Dismissals *re* Inland Rev. Dept., Policy of Minister: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 5819 (iv).

Dismissals by Hon. Mr. Lemieux, Par. in 'Le Devoir' read: Ques. (Mr. Bellemare) 2452 (ii).

Dismissals in Ottawa, Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 1275 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 3834 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 3262 (ii).

Dismissals for Political Partisanship: in Com. of Sup., 1074 (i).

——— Ques. of Order (Messrs. A. K. Maclean and Hon. S. Hughes) 1183 (i).

Dismissals of Public Officials: M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) for Papers, &c., 878, 944 (i).

Dismissal from Public Works, Par. in Newspapers: Remarks (Mr. Devlin) 3058 (ii).

Dismissals from Public Offices from 1896 to 1911: M. (Mr. Goodeve) for Ret.* 1280 (i).

Dismissals in Rimouski County: Remarks (Mr. Boulay) 1276 (i).

Disraeli Postmaster, Dismissal, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 6616 (iv).

Dom. Lands Agent at Medicine Hat, Suspension or Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Buchanan) 552 (i).

Doucet, Odilon, Postmaster at Notre Dame des Lourdes, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pacaud) 1863 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Pacaud) in Com. of Sup., 6285 (iv).

Duchaine, Pierre, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Béland) 2454 (ii).

Ducharme, Mr. G. N., Apptmt. of as Commissioner: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 4980 (iii).

——— Resignation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4979 (iii).

Dumelong, E., Postmaster at L'Assomption, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 580, 720 (i).

Dunn, Albert, Charges *re* Political Partisanship: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4039 (iii).

Dupont, Rene, Dismissal as Immigration Agent: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 1864 (i).

Dupre, Dr., Postmaster at St. Robert, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 3753 (ii).

——— M. for Papers* (Mr. Cardin) 4782 (iii).

East Roman Valley Post Office, Dismissal: Remarks (Mr: Pelletier) in Com. of Sup., 2028 (ii).

DISMISSALS—*Con.*

Elevator Men in Govt. Employ: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 3244 (ii).

——— Dismissals: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 3245 (ii).

Falconer, R. S., Dismissal as Inspector on I.C.R., Apptmt. of Successor: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 543 (i).

Farly, Mrs., Postmistress at St. Gabriel de Brandon, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Béland) 2579 (ii).

Ferguson, S. M., Dismissal of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 2459 (ii).

Fishery Guardians in Guysborough County, Names, Dismissals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3053 (ii).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 3056 (ii).

Fisheries Inspectors, Dismissal, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5242 (iii).

Fishery Overseer, J. A. Doucet, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Turgeon) 1590 (i).

Fishery Overseer, W. C. Robichaud, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Turgeon) 1589 (i).

Flemming, Mr. Charles, Dismissal from Inland Rev. at Petrolia: Ques. (Mr. Pardee) 4259 (iii).

Forest, Mr. Medard, Excise Officer at L'Epiphanie, Dismissal, Charges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Nantel) 726 (i).

Fraser, Mr. John, Postmaster at Stellarton, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 546 (i).

——— Inspector at Stellarton, I.C.R., Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3935 (ii).

Fritz, Henry, Dismissal as Fishery Overseer: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4977 (iii).

Garceau, Mr. N., Apptmt. as Inquiry Commissioner: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 2860 (ii).

Gass, Trueman, Emplymt. and Dismissal on I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2242 (ii).

Gauthier, Alderic, Dismissal from Soulanges Canal: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4976 (iii).

Gerrior, Mr. William, Dismissal from Customs at Larry's River, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3051 (ii).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 3056 (ii).

Gillies, Capt., Dismissal: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 3261 (ii).

Girard, Louis, Dismissal as Postmaster at Ste. Angele de Merici: M. for Pets.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 2587 (ii).

Glenelg, N.S., Postmaster, Complaints *re* Pets., &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Sinclair) 1817 (i).

DISMISSALS—*Con.*

Godbout, Mr. J., Emplymt. in Govt., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 3752 (ii).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 4980 (iii).

Goucher, Wesley, Dismissal as Lightkeeper: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4977 (iii).

Govt. Employees, Dismissal, Resignations, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 1818 (i).

Govt. Employees, Inside and Outside Service, Dismissals, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Kyte) 2587 (ii).

Gray, W. W., Coal Inspector, Charges *re*, Investigation by H. P. Duchemin: M. for Papers* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2588 (ii).

Green, John B., Homestead Inspector, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. White) 6183 (iii).

Griever, Mr. S., Charges *re* Lighthouse Keeper: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1358 (i).

Guillemette, Mr. N., Dismissal, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bureau) 1210 (i).

Guimond, Eugene, Dismissal of: M. for Pets.* (Mr. Lemieux) 2460 (ii).

Hagerty, Mr. S. W., Dismissal from Inspectorship of Ry. Station: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4976 (iii).

Hale, Thos., Dismissal as Correspondent, 'Labour Gazette,' Apptmt. of Successor: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 4459 (iii).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 4263 (iii).

Hamel, Hector, Customs Appraiser, Montreal, Dismissal of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 3343 (ii).

Ham Nord Postmaster, Investigation, Dismissal: Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 6616 (iv).

Harbour, Geo. T., Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 2460 (ii).

——— Letter *re* Dismissal: Read (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 3252 (ii).

Harris, W. H., Postmaster at White Head, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Sinclair) 2588 (ii).

Hatfield, Mr., Dismissal: Remarks (Mr. Law) in Com. of Sup., 5252 (iii).

Hattie, Mr. W. A., Preventive Officers, Mulgrave, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1815 (i).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 2460 (ii).

Hayden, W. W., Wharfinger at Digby, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 5957 (iii).

Hebert, Auguste, Postmaster at St. Pascal, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 3756 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. E. Lapointe) in Com. of Sup., 6291 (iv).

DISMISSALS—*Con.*

Hefferman, Mr. E. S., Dismissal from Customs at Spring Hill, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4039 (iii).

Hendsbee, David S., Dismissal from Marine and Fisheries Dept.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 3342 (ii).

Homestead Inspectors, Number employed in Sask., Number dismissed: Ques. (Mr. L. Thomson) 1588 (i).

Ile Rouge Lighthouse Keeper, Dismissal of Mr. Irving: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 4259 (iii).

I.C.R. Dismissals: Remarks (Mr. Lesperance) in Com. of Sup., 5806 (iv).

——— Employees in Pictou, Charges *re* Political Partisanship: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Macdonald) 2246 (ii).

Investigations into Dismissals: *See* 'Commission,' &c.

Jacques, Leander, Postmaster, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 3339 (ii).

Jones, Chas. O., Dismissal, Evidence, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Kay) 3757 (ii).

Kelly, Edward, Dismissal from Canso Reduction Works: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 3341 (ii).

Kennedy, Allan, Govt. Telegraph Repairer, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. A. Chisholm) 3757 (ii).

Kennie, Capt. Edmund, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 6782 (iv).

Kirouac, Mr., Postmaster at Manseau, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Pacaud) 2579 (ii).

Labour Gazette Correspondents, Dismissals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 1411 (i).

Lacombe, Mr. J. A., Dismissal from St. Sebastien P.O., Inquiry *re*: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 974 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Beland) in Com. of Sup., 6618 (iv).

Lalonde, Mr. Alfred, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Cardin) 6783 (iv).

Laroche, Capt. Leon, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Fortier) 4549 (iii).

Lavoie, Mr. Calixte, Postmaster, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Brouillard) 3339 (ii).

Lebel, Mr. W., Dismissal from Customs: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 1864 (i).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 3756 (ii).

Legault, Mr. Ophir, Postmaster at L'Ile Perrot, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 5950 (iv).

Leigh, Mr. W. M., Dismissal from Kirkton Post Office: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 5949 (iv).

DISMISSALS—*Con.*

Lemieux, Hon. Mr., late P.M.G., Par. in 'Le Devoir' *re* Dismissals: Ques. (Mr. Bellemare) 2664 (ii).

——— Ques. Ruled out (Mr. Speaker) 2580 (ii).

Lepage, M. J., Preventive Officer, Rimouski, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4458 (iii).

Leroux, Mr., Soulanges Canal, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 6183 (iii).

Lightkeepers in N.S., Investigation *re* Charges: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 5233 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 6650 (iv).

Lightkeepers in P.E.I., Investigation *re* Charges: Remarks (Mr. J. J. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 5232 (iii).

Lizotte, Luc., Postmaster at Pacome, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 3756 (ii).

Locas, Mr. Henri, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 3338 (ii).

Londonderry Postmaster, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 6337 (iv).

Lotbiniere County Postmasters, Dismissal, Number, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fortier) 972 (i).

McAdam, Alex. R., Fishery Officer at Antigonish, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) 3343 (ii).

McDonald, Dr. D., Dismissal from Indian Reserve, Baddeck: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McKenzie) 2861 (ii).

McEachren, Mr. Charles, Dismissal from Tatamagouche Post Office: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2243 (ii).

McFarlane, J. D., Postmaster at Southwest Margaree, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 3756 (ii).

McGrath, James, Postmaster at Aspen, N. S.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 2587 (ii).

McIsaac, Colin, Preventive Officer at Port Hood, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 5956 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 5816 (iv).

McLean, Donald E., Dismissal, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 4980 (iii).

McLean, W. D., Dismissal from Customs at L'Etang: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 4780 (iii).

McLennan, Mr., Dismissal from Inverness Public Building: Remarks (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 2017 (ii).

McLeod, John, Dismissal as Postmaster at Denmark, N.S.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Macdonald) 4460 (iii).

H

DISMISSALS—*Con.*

McLeod, Dr. J. R., Dismissal from Port Hawkesbury, Charges *re*: M. for Papers* (Mr. Kyte) 3945 (ii).

McPhee, James, Customs Officer, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 3757 (ii).

McPherson, John H., Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4259 (iii).

Mader, Mr. D., Dismissal from Mahone Bay P.O.: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 722 (i).

Marlin, Mrs. A. S., Postmistress, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 3753 (ii).

Matte, Arthur J., Postmaster at Montauban, Dismissal of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Delisle) 5957 (iii).

Michaud, Mr. E., Dismissal from P.O. at St. Germain: M. for Cor. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 1592 (i).

Michaud, Mr. J., Postmaster at St. Moise Station, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 1864 (i).

Montcalm Postmaster, Pets. *re* Removal: Ques. (Mr. Lafortune) 575 (i).

Montpetit, Dr. E., Pet. sent to P.M.G. *re* Dismissal of William Brown: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4977 (iii).

Montreal Customs House, Dismissals: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4040 (iii).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Retention of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2062 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 1708 (i); 2057 (ii).

——— Res. from Board of Trade *re* Dismissals: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1812 (i).

Moreau, Mr. Jos., Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 1818 (i).

Morine, A. B., Letter received by Prime Minister: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 6185 (iv).

——— Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 6185 (iii).

——— Correction *re* Ruling on Question (Mr. Speaker) 6335 (iii).

——— Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 6335 (iv).

Morine, Mr. A. B., Charges *re* as Public Commissioner: Remarks (Mr. Carvell) on M. for Sup., 6528 (iv).

Mosher, Mr. G. A., Preventive Officer at Ship Harbour, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4039 (iii).

Mount Oscar, Postmaster, Dismissal of I. Chevrier: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4780 (iii).

Mullaly, Mr., Emplymt. in P.O. Dept., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Power) 1583 (i).

Mundle, D. I., Dismissal as sub-collector at Richibucto, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 4780 (iii).

DISMISSALS—*Con.*

Notre Dame des Anges Postmaster, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 554 (i).

O'Brien, A. J., Dismissal from Immigration Office at Halifax: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 717 (i).

Oyster Pond Preventive Officer, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1207 (i).

Payson, Mr. W. W., Dismissal from Deep Brook Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 2243 (ii).

Peloquin, Mr. F., Postmaster at St. Joseph de Sorel, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 3753 (ii).

Poirier, N. P., Investigation *re* Charges: Remarks (Mr. Gauvreau) in Com. of Sup., 5815 (iv).

Postmasters dismissed: Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 6617 (iv).

Post Office Dismissals, Govt. Policy *re*: Remarks (Mr. Carvell) in Com. of Sup., 6299 (iv).

Post Office Dismissals since Oct. 1911, Pets. *re*, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Lemieux) 1395, 1589 (i).

——— List read (Mr. Lemieux) 6636 (iv).

Postmasters in Kamouraska County, Names, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 6781 (iv).

Postmasters in Lotbiniere County, Dismissals: Remarks (Mr. Fortier) in Com. of Sup., 6294 (iv).

Postmasters in Temiscouata County, Dismissal, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 548 (i).

Poulin, Mr. E., Dismissal from Customs, Quebec City: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 2071 (ii).

Pouliott, Louis, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4459 (iii).

Powassan Postmaster, Change *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Arthurs) 2459 (ii).

Power, Lawrence F., Supt. of Lobster Hatchery at Arichat, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 3751 (ii); 4781 (iii).

Printing Bureau, Dismissals and Apptmts.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 1809 (i).

Provost, Raoul, Dismissal from Marine and Fisheries: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 2453 (ii).

Public Service Commission, Charges *re* A. B. Morine: on M. for Sup., (Mr. Carvell) 6528 (iv).

See 'Morine.'

Public Works, Dismissal of Workmen: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2584 (ii).

Rathburn Post Office, Removal of Postmaster, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Pardee) 4262 (iii).

DISMISSALS—*Con.*

Rayne, R. W., Caretaker Truro Armoury, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 6184 (iii).

Renfrew, N., Dismissal of Govt. Officials: Ques. (Mr. Proulx) 2856 (ii).

Renfrew, S., Dismissal of Govt. Officials: Ques. (Mr. Proulx) 2856 (ii).

Richards, Mr. S., Dismissal: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 5821, 6652 (iv).

Rivers, Lachapelle and Dubois, Messrs., Dismissal &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 3752 (ii).

Roberts, Capt. Alex., Postmaster at Canso, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 3341 (ii).

Robert, Wm., Dismissal from Val des Eboulis Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 3537 (ii).

Robitaille, Mr. J. C., Charges *re* Political Partisanship: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2858 (ii).

Rogers, J. M., Dismissal from East Roman Valley P. O., N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 722 (i).

——— M. for Pets.* (Mr. Sinclair) 1409 (i).

Rutherford, Mr. John, Land Agent at Moosejaw, Dismissal, &c.: M. (Mr. Knowles) for Papers, 1395 (i).

St. Adelaide de Pabos Postmaster, Investigation *re* Charges: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2068 (ii).

St. Agathe des Monts, Dismissal of Postmistress: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 973 (i).

——— M. for Cor. (Mr. Lemieux) 1591 (i).

St. Amour Postmaster, Changes since Jan. 1912: Ques. (Mr. Proulx) 2666 (ii).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Proulx) 2861 (ii)

St. Ancilet Postmaster, Request for Dismissal: M. for Cor. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 2588 (ii).

St. Angele de Laval Postmaster, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 3755 (ii), 4039 (iii).

St. Germain Postmaster, Changes *re* Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 1579 (i).

——— M. for Cor. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 1592 (i).

St Martin, Madame, Dismissal from St. Louis de Bonsecours: M. for Papers* (Mr. Cardin) 4782 (iii).

St. Paul d'Abbottsford Postmaster, P. L. St. Pierre, Investigation *re*: M. for Papers* (Mr. Lemieux) 1589 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 6290 (iv).

St. Peter of Wakefield Postmaster, Dismissal: Remarks (Mr. Devlin) 6286 (iv).

St. Tite Postmaster, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Bureau) 1210 (i).

DISMISSALS—*Con.*
——— Remarks (Mr. Bureau) in Com. of Sup., 6285 (iv).
Sauve, Mr. L. A., Dismissal from Soulanges Canal: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 575 (i).
Sayabec Postmistress, Pet. *re* Dismissal, Apptmt. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 2585 (ii).
Scotch Village Postmaster, Apptmt. in 1903, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2666 (ii).
Sheltus, Anson, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Kay) 3757 (ii).
Shurtloff, Dr., Investigation *re* J. Clouthier: Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 6629 (iv).
Smith, Angus, Pilot of D.G.S. 'Earl Grey,' Suspension of: M. for Papers* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1590 (i).
Smith, Lyman C., Customs Collector at Oshawa, Dismissal of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 2861 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. on Customs Bill, 4575 (iii).
Stellarton Postmaster, Mr. John Fraser, Dismissal: M. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) for Cor.* 1589 (i).
Storey, Wm., Dismissal, Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. Reid) 5054 (iii).
Sudbury Post Office, Dismissals: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 2033 (ii).
Sutherland, Mr., Dismissal of: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 1274 (i), 2018; Cor. read 2022 (ii).
See 'Canso.'
Therrien, F., Charges *re* Political Partisanship, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1413 (i), 3152 (ii).
——— (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 5823 (iv).
Thibault, Theophile, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 3339 (ii).
Thompson, Dr., Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6784 (iv).
Three Rivers, Inland Revenue, Charges *re* Collector C. D. Herbert: Ques. (Mr. Bureau) 1209 (i).
Tory, Mr. H. L., Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 6784 (iv).
Valois, J. B., Dismissal from Vaudreuil Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 3537 (ii).
Veit, Frederick, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 6783 (iv).
Venoit, Mr. Joseph, Complaints *re* Suspension, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1817 (i).
Waterways Treaty, Dismissal of Commissioners: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 966 (i).

DISMISSALS—*Con.*
Webber, James, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 6783 (iv).
Webster, Dr. C. A., Dismissal of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Law) 6186 (iv).
Webster, Mr., Immigration Agent at Edmonton, Dismissal, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 3922 (ii).
Westville Public Building, Dismissal of Caretaker: Remarks (Mr. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 1531 (i).
Whitehead, N. S., Dismissal of Postmaster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2855 (ii).
White Head Island Lighthouse, Dismissal of Patrick Conway, Investigation: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2857 (ii).
White, James, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 3338 (ii).
Williams, Mr., Dismissal from H. of C.: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 3279 (ii).
Yule, Mr., Customs Officer at Aurora, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4779 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 5950 (iv).
Disraeli Postmaster, Dismissal, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 6616 (iv).
Divorce: *See* 'B. Nos. 102, 109, 110, 112, 120, 122, 131, 142, 147, 162, 163, 164, 173, 174 and 175.
Documents handed in to 'Hansard' not read: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 6718 (iv).
Dogfish Scrap, Price *re*: M. for Cor. (Mr. Sinclair) 1391 (i).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 22.'
Dom. Gresham Guarantee Co.: *See* 'B. N. 29.'
Dom. Gresham Guarantee and Casualty Co.: *See* 'B. No. 176.'
Dom. Guarantee Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 29.'
Dom. Exhibition Grant to Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 6479 (iv).
Dom. Lands Agent at Medicine Hat, Suspension or Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Buchanan) 552 (i).
Dom. Lands in N.W. Area, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1587 (i).
Dom. Notes, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1033 (i).
Dom. Notes and Stamps Printing Contract, Complaints *re* British Tenders: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 5843 (iv).
——— Limitation as to Tenders: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 1820 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for Sup., 1841 (i).
Dom. Trust Co.: *See* 'B. Nos. 46 and 80.'
Doncaster Indian Reserve Road Repairs: Conc., 6806 (iv).

Dorchester Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 6561 (iv).
Double Tracking, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5637 (iv).
Doucet, Mr. A. E., Cor. *re* Ry. Station Sites: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lavallee) 2460 (ii).
—— Position on N. T. Ry.: Ques. (Mr. Lavallee) 2245 (ii).
Doucet, Odilon, Postmaster at Notre Dame des Lourdes, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pacaud) 1863 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Pacaud) in Com. of Sup., 6285 (iv).
Douglas Road Post Office, Date of Opening, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Davidson) 3754 (ii).
Downey, W. H., Returning Officer, Kings and Albert, Non-Payment of: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 2057 (ii).
Dredges and Boiler Inspection: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 5953 (iv).
Drill Halls in the West, Donation of Lands *re* Sites: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 1815 (i).
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 111 and 180.'
See 'Collingwood.'
Duchaine, Pierre, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Béland) 2454 (ii).
Ducharme, Mr., Apptmt. to Civil Service Commission: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 2830 (ii).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 4980 (iii).
—— Resignation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4979 (iii).
Duffy, Edith Harriet, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 163.'
Dugas, Hon. Mr. Justice, Date of Apptmt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sevigny) 2858 (ii).
Dumelong, Mr. E., Dismissal from L'Assomption, P. O.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 580, 720 (i).
Dumontier, Joseph, Apptmt. as Inland Rev. Inspector at Quebec, Qualifications: Ques. (Mr. A. H. Clarks) 3340 (ii).
Dunn, Albert, Charges *re* Political Partisanship: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4039 (iii).
Dunnville Customs Revenue for 1910-11, Postal Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 2066 (ii).
Dupont, René, Dismissal as Immigration Agent: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 1864 (i).
Dupré, Dr., Postmaster at St. Robert, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 3753 (ii).
—— M. for Papers* (Mr. Cardin) 4782 (iii).
Dynamite and Explosives, Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Robb) 724 (i).
'Earl Grey' and 'Minto,' Govt. Steamers, Names of Employees: M. for Ret..* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1816 (i).
Eastern Block Addition: in Com. of Sup., 1339 (i).
Eastern Townships, Field for Immigrants: Remarks (Mr. McCrea) 6557 (iv).
East River, Pictou County, Deepening, &c.: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 2020 (ii).
East Roman Valley Post Office, Dismissal: Remarks (Mr. Pelletier) in Com. of Sup., 2028 (ii).
Eddy, Ezra Butler Bessey, Change of Name: *See* 'B. No. 117.'
Edmonton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2206 (ii).
Edmonton Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2816 (ii).
Eganville Post Office, Purchase of Site: Ques. (Mr. Low) 725 (i).
Election Accounts, Payments *re*: Remarks (Mr. Turriff) 4460 (iii).
Elections Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 4, 8, 17.'
Election Deposits: *See* 'B. Nos. 8 and 17.'
Electric Light Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 5828 (iv).
Elevator Men in Govt. Employ: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 3244 (ii).
—— Dismissals: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 3245 (ii).
Elevators, Control of by Govt.: Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. W. H. Bennett) 137 (i).
—— Ref. to in debate on Address, 154, 287 (i).
Elevators, Ownership and Operation by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Knowles) 2853 (ii).
See 'Grain B. 32.'
Empire Trade Commission, Apptmt. of Representative: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 5951 (iv).
Erie, London and Tillsonburg Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 12.'
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 90.'
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6220 (iv).
Estende to Baddeck Line I.C.R., Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. McKenzie) 576 (i).
Estimates, The (1911-12) Presented (Mr. W. T. White) 525 (i).
—— Suppl., Presented (Mr. W. T. White) 971 (i), 4974 (iii), 6154 (iv).
Estimates Discussion in Concurrence: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 6805 (iv).
Estimates, Discussion of Outside Works: Remarks *re* Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 2443 (ii).
Estimates, Discussion of: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) *re* Adjournment, 5937 (iv).
Estimates, Suppl.: Inquiry for (Mr. A. J. Maclean) 1575 (i).
Estimates Omitted: *See* 'Pub. Works,' &c.
Estmere to Baddeck Branch Ry., Tenders *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McKenzie) 1589 (i).
Excavators purchased from Mr. Harris, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 559 (i).

Exchequer Court Act. (asst. judge) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 168.'
Exchequer Court Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1035, 1039 (i).
Excise Customs Duties: in Com. of Sup., 5827 (iv).
Excise Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 5812 (iv).
Excise Preventive Officers: in Com. of Sup., 5824 (iv).
Excise Salaries to Inspectors, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5812 (iv)
Excise Travelling Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iv).
Experimental Farms: in Com. of Sup., 6477 (iv).
—— Branch Stations: in Com. of Sup., 6477 (iv).
See 'Agriculture.'
Experimental Farm Bulletins, Distribution, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6465 (iv).
Explosive Apparatus Testing Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 6603 (iv).
External Affairs Dept.: *See* 'B. No. 58.'
Eyesight, Insurance of: *See* 'B. No. 126.'
Falconer, R. S., Dismissal as Inspector on I.C.R., Apptmt. of Successor: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 543 (i).
See 'Faulkner.'
False Creek Flats, Date of Application of Lease from Marpole and Macdonald: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 5953 (iv).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Macdonald) 6186 (iv).
Farly, Mrs., Postmistress at St. Gabriel de Brandon, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Béland) 2579 (ii).
Farmers' Bank Failure, Indemnifying Shareholders, Speech of Hon. Mr. Crothers *re*: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 3147 (ii).
Farmers' Bank, Inquiry by Chief Justice Meredith: Remarks (Mr. Morphy) 6710 (iv).
Farmers' Bank Investigation, Apptmt. of Sir William Meredith: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3332 (ii).
—— O. C. *re* Apptmt. of Sir William Meredith: M. for Copy* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3756 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 2853 (ii).
Farmers' Bank, Promises to Reimburse by Ministers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 713 (i).
Farmers' Bank Reimbursements: (Ques.) (Mr. Lemieux) 528 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 527 (i).
Farmers' Bank, St. Jean, Indemnity to Depositors: Ques. (Mr. Demers) 551 (i).
Farmers' Bank, Speech of Hon. Mr. Crothers: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 3332 (ii).
Farming Implements, Cost of: *See* 'Cockshutt.'
Fast Atlantic Service and Halifax Terminals: (Mr. Maclean) on M. for Sup., 6496 (iv).
Fast Atlantic SS. Service, Conference *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 5695 (iv).
See 'Post Office.'
Faulkner, R. S., Emplymt. by Public Works as Contractor: Ques. (Mr. Davidson) 5261 (iii).
See 'Falconer.'
Fenian Raid Veterans, Bounties to: *See* 'B. No. 190.'
Fenian Raid Veterans, Land Grant, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boivin) 3334 (ii).
See 'Militia.'
Ferguson, S. M., Dismissal of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 2459 (ii).
Fidelity Trust Co., Incorporation, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Lemieux) 3757 (ii).
Fife, Duke of, Decease of: Remarks (Mr. Borden) 2154 (ii).
FINANCE.
Aud. Gen.'s Report: Presented (Mr. W. T. White) 970 (i).
Banking Act Amt. Bill (Mr. Demers) on M. to introduce (Mr. Speaker) 407 (i).
Banking Act, Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 1820 (i).
Bounties on Steel and Iron, Administration of Act: in Com. of Sup., 687 (i), 5934 (iv).
—— Budget Speech: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4249 (iii).
—— Par. in Montreal 'Gazette': Remarks (Mr. Kyte) 2588 (ii).
Bounties on Steel Rods, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Neely) 529 (i).
B.C. Provincial Subsidy, Consultations with other Provs.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 573 (i).
Budget, The, 4985 (iii).
Charges of Management, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 619 (i).
Coin Circulation: in Com. of Sup., 1034 (i).
Debt of Canada, Average Interest: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1811 (i).
Dom. Notes, Engraving, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 4778 (iii).
Dom. Notes, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1033 (i).
Dom. Notes, Printing, &c., Limitations *re* Tenders: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for Sup., 1820, 1841 (i).
—— Complaints *re* British Tenders: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 5843 (iv).
Estimates, The (1911-12): Presented (Mr. W. T. White) 525 (i).
—— Suppl. (1912): Presented, 4974 (iii).
—— 1912-13: Presented (Mr. W. T. White) 971 (i), 6154 (iv).
Farmers' Bank Failure, Investigation, O.C. *re* Apptmt. of Sir William Meredith: M. for Copy* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3756 (ii).

FINANCE—*Con.*
——— Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 2853 (ii)
——— Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3332 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Morphy) 6710 (iv).
Farmers' Bank, Promises to Reimburse by Ministers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 713 (i), 3147, 3332 (ii).
Farmers' Bank Reimbursements: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 528 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 527 (i).
Farmers' Bank, and Bank of St. Jean, Indemnity to Depositors: Ques. (Mr. Demers) 551 (i).
Finance, Deptl. Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 1068 (i).
Financial Review (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 6707 (iv).
Gold Coinage, by Mint: Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 1213 (i).
Govt. Loans, Amounts, Rates of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4777 (iii).
La Banque de St. Hyacinthe, Investigation *re* Liquidation: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2069 (ii).
La Banque de St. Hyacinthe and La Banque St. Jean, Reimbursements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 528 (i).
Man. and N.S. Federal Subsidies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4258 (iii).
Meredith, Hon. Sir William, Application *re* Leave of Absence: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 5954 (iv).
P.E.I. Better Terms: Remarks (Mr. J. J. Hughes) on M. for Sup., 5171 (iii).
Public Accounts Report: Presented (Mr. W. T. White) 11 (i).
Royal Mint: in Com. of Sup., 6584 (iv).
Fisheries Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 140.'
FISHERIES.
Alder Point Lobster Hatchery, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McKenzie) 3053 (ii).
B.C. Herring Fishing, Authority *re* Close Season: Ques. (Mr. Shepherd) 4256 (iii).
B.C. Fishing Licenses, Transfers, &c.: M. for Pets.* (Mr. Sinclair) 3945 (ii).
B.C. Fisheries Question: Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Stevens) 290 (i).
Canso Reduction Works, Dismissals, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 874 (i).
Cold Storage for Bait *re* Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 5256 (iii), 6653 (iv).
Dogfish Scrap, Price *re*: M. for Cor. (Mr. Sinclair) 1391 (i).
Fish, Fresh, Expenditure *re* Transportation: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2666 (ii).
See 'I.C.R.'
FISHERIES—*Con.*
Fishery Act, Prosecutions in Pictou County: M. for Papers* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1589 (i).
Fisheries Contracts with Stewards on Cruisers: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 681 (i).
Fisheries Department, Reorganisation of: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) 936 (i).
Fishery Guardians in Guysborough County, Names, Dismissals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3053 (ii).
——— Dismissals: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 3056 (ii).
Fishery Inspectors, N.S., Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4257 (iii).
Fisheries Inspectors, Dismissal, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5242 (iii).
Fisheries Jurisdiction *re* Provinces: Ques. (Mr. H. Clark) 3339 (ii).
Fishery Overseer, J. A. Doucet, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Turgeon) 1590 (i).
Fishery Overseer, W. C. Robichaud, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Turgeon) 1589 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Turgeon) 5259 (iii).
Fisheries Protection Service: in Com. of Sup., 5386 (iii).
Fisheries Protection Service on Pacific Coast, Capt. Newcombe's Rep.: M. for Copy (Mr. Clements) 2467 (ii).
Fishery Treaty with U.S., Withdrawal *re*: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 408 (i).
Fish Hatcheries, B.C., Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Shepherd) 4256 (iii).
Fish Reduction Works at Arichat, Tel. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 2289 (ii).
Fish Scrap as Fertilizer: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 684 (i).
Fish Trap Licenses issued to Capt. J. H. Thorburn: M. for Pets.* (Mr. Law) 2861 (ii).
Gasoline Engines on Fishing Boats, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2666 (ii).
Hague Tribunal, Fishery Regulations *re*: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3830 (ii).
Hurley, Mr. J. M., Fishery Inspector at Belleville, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2860 (ii).
I.C.R. Freight on Fish, Aid *re* Transportation: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 6748 (iv).
See 'Fish, Fresh.'
International Congress *re* Fisheries, Delegates: in Com. of Sup., 5237 (iii).
International Fisheries Commission: in Com. of Sup., 6646; conc., 6778 (iv).
'Kestrel' Fishery Cruiser, Condemnation of: Ques. (Mr. Stevens) 549 (i).

FISHERIES—*Con.*
Lake Winnipegosis Fishery, Limitation *re* Catch: Ques. (Mr. Cruise) 3055 (ii).
Lapointe, Mr. Joseph, Apptmt. as Overseer on Lake Aylmer: Ques. (Mr. Tobin) 4550 (iii).
Lobster Fishing Season in St. John, Date of Opening: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 722 (i).
Lobster Hatchery: in Com. of Sup., 5256 (iii).
Lobster Traps, Customs Changes in Tariff: on M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) for Papers, 1362 (i).
Marine Hospitals for Fishermen: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) 6787 (iv).
Medical Attendance, Free, for Fishermen: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 680 (i).
Murray, Dr., Poaching for Salmon on East River, N.S.: Remarks (Mr. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 5242 (iii).
Oyster Culture: in Com. of Sup., 5255 (iii).
Pelagic Sealing Treaty, Ratification of: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4460 (iii).
——— Explanation (Mr. Borden) 4550 (iii).
——— Compensation *re* Treaty: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 4776 (iii).
——— Remuneration to Commissioners: in Com. of Sup., 5810 (iv).
——— Treaty between G.B., U.S. and Japan: M. for Copy* (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1590 (i).
Salmon Fisheries, B.C., Negotiations *re* Exportations, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3756 (ii).
Steam Trawlers and Fisheries Bounties: M. for Pets.* (Mr. Sinclair) 5957 (iv).
Steam Trawling on Canadian Coasts: M. for Papers (Mr. Sinclair) 2461 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 5388 (iii).
Twine for Lobster Nets: Remark (Mr. Sinclair) on M. for Sup., 5587 (iv).
——— Importations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3536 (ii).
——— Customs Duties: on M. for Sup. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1070 (i).
Flags, Flying of: *See* 'B. No. 74.'
Flax Seed, Stmnt. of, Excessive Freight Rates: Remarks (Mr. Turriff) 661 (i).
Flemming, Mr. Charles, Dismissal from Inland Rev. at Petrolia: Ques. (Mr. Pardee) 4259 (iii).
Flour Bags, Inspection of: *See* 'B. No. 78.'
Foresters, Ancient Order of: *See* 'B. No. 157.'
Forest, Mr. Medard, Excise Officer at L'Epiphanie, Dismissal, Charges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Nantel) 726 (i).
Fort McMurray and Athabasca Tel. Lines: in Com. of Sup., 2819 (ii).
Fort Osborne Barracks, Sale of: *See* 'B. No. 185.'
Franco-Canadian Trade Relations: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for Sup., 5747 (iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 5262 (iii).
Franking Campaign Literature: *See* 'Political.'
Fraser, Mr. John, Inspector at Stellarton, I.C.R., Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3935 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 4188 (iii).
Fraser, Mr. John, Postmaster at Stellarton, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 546 (i).
Fraserville Bridge Works, Interview with Messrs. LeBel and Riou: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 549 (i).
Fraserville Wharf and Dredging, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 3150 (ii).
——— Cor. *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 3534 (ii).
Fredericton and Grand Lake Coal & Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6224 (iv).
Freight Rates, Discrimination in the West: Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3194 (ii).
——— Notice of Discussion (Mr. Turriff) 3048 (ii).
See 'Railways.'
French Canadian Repatriation, Policy of Govt. (Mr. Paquet) 619 (i).
French River, Dredging, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6657 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Devlin) *re* Provision in Estimates, 6729 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Murphy) Conc., 6776 (iv).
French Translation of Revised Statutes: *See* 'B. No. 65.'
French Translator, Apptmt. of Mr. C. E. Duckett: M. (Mr. Borden) 1969 (ii).
Fritz, Henry, Dismissal as Fishery Overseer: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4977 (iii).
Fumigating Stations: in Com. of Sup., 6479 (iv).
Galops Canal, Upper Lock: in Com. of Sup., 5797 (iv).
Gananoque Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1855 (i).
Garceau, Mr. N., Apptmt. as Inquiry Commissioner: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 2860 (ii).
——— Resignation as Commissioner: Remarks (Mr. Demers) in Com. of Sup., 5816 (iv).
Garthby, Lake Aylmer, Wharf Construction: M. for Papers* (Mr. Tobin) 4781 (ii).
Gasoline Engines on Fishing Boats, Number, &c.: (Mr. Sinclair) 2666 (ii).

Gaspé Basin Marine Agency, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 878 (i).
——— Inquiry, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1358 (i).
Gaspé Landing Pier, Appropriation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 2785 (ii).
Gaspé, Magdeleine and Chlorydormes Mail Contracts, Annulment of: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1204 (i).
Gaspé Shore Tidal Wave, Govt. Aid *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2858 (ii).
Gaspé Telegraph System: in Com. of Sup., 3305 (ii).
Gass, Trueman, Emplymt. and Dismissal on I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2242 (ii).
Gatineau and Ungava Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 61.'
Gauthier, Alderic, Dismissal from Soulanges Canal: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4976 (iii).
Geological Survey, Explorations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6604 (iv).
Georgian Bay Canal: *See* 'B. No. 30.'
Georgian Bay Canal, Govt. Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 544 (i).
——— Govt. Policy *re*: Remarks (Mr. Devlin) 3060 (ii).
See 'French River.'
——— Rep. in Ottawa 'Citizen' *re* Speech of P.M.G. at Renfrew: Remarks (Mr. Devlin) 1970 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal Route and French River: Remarks (Mr. Devlin) 6785 (iv).
Gerrior, Mr. William, Dismissal from Customs at Larry's River, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3051 (ii).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 3056 (ii).
Gillies, Capt., Dismissal: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 3261 (ii).
Gillis Point Wharf Construction: in Com. of Sup., 2056 (ii).
Girard, Louis, Dismissal as Postmaster at Ste. Angele de Merici: M. for Pets.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 2587 (ii).
Girroir, John, Resignation from I.C.Ry.: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 4185 (iii).
Glace Bay Mail Delivery, Delay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carroll) 804 (i).
Glenelg, N.S., Postmaster, Complaints *re*, Pets., &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Sinclair) 1817 (i).
Godbout, Mr. J., Emplymt. in Govt., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 3752 (ii).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 4980 (iii).
Gold Coinage, by Mint.: Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 1213 (i).
See 'Coin.'
Good Roads, Aid to: *See* 'B. No. 77.'
Good Roads, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Stevens) 284 (i).
Goods purchased by Public Works Dept. since Oct. 1911, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 1578 (i).
See 'Pub. Works—Purchases.'
Gooseberry Cove, N.B., Improvements *re*: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 555 (i).
Goose Creek Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 2372 (ii).
Goucher, Wesley, Dismissal as Lightkeeper: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4977 (iii).
Goulet, Mr., Apptmt. as Station Inspector, N. T.Ry.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 3935 (ii).
Govt. Appointments of Relatives of Members: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 6295-7 (iv).
See 'Dismissals.'
Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays: M. (Mr. Borden) 2376 (ii).
Govt. Dredges, Contract *re* Boarding Employees: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 5953 (iv).
See 'Marine.'
Govt. Dredges and Tugs, Instructions *re* Appointments: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 5952 (iv).
Govt. Employees, Dismissal, Resignations, &c: M. for Ret. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 1818 (i).
See 'Dismissals.'
Govt. Employees, Inside and Outside Service, Dismissals, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Kyte) 2587 (ii).
Govt. House Property, Toronto, Sale of: *See* 'B. No. 182.'
Govt. Loans, Amounts, Rates of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4777 (iii).
Govt. Ownership: *See* 'Cable,' 'Freight Rates,' 'Parcel Post,' 'Railways,' &c.
Govt. Printing Patronage to Quebec Papers: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1357 (i).
Govt. Purchases for Public Works, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1204 (i).
Govt. Railways Management, Abolition of Govt. Ry. Managing Board: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 569 (i).
See 'I.C.R.'
Govt. Steamers, B.C., Use for Political Purposes: Ques. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5262 (iii).
Govt. Steamers, Building, &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 1964 (i).
——— Repairs, Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5186, 5207 (iii).
See 'Marine.'
Govt. Works Tolls Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 103.'
Gov. Gen.'s Office: in Com. of Sup., 1035, 1041 (1).
Governor General of Canada, Letters Patent: M. for Copy* (Mr. Macdonald) 2247 (ii).

Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) Res. prop., 793, 869, in Com. on Res., 870; 1°* of B., 874 (i); 2°, 2161; in Com., 2179, 2186, 2302, 2382, 2535, 2560, 2755, 3156, 3451, 3491, 3630, 3757 (ii), 4042, 4153, 4787; 3°m., 4788, agreed to, 4835 (iii).
See 'B. 96.'

In committee:
Agents car reports, 2573 (ii).
Binning, 3452,, 3460 (ii).
Car distribution, 3461, 3491 (ii); 4788 (iii).
Car orders and distribution, 3183, 3190 (ii).
Car rights, 2565 (ii).
Certificates, 3180 (ii).
Certificates with grain, 2400 (ii).
Commission's offices, 2182; salaries, 2181 (ii), 4154 (iii).
—— Regulations, 2187 (ii).
—— Transportation, 2187 (ii).
Country elevators, rules, &c., 2562 (ii).
Country elevators and warehouses, 2568, 3181 (ii).
See 'Warehouse.'
Fees, 2304, 2323, 2326, 2573, 3156 (ii).
Flat warehouses, 2568 (ii).
Fort William elevators, 2317, 2383 (ii).
Grades, 2536, 2767 (ii).
Grading, 2535 (ii).
Grain in bond, 2401, 3453 (ii).
Grain delivery on receipts, 4046 (iii).
Grain rejected, 2554, 2767, 3176, 3456 (ii).
Grain of same grade to be kept together, 2383 (ii).
Grain Survey Board, 2535 (ii).
Grain Offices in Winnipeg, 2536, 3159, 3453 (ii).
Hospital elevators, 2547, 2548, 3177, 3757 (ii), 4042 (iii).
Inspection, 3157 (ii).
Inspectors security, 2202 (ii).
Inspection at Terminal elevators, 2561 (ii).
Interpretation, 2548 (ii).
Licenses, 2561, 3182, 3457, 3761, 3798 (ii).
Loading platforms, 2570, 3188, 3461 (ii).
'Manitoba Hard,' 2538, 2771, 3162 (ii), 4155 (iii).
Manufacturing license, 2561 (ii).
Mixing, 2313, 3458, 3799 (ii).
Oaths, 2201, 2302 (ii).
Overage, 2399, 3452 (ii).
Reinspection, 2382, 2755 (ii).
Sample markets, 2306, 2383, 3630, 3799 (ii), 4077 (iii).
Samples, rejection of, 2545 (ii).
Screenings, 2554 (ii).
See 'Grain rejected.'
Seed grain, 2564 (ii).
Seed elevators, 3761 (ii).

In committee—*Con.*
Security by licenses, 3798 (ii).
Standards, establishment of, 2203, 2302, 2305, 2397, 3157, 3161 (ii).
Terminal elevators, acquisition of, 3526 (ii).
—— privileges, buying and selling, 3762, 3773 (ii), 4042, 4058 (iii).
—— Storage at, 2560 (ii).
Time for loading cars, 2572, 3183 (ii).
U.S. grain, grading of, 2547 (ii).
Weigh masters, apptmnt., 2323 (ii).
Weights, 2323, 2770 (ii).
Warehouse receipts, 3183, 3458 (ii).
Warehouse receipts and fees, 2183, 2186 (ii). 3°m., 4788 (iii).
Amt. (Mr. Cash) 6 m. h., 4808 (iii).
Amt. (Mr. Cruise) *re* car distribution, 4788 (iii).
Amt. (Mr. Knowles) *re* elevator owners buying and selling grain, 4804 (iii).
Amt. (Mr. McCraney) *re* mixing, 4803 (iii).
Amt. (Mr. Oliver) *re* expenses of administration, 4806 (iii).
Amt. (Mr. Thomson) *re* sample markets, 4794 (iii).
Grain Bill, Notice for Discussion (Mr. W. F. Knowles) 1574 (i).
—— Tel. from Grain Growers Association: Read (Mr. Knowles) 4744 (iii).
Grain Carriage to Duluth, &c., Ref. to Washington Despatches: Stmnt. (Mr. Foster) 2577 (ii).
Grain Congestion in the North West: Remarks (Mr. McCraney) on M. for Sup., 5760 (iv).
Grain Congestion in the West, Car Distribution: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 6186, 6556 (iv).
—— Stmnt. (Mr. Foster) 5954 (iv).
Grain Congestion in N.W.: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. Oliver) 6203 (v).
Grain Shipments from Canadian Ports, Quantity, Grades, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Bennett) 536 (i).
Grain Shipments from Port Arthur and Fort William: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Bennett) 539 (i).
Grain Shipments to Terminal Elevators: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 6792 (iv).
Grain Shipments from the West, Regulation of Freight Rates, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3975, Neg. (Y. 54; N. 84) 4035 (ii).
Grain Storage at Minneapolis: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Oliver) 6493 (iv).
Grain Transportation in the West, Par. in Toronto Globe: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 5928 (iv).
Grand Lake and Belle River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6307 (iv).
G. T. R. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 130.'
G. T. R. Trainmen's Strike: *See* 'B. No. 130.'

G. T. Ry., Strikes and Board of Conciliation: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. MacNutt) 3756 (ii).
G. T. Ry. Trainmen's Strike, Settlement by late Govt., Judge Barron's Rep.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2580 (ii).
G. T. R., Running Rights over T. & N. O. R., *See* 'B. No. 145.'
G. T. P. Ry. Co.'s (charter extension) Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 20.'
G. T. P. Ry., Privy Council Judgment: *See* 'B. No. 95.'
G. T. P. Ry. (Brandon) Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6324 (iv).
—— Bridge at Assiniboine, Subsidy: in Com. on Res., Amt. (Mr. Borden) 6060 (iii).
—— Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 5900 (iv).
—— Remuneration to Govt. Director: in Com. of Sup., 5801 (iv).
—— Workshops at Quebec, Agreement *re* Site: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 3050 (ii).
Gray, W. W., Coal Inspector, Charges *re* Investigation by H. P. Duchemin: M. for Papers* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2588 (ii).
Great Northern Mining & Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6224 (iv).
Green, John B., Homestead Inspector, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. White) 6183 (iii).
Griever, Mr. S., Charges *re* Lighthouse Keeper: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1358 (i).
Guarantee Life Ins. Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 154.'
Guillemette, Mr. N., Dismissal, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bureau) 1210 (i).
Guimond, Eugene, Dismissal of: M. for Pets.* (Mr. Lemieux) 2460 (ii).
Gutelius, Mr. F. P., Apptmt. to N. T. Ry. Investigation Commission, British Subject, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 4038 (iii).
—— Improper form of Question: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3934 (ii).
—— Naturalization of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 4978 (iii).
See 'N. T. Ry.'
Guysborough Branch Ry. Appropriation: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) on M. for Sup., 1445 (i), 5621 (iv).
Guysborough Branch Line, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 676 (i).
—— Construction *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 571 (i).
Hagerty, Mr. S. W., Dismissal from Inspectorship of Ry. Station: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4976 (iii).
Ha Ha Bay Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 5895, 6212 (iv).
Hale, Mr. Thos., Discharge as Labour Correspondent: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 4263 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 4459 (iii).
Halifax, &c., Newfoundland & G. B., Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 4727 (iii).
Halifax Dock Accommodation, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 5596 (iv).
Halifax Terminal Facilities: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 4196 (iii).
See 'G.B. and Can. Mail Service,' 'Fast Atlantic.'
Hamel, Hector, Customs Appraiser, Montreal, Dismissal of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 3343 (ii).
Hamilton Harbour: *See* 'B. No. 23.'
Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 47.'
Ham Nord Postmaster, Investigation Dismissal: Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 6616 (iv).
Ham., Robt., Dismissal from Trachoma Hospital, Halifax: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 875 (i).
Hampton Highway Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 4225 (iii).
Hampton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1527 (i).
Hampton Spur Line, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 675 (i).
—— Construction *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 572 (i).
Hansard, French Edition, Delay in Distribution, 269 (i).
See 'Debates.'
Harbour Commissioners Report: Presented (Mr. Hazen) 1571 (i).
Harbour, Geo. T., Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 2460 (ii).
—— Letter *re* Dismissal: Read (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 3252 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 3235 (ii).
—— Improvements, &c., Govt. Policy *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 2044 (ii).
—— Man., Repairs, &c.; in Com. of Sup., 2814 (ii).
—— Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 2440 (ii).
—— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 623 (i), 2366 (ii).
—— Que.: in Com. of Sup., 2785 (ii).
Harmony to Elmira Branch Ry., P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 5659 (iv).
Harris, W. H., Postmaster at White Head, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Sinclair) 2588 (ii).
See 'Whitehead.'
Harvey and Salisbury Ry., Contract *re* Rails: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 4171 (iii).
—— Ry.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Pugsley) 1843 (i).
See 'Albert,' &c.

Hatfield, A. M., Charges *re*: M. for Copy* (Mr. Law) 5263 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Law) in Com. of Sup., 5252 (iii).
Hattie, Wm. A., Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 2460 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1815 (i).
Hawkes, Mr. A., Apptmt. in Immigration Dept.: M. (Mr. Oliver) for O. Cs., 605 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 527 (i).
Hayden, W. W., Wharfinger at Digby, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 5957 (iii).
Headquarters Staff, Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5536 (iii).
Health Ass'n.: *See* 'B. No. 127.'
Health Department, Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Knowles) 1585 (i).
Hebert, Auguste, Postmaster at St. Pascal, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 3756 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. E. Lapointe) in Com. of Sup., 6291 (iv).
Hefferman, Mr. F. S., Dismissal from Customs at Spring Hill, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4039 (iii).
Hendsbee, David S., Dismissal from Marine and Fisheries Dept.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 3342 (ii).
Henry, Norbert, Contract *re* Mails between Scott Junction and Station: Ques. (Mr. Béland) 975 (i).
Highlands Bridge Construction: Remarks (Mr. Bickerdike) 1197 (i), 5790 (iv).
High River, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 81.'
Highways and Road Construction: Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Pugsley) 142 (i).
Highways, Assistance to: *See* 'B. No. 77.'
Highways Improvements, Subsidies: in Com. of Sup., 6611 (iv).
Highways in N.S., Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4226 (iii).
Highway Crossings eliminated on I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5595 (iv).
Hillsboro Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1528 (i).
Historic Tableaus in Ottawa Govt. Buildings: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 1336 (i).
Homestead Inspectors, Number employed in Sask., Number dismissed: Ques. (Mr. L. Thomson) 1588 (i).
Horncastle, Isabella Helen, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 147.'
Horse Racing: *See* 'B. No. 165.'
Horses destroyed at Weyburn, Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 6790 (iv).
Horses imported from U.S., Destruction of for Glanders: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 5693, 5939 (iv).
Horsfall, Herbert, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 109.'
Houle, Stanislas, Emplymt. on Soulanges Canal: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 3537 (ii).
HOUSE OF COMMONS:
Additional Accommodation for Members: in Com. of Sup., 1951 (i).
Ash Wednesday, Adjournment for: M. (Mr. Borden) 3343 (ii).
Ballots, Voting by Divisions: Ques. (Mr. Burnham) 4979 (iii).
Bibeau, Mr. A., Sessional Clerk, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 4248 (iii).
Bills, Royal Assent, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 4775 (iii).
Business of the House, Morning Sittings: M. (Mr. Borden) 4980 (iii).
Carleton County Electoral Vacancy, Issue of Writ: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1810 (i).
Chicoutimi Controverted Election, Certificate of Judge: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 11 (i).
Christmas Adjournment for Holidays: M. (Mr. Borden) 927 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 702 (i).
Coffin, Mr. Henry, Emplymt. as Sessional Messenger, Reinstatement: Ques. (Mr. Guilbault) 2289 (ii).
—— M. Picotte: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Seguin) 2459 (ii).
See 'Picotte.'
Committees, Sel. Standing: M. (Mr. Borden) 10 (i).
—— Lists: Presented (Mr. Borden) 703 (i).
—— M. to present Rep. (Mr. Borden) 794 (i).
Distribution Office, Salaries: M. to conc. in Senate Report, &c.: (Mr. Borden) 6660 (iv).
Downey, W. H., Returning Officer, Kings and Albert, Non-Payment of: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 2057 (ii).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays: M. (Mr. Borden) 2376 (ii).
—— Wednesday Sittings, M. (Mr. Borden) *re* Precedence, 1969 (ii).
House of Commons Desks, Changes *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 623 (i).
House of Commons Employees, Salary Increases: M. (Mr. Borden) to conc. in report of Mr. Speaker, 6660 (iv).
—— Improvements *re* Acoustics: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 1335 (i).
—— Messengers, Dismissals, &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Ethier) 562 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 6807 (iv).
—— Stenographers: in Com. of Sup., 6461 (iv).
—— Remarks *re* (Mr. Pugsley) 1846 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*
——— Ventilation: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 1336 (i).
Internal Economy Commission, Names. presented (Mr. Borden) 11 (i).
Joliette County Returning Officer, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Guilbault) 4979 (iii).
Lanctot Investigation, Counsel Fees *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6486 (iv).
Legislation, Joint Com.: M. (Mr. Borden) 2217 (ii).
Library Committee: M. (Mr. Borden) 795 (i).
Library, House of Commons, Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1950 (ii).
——— Report presented (Mr. Borden) 11 (i).
McDougall, J. M., Counsel Fees *re* Lanctot Investigation: in Com. of Sup., 6486 (iv).
Maskinonge Election Expenses, Settlement of: Ques. (Mr. Bellemare) 4776 (iii).
Members Travelling Allowances during Adjournments: Remarks (Mr. Knowles) 1848 (i).
Parliamentary Documents, Distribution: in Com. of Sup., 6613 (iv).
Parliament, Opening of Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 6 (i).
Picotte, Mederic, Messenger H. of C., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2065 (ii).
See 'Coffin.'
Political Literature, Application *re* Free Postage: Ques. (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 1585 (i).
Private Bills, Extension of Time: M. (Mr. Borden) 930 (i).
——— Rep. of Examiner *re* Pets., Divergency of Rules: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 643 (i).
Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 6780 (iv).
Quebec West Controverted Election, Certificate of Judge: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 407 (i).
Questions, Improperly drafted: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 4983, 5054 (iii).
Renfrew South, Electoral Vacancy: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 926 (i).
Restaurant Com.: M. for Com. (Mr. Borden) 710 (i).
Restaurant, Payments to Waiters: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 2861 (ii).
——— Minimum Wages paid in Cites: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 3049 (ii).
Rooms allotted to Liberal Members, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 670 (i).
Saturday Sittings: Stmnt. (Mr. Borden) 5830 (iv).
Sessional Employees dismissed, Number &c.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 568 (i), 2064 (ii).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*
Speaker, Election of: M. (Mr. Borden) 2, 5 (i).
——— Deputy: M. (Mr. Borden) 519, 523 (i).
Speaker, Mr., Congratulations *re* Reading Prayers in French (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1808 (i).
Statutes of Previous Sessions, Delay *re* Distribution: Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com. of Sup., 678 (i).
Telephones, Long Distance, &c., in H. of C.: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 3243 (ii).
Voters' Lists, Preparation of by Federal Govt., Stmnt. of Min. of the Int.: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 553 (i).
Voters' Lists in Man., Distribution *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Staples) 3056 (ii).
Yamaska Electoral Agent: Ques. (Mr. Mondou) 1584 (i).
Hudson Bay Ry. Construction: in Com. of Sup., 622, 677 (i), 5762, 6605 (iv).
Hudson Bay Ry. Construction, Cor. *re*: M. (Mr. Aikins) for Papers, 1213 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Neely) for O. Cs., 732 (i).
Hudson Bay Ry.: Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. W. H. Bennett) 132 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Murphy) 6776 (iv).
Hudson Bay Ports, Nav., &c.: M. for Reps.* (Mr. Aikins) 3756 (ii).
——— Surveys, *re* Navigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Aikins) 3943 (ii).
Hull City Hall Square, Improvements by Improvement Commission: Ques. (Mr. Kidd) 2293 (ii).
Hull Dismissals: *See* 'Dismissals.'
Hull Superior Court, Apptmt. of Mr. Chauvin: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4261 (iii).
See 'Chauvin.'
Humboldt Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2211 (ii).
Hurley, Mr. J. M., Fishery Inspector at Belleville, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2860 (ii).
Hydro-Electric Commission, Power for Govt. Buildings: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 3289 (ii).
Ice-breaker at St. Gerard, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2451 (ii).
Ile Bezard and Ste. Genevieve Wharfs, Completion of repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 557 (i).
Ile Rouge Lighthouse Keeper, Dismissal of Mr. Irving: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 4259 (iii).
IMMIGRATION—
Agents in Belgium, Number &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 878 (i).
Agents, Dismissals, Number and Names: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 877 (i).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
Agencies, G. B. and Can., Salaries, &c.: in Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1212 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 878 (i).
Agencies, G. B. and Can., Salaries &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3305, 3911 (ii).
Agents, Notification to Booking Agents *re* Bonus: Ques. (Mr. Sutherland) 875 (i).
Asselin, Mr. Oliver, Emplymt. by Immigration Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 1813 (i).
'British News,' &c., Purchase by Dept. of Int.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 6660 (iv).
Chinese entering B. C., Total Number: Ques. (Mr. Stevens) 4778 (iii).
Chinese Tax in B. C.: Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Stevens) 285 (i).
Chinese and Japanese in B. C., Number naturalized, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stevens) 555 (i).
Eastern Townships, Field for Immigrants: Remarks (Mr. McCrea) 6557 (iv).
Farm Labourers, Placing of, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sutherland) 5263 (iii).
—— Agents *re* &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sutherland) 874 (i).
—— Complaints *re*: M. for Papers* (Mr. Sutherland) 4781 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Sutherland) in Com. of Sup., 3923 (ii).
Farm Labourers in Quebec, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1359 (i).
French Canadian Repatriation, Policy of Govt. (Mr. Paquet) 619 (i).
Hawkes, Mr. Arthur, Apptmt. *re* Immigration Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 527 (i).
—— M. (Mr. Oliver) for O. Cs. 605 (i).
—— Report of Mr. Hawkes: Inquiry for (Mr. Oliver) 6551 (iv).
Hospitals, Number and Location: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1210 (i).
Immigration, Amount expended, Number of Immigrants, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1211 (i).
Immigrants deported, Number, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1213 (i).
Immigrant Inspection before Sailing for Canada: Remarks (Mr. Bickerdike) 618 (i).
Immigration Office in London, Ont.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 2451 (ii).
Immigration in Ont., Promise to Premier *re* Assistance: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 546 (i).
Immigration Premiums, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1212 (i).
Immigration Regulations *re* entering Canada: in Com. of Sup., 3911 (ii).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
Immigration Societies, State-Aid, Amounts expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1211 (i).
Immigration from U.S., *re* Wm. Pearson Co.: Remarks (Mr. Turriff) 3152 (ii).
Immigration from U.S., Opposition by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Turriff) 3154 (ii).
—— Members remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 3154 (ii).
Japanese, Oriental, Immigration, Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 875 (i).
Labour Conditions in B. C., Emplymt. of Orientals: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) 177 (i).
Laforce, Mr. J. W., Emplymt. as Immigration Agent: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 2242 (ii).
Laurier, Mr. C. A., Immigration Agent at Marquette, Mich.: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 2454 (ii).
Laurier, Mr. R., Immigration Agent at Detroit: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 2454 (ii).
Literature, French Publications: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1212 (i).
Mar. Provs. Immigration Policy: Prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2072 (ii).
Medical Examiners, Number, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1213 (i).
Murray, J. P., Carpet Co., Breach of Immigration Regulations: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 550 (i).
Negro Immigration: Remarks on Immigration Question (Mr. Thoburn) 608 (i).
Oriental Immigration, Total Number: Ques. (Mr. Stevens) 4779 (iii).
Sevigny, Mr. J. E., Apptmt. by Immigration Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 1205, 1588, 1814 (i).
Sikhs in B.C., Decision *re* bringing in their wives: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2457 (ii).
Syrian Immigration, Pet. *re* O.C.: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 1209 (i).
Imperial Loan and Investment Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 184.'
Imperial Naturalization, Uniformity *re*: on M. for Sup. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2420 (ii).
Indemnity to Members: *See* 'B. No. 75.'
INDIANS:
Abenakis Indian Agent, Apptmt. and Salary: Ques. (Mr. Mondou) 1587 (i).
Doncaster Indian Reserve Road Repairs: in Conc., 6806 (iv).
Indians, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1039 (i).
Police Point Reserve Transfer: M. for Papers* (Mr. Buchanan) 5557 (iv).
Watha Indian Reserve, Tenders *re* Timber: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 3055 (ii).

Industrial Disputes Investigation: *See* 'B. No. 87.'
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act: in Com. of Sup., 1498 (i), 6615 (iv).
Industrial Training and Education Royal Commission: in Com. of Sup., 1527 (i).
Inland Revenue, Deptl. Salaries: in Conc., 6770 (iv).
—— Private Secretary: in Com. of Sup., 6490 (iv).
—— Promotions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6490 Conc., 6771 (iv).
—— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1040, 1061 (i).
Inland Revenue Reports: Presented (Mr. Nantel) 565 (i).
Inquiries Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 19.'
Insect and Pest Destruction Act, Enforcement of: in Com. of Sup., 6479 (iv).
Inspection and Sale Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 78.'
Inspectors *re* Weights and Measures: in Com. of Sup., 5828 (iv).
INTERCOLONIAL RY.:
Air Brakes: in Com. of Sup., 4136 (iii).
Archibald, Mr. P. B., Emplymt. by Ry Dept.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 933 (i).
Ash, Mr. Earl, Claims *re* Damages for Fire on I.C.R.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Emmerson) 2246 (ii).
Benoit, Mr. Joseph, Dismissal from I.C.Ry.: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 4184 (iii).
Board of Management: in Com. of Sup., 4136 (iii).
—— Abolition of: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Emmerson) 5571 (iv).
—— Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 569 (i).
Bourque, Mr. Jeffrey, Claims *re* Damages on I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2243 (ii).
—— M. for Reps.* (Mr. Boulay) 2459 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 5610 (iv).
Branch Lines, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 622 (i), 4135 (iii).
Branch Lines: Prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 985 (i).
—— Accommodation, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Davidson) in Com. of Sup., 4218 (iii).
Branch Lines, Acquisition by Govt., Tel. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 565 (i).
—— Legislation *re* Acquisition: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 569 (i).
—— Subsidies to, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5618 (iv).
Bridge Strengthening: in Com. of Sup., 4137 (iii).
INTERCOLONIAL—*Con.*
Brotherhood Unions, Agreements, &c.: M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) for Papers, 793 (i).
Campbellton Ry. Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 4162 (iii).
Caraquet and North Shore Branch Line, I.C. Ry., Inspection *re* Subsidy: Remarks (Mr. Turgeon) 4192 (iii).
Chatham Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 4137 (iii).
Coal Supply, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2457 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 5611 (iv).
Condon, D. Murray, Passenger Agent: Transfer of, Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 3337 (ii).
Construction and Working Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 4130 (iii).
Dartmouth Branch Line: in Com. of Sup., 670 (i).
Dartmouth to Denus Branch Line, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 543 (i).
Double Tracking: in Com. of Sup., 5637 (iv).
Estende to Baddeck Branch Line, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. McKenzie) 576 (i).
—— M. for Papers (Mr. McKenzie) 2494 (ii).
Extension Branches: in Com. of Sup., 673 (i).
Facilities on I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5809; conc., 6774 (iv).
Fences, Number of Rods, Campbellton Division: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 6748 (iv).
Freight on Fish, Aid *re* Transportation: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 6748 (iv).
Girroir, John, Resignation from I.C.Ry.: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 4185 (iii).
Guysborough Branch Line: in Com. of Sup., 676 (i).
—— Construction *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 571 (i).
Halifax Dock Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5596 (iv).
Hampton Highway Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 4225 (iii).
Hampton Spur Line: in Com. of Sup., 675 (i).
Highway Crossings eliminated: in Com. of Sup., 5595 (iv).
Hillsborough Branch, Rails loaned, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 4978 (iii).
I.C.R. and G.T. Ry. Arbitration, Delays in Settlement, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Davidson) 3939 (ii).
I.C.R., Control by Ry. Commission, Res. *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 4979 (iii).

INTERCOLONIAL—*Con.*
Lavoie, Mr. Absolon, Inquiry *re* Death on I.C.R.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boulay) 4263 (iii).
Locomotives manufactured at Moncton: in Com. of Sup., 5607 (iv).
—— &c.: Remarks (Mr. Boulay) in Com. of Sup., 5655 (iv).
Madore, Alphonse, Claims for Damages: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 3055 (ii).
'Market Tickets' to Employees: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 5809 (iv).
Matapedia to Gaspé Basin Line, I.C. Ry. Inspection *re* Subsidy: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 4194 (iii).
Matapedia Water Works Co., Claims against I.C. Ry.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boulay) 4263 (iii).
Moncton Ry. Office, Fittings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6604 (iv).
Moncton Office, Tenders *re* Heating, Stmnt. *re*: Ans. (Mr. Monk) 6744 (iv).
Moncton Shops, Contract for Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5611, 5762 (iv).
—— Operation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5604 (iv).
—— Transfer to Fraserville: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 544 (i).
Morice, Theophile, Dismissal from: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Gauvreau) 4262 (iii).
Mulgrave Highway Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 4225 (iii).
North Sydney Diversion Line: in Com. of Sup., 5610 (iv).
Ocean Limited, Instructions *re* Transportation of Private Cars: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 2241 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) on conc., 6774 (iv).
Passes to Employees, Newspaper Reporters, &c., Instruction from Ottawa: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 2328 (ii).
Pay Day, Changes *re*: Ques. (Mr. Brouillard) 3340 (ii).
—— Instructions *re* Holiday and Sunday Pay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 1583 (i).
Pictou Employees, Charges *re* Political Partisanship: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Macdonald) 2246 (ii).
Provident Fund, Payments to Dismissed Officials: M. (Mr. Emmerson) to Com. of Sup., 5930 (iv).
—— Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 2450 (ii).
Pullman Conductors, Promotions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1413 (i).
Ry. Ties, Contract *re* at Sayabec: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4041 (iii).
—— Contract with Dame Boulay: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Carvell) 5957 (iii).

INTERCOLONIAL—*Con.*
Refrigerator Cars: in Com. of Sup., 5603 (iv).
Rivière du Loup, Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5654 (iv).
—— Shops Removal to Fraserville: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 570 (i).
Rolling Stock: in Com. of Sup., 5609, 5653, 6461 (iv).
Roy, Wm., Rep. of H. Boulay *re* Charges on I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 934 (i).
—— M. for Papers (Mr. Boulay) 1391 (i).
Ste. Anne de la Pocatière Fence Poles, Charges *re* Removal, Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2586 (ii).
St. Laurent, Xavier, Claims for Loss of Horse killed: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boulay) 4263 (iii).
Ste. Rosalie Branch Line, Accommodation, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 4134 (iii).
Snow Blockade, Delay to Trains: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 1409 (i).
Steamship Connections with I.C.R., Subsidies, &c.: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 5597 (iv).
Sunnybrae and Guysborough Branch Ry., I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2289 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 542 (i).
—— Supt., Application from Member of H. C.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 4040 (iii).
Sydney Mines Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 5658 (iv).
Ticket Collectors, Appmt of.: Remarks (Mr. Gauvreau) 6786 (iv).
Truro Station: in Com. of Sup., 4231 (iii).
—— Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1412 (i).
Vale Railroad, Operation by I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 5612 (iv).
—— Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 933 (i).
Wallace Harbour Spur Line: in Com. of Sup., 6604 (iv).
Working Expenses, Construction, &c., Statement (read): in Com. of Sup., 4162 (iii).

INTERIOR:
Crown Lands in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Number of Acres, Reservations for School Lands: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1587 (i).
Interior Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1038 (i).
Internal Economy Commission Names: presented (Mr. Borden) 11 (i).
International Congress *re* Fisheries, Delegates: in Com. of Sup., 5237 (iii).
International Fisheries Commission: in Com. of Sup., 6646; conc., 6778 (iv).
International Guarantee Co.: *See* 'B. No. 148.'

International Institute of Agriculture: in Com. of Sup., 6478 (iv).
International Waterways: *See* 'Boundary.'
Interprovincial Fire Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 141.'
Interprovincial and James Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 67.'
Inverness Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2056 (ii).
Investigation *re* Govt. Dismissals: *See* 'B. No. 19.'
See 'Dismissals.'
Investigation *re* Dismissals, Cost of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 5950 (iv).
Isaac, Isobell, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 131.'
Jacques, Leander, Postmaster, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Béland) 3339 (ii).
James Bay Ry. Subsidy: in Com., 6309 (iv).
Japanese, Oriental, Immigration, Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 875 (i).
See 'Immigration.'
Jenkins, Wm. A. Hunt, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 162.'
Joint Stock Companies Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sevigny) 2857 (ii).
Joliette County Returning Officer, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Guilbault) 4979 (iii).
Jones, Chas. O., Dismissal, Evidence, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Kay) 3757 (ii).
—— Remarks, 5161 (iii).
Judges Act (salaries) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 156.'
Judges for Ont., Apptmt. of Additional in Ont.: Remarks (Mr. German) in Com. of Sup., 1035 (i).
Judges in Yukon: *See* 'B. No. 123.'
Judges of Superior Court, Montreal, Superannuation, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Ethier) 2459 (ii).
JUSTICE:
Burrard Power Co. v. The King, Judgment of Judicial Com.: M. for Copy* (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1409 (i).
Deputy Minister of Justice, Travelling Expenses: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 3150 (ii).
—— Extra Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cruise) 2458 (ii).
Dugas, Hon. Mr. Justice, Date of Apptmt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sevigny) 2858 (ii).
Hull Superior Court, Apptmt. of Mr. Chauvin: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4261 (iii).
Judges for Ont., Apptmt. of Additional in Ont.: Remarks (Mr German) in Com. of Sup., 1035 (i).
Judges of Superior Court, Montreal, Superannuation, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Ethier) 2459 (ii).
Justice, Deptl. Promotions: in Com. of Sup., 6584 (iv).
—— Litigation Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 6561 (iv).
JUSTICE—*Con.*
Justice, Min. of, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 725 (i).
Letellier, Judge Blaise, Residence *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lavallee) 3150 (ii).
Montreal Circuit Court Judge, Additional: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 545 (i), 2855 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 3907 (ii).
—— Additional Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6597 (iv).
Northwest Territories, Administration of Justice: in Com. of Sup., 6565 (iv).
Ottawa County Superior Court, Additional Judge: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 4121 (iii).
Penitentiaries in Canada Report: Presented (Mr. Doherty) 970 (i).
Ritchie, Hon. Mr. Justice, Apptmt. of: Remarks (Mr. Macdonald) 3331 (ii).
Solicitor General, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1816 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 1577 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 546 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 5162 (iii).
Solicitor General, Payment of Salary to Min. of Justice, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 725 (i).
Supreme Court of Canada, Division *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 547 (i).
Tourigny, Mr. Justice, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 3147 (ii).
Juvenile Delinquents Act: *See* 'B. No. 2.'
Keewatin, Pet. *re* Educational Clause: Ques. (Mr. Barrette) 3149 (ii), 4240 (iii).
See 'Man. Boundaries B. 115.'
Keewatin. R. C. Corporation: *See* 'B. No. 69.'
Kelley's Cove Breakwater, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Law) 3340 (ii).
Kelly, Edward, Dismissal from Canso Reduction Works: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 3341 (ii).
Kennedy, Allan, Govt. Telegraph Repairer, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 3757 (ii).
Kennedy, John Rogers, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 164.'
Kennedy, Mr., Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 2020 (ii).
Kennie, Capt., Edmund, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 6782 (iv).
'Kestrel' Fishery Cruiser, Condemnation of: Ques. (Mr. Stevens) 549 (i).
Kettle Valley Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 62.'
Kettle Valley Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 5899, 6220, 6322 (iv).
Kettle Valley Ry. Co.'s Bridge Subsidy: in Com., 6327 (iv).
Kidsons' Island Lighthouse, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. McKenzie) 3054 (ii).

King's Printer, Apptmt. of Assistant: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 1809 (i).
Kingston, R. M. C. Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1855 (i).
Kirouac, Mr., Postmaster at Manseau, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Pacaud) 2579 (ii).
Kootenay and Alberta Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 48.'
Kootenay Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 91.'
Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 5899, 6219 (iv).
La Banque de St. Hyacinthe and La Banque St. Jean, Reimbursements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 528 (i).
See 'Farmers Bank.'
—— Investigation *re* Liquidation: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2069 (ii).
Laberge, Mr., Compensation to Family *re*: Remarks (Mr. Ethier) in Com. of Sup., 6282 (iv).
Labour Conditions in B. C., Emplymt. of Orientals: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) 177 (i).
Labour, Deptl. Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 6615 (iv).
—— Private Secretary: in Com. of Sup., 6615 (iv).
'Labour Gazette' Correspondents, Apptmt. in Richelieu County: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 2292 (ii).
—— Dismissals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 1411 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Verville) on M. for Sup., 1441 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 1468 (i).
—— Names of Apptmts.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 1865 (i).
'Labour Gazette,' Printing and Distribution &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1468 (i).
Labour Strike Funds: *See* 'B. No. 87.'
Lachenaie Postmaster, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 5949 (iv).
L'Achigan Ice Breaker, Tenders *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2294 (ii).
Lachine Canal, Lock Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6611 (iv).
—— Rockfield Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 5790 (iv).
Lachine Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1346 (i), 1952 (ii).
Lacombe, Mr. J. A., Dismissal from St. Sebastien P. O., Inquiry *re*: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 974 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Beland) in Com. of Sup., 6618 (iv).
Lac Seul, Rat Portage and Keewatin Ry Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6217 (iv).
Laforce, Mr. J. E., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Michaud) 3535 (ii).
Laforce, Mr. J. W., Emplymt. as Immigration Agent: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 2242 (ii).
Lake Erie and Northern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6312 (iv).
Lake Temiskaming Dam, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Pugsley) 2459 (ii).
See 'Pub. Works.'
Lake Winnipegosis Fishery, Limitation *re* Catch: Ques. (Mr. Currie) 3055 (ii).
Lalonde, Alfred, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 4779 (iii).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Cardin) 6783 (iv).
Lalonde, Mr. Damien, Rep. *re* Assault: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4255 (iii).
Lanctot Investigation, Counsel Fees *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6486 (iv).
See 'House of Commons..
Land Grants to Railways in Western Provs., prior to 1896: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 725 (i).
Land Scrip, &c., to Veterans: *See* 'B. Nos. 137 & 190.'
Lapointe, Mr. Joseph, Apptmt. as Overseer on Lake Aylmer: Ques. (Mr. Tobin) 4550 (iii).
Laroche, Capt. Leon, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Fortier) 4549 (iii).
Larry's River Dredging, Apptmt. of Inspector: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 5055 (iii).
La Societe National Gymnastique, Grant to: in Com. of Sup., 5811 (iv).
L'Assomption Wharf, Appropriations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2451 (ii), 5951, 6781 (iv).
—— Continuation of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2579 (ii).
Laurentides Public Building, Acquisition of Property: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2451 (ii).
Laurier, Mr. C. A., Immigration Agent at Marquette, Mich.: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 2454 (ii).
Laurier, Mr. R., Immigration Agent at Detroit: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 2454 (ii).
Lauzon, Desire, Emplymt. by Govt., References as to Character: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 3538 (ii).
Lavergne, Capt. Armand, Apptmt. *re* Capt. 61st Regiment: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 723 (i).
Lavoie, Mr. Absolon, Inquiry *re* Death on I. C.R.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boulay) 4263 (iii).
Lavoie, Mr. Calixte, Postmaster, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Brouillard) 3339 (ii).
Lawlor's Island Quarantine Station: in Com. of Sup., 1341, 1531 (i).
—— Memorials, *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2460 (ii).
Leaitch, Alvena Bell, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 142.'
Lebel, Mr. W., Dismissal from Customs: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 1864 (i).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 3756 (ii).
'Le Devoir,' Quotations from: Ques. of Order (Mr. Blondin) 371; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 372 (i).

Legault, Mr. Ophir, Postmaster at L'Ile Perrot, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 5950 (iv).
Legislation, Joint Com.: M. (Mr. Borden) 2217 (ii).
Leigh, Mr. W. M., Dismissal from Kirkton Post Office: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 5949 (iv).
Lemieux, Hon. Mr., Ex. P.M.G., Par in 'Le Devoir' *re* Dismissals: Ques. (Mr. Bellemare) 2664 (ii).
——— Ques. Ruled out (Mr. Speaker) 2580 (ii).
Lemieux, Mr., Relatives appointed to Govt. Service: List read (Mr. Boulay) in Com. of Sup., 6297 (iv).
Lepage, M. J., Preventive Officer, Rimouski, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4458 (iii).
Leroux, Mr., Soulanges Canal, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 6183 (iii).
Letellier, Judge Blaise, Residence *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lavallee) 3150 (ii).
Lethbridge Armoury, Plans, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Buchanan) 729 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Buchanan) in Com. of Sup., 2210 (ii).
Lethbridge Post Office, Plans, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Buchanan) 728 (i).
Lethbridge Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2212 (ii).
Level Ry. Crossings: *See* 'B. No. 5.'
L'Evenement Publishing Co., Minister acting as Director: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 1813 (i).
Levis Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 1346 (i).
Levis Dry Dock: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Beland) 6492 (iv).
Levis Graving Dock, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3295 (ii).
Library Committee: M. (Mr. Borden) 795 (i).
Library, House of Commons, Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1950 (ii).
Library of Parlt., Report Presented (Mr. Borden) 11 (i).
Life Saving Awards: in Com. of Sup., 5228 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service, Inspectors Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5232 (iii).
Lighthouses, Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5237 (iii).
Lighthouse Keepers at Repentigny, Charges *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 3752 (ii), 5949 (iv).
Lighthouse Keepers, Dismissal, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 6650 (iv).
Lightkeepers in N.S., Investigation *re* Charges: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 5233 (iii).
Lightkeepers in P.E.I., Investigation *re* Charges: Remarks (Mr. J. J. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 5232 (iii).
Linwood and Grosvenor Mail Service: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 6281 (iv).
Little Anse Harbour Improvements: Remarks (Mr. Kyte) in Com. of Sup., 2043 (ii).
Liverpool-Manitoba Assurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 13.'
Live Stock Industry: in Com. of Sup., 6469 (iv).
Live Stock, Inspection *re* Shipping: in Com. of Sup., 5229 (iii).
Live Stock Record Assns.: *See* 'B. No. 167.'
Living, Cost of, Special Rep.: Presented (Mr. Crothers) 6332 (iv).
Lizotte, Luc., Postmaster at Pacome, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 3756 (ii).
Lobster Fishing Season in St. John, Date of Opening: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 722 (i).
Lobster Hatchery: in Com. of Sup., 5256 (iii).
Lobster Traps, Twine, Customs Changes in Tariff: on M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) for Papers, 1362 (i).
——— on M. for Sup. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1070 (i).
See 'Fisheries.'
Locas, Mr. Henri, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 3338 (ii).
Locomotives manufactured at Moncton I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5607 (iv).
——— Renewing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Boulay) in Com. of Sup., 5655 (iv).
Logs, Stealing of: *See* 'B. No. 9.'
Londonderry Postmaster, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 6337 (iv).
London, Eng., Dom. Building: in Com. of Sup., 6655 (iv).
See 'Can. Offices.'
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal, Settlement *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 269 (i).
Lords Day Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 85.'
Lorneville Breakwater, N.B. Tests *re* Foundation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 555 (i).
Lotbiniere County Postmasters, Dismissal, Number, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fortier) 972 (i).
Louiseville Public Building: Conc., 6794 (iv).
Lowe, Robt. S., Emplymt. by Public Works Dept., Leave of Absence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Davidson) 3754 (ii).
Loyal Order of Moose: *See* 'B. No. 158.'
Lumber Duties, Inspection *re*, Report in Winnipeg 'Free Press': Ques. (Mr. Turriff) 2446 (ii).
——— Interpretaion and Enforcement: M. for Papers (Mr. Knowles) 582 (i).

Lumber Duties, Violation of Customs Act: Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 1723 (i); Neg. (Y. 62; N. 107) 1806 (i).
Lumber, Stealing of: *See* 'B. No. 9.'
Lunenburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1343 (i).
McAdam, Alex. R., Fishery Officer at Antigonish, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) 3343 (ii).
McAllister, Mr., Moving Expenses: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. of Sup., 6596 (iv).
McAuley, Angus, Claims for Damages *re* Fire Investigation: M. for Rep.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3756 (ii).
McDonald, Dr. D., Dismissal from Indian Reserve, Baddeck: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McKenzie) 2861 (ii).
McDougall, J. M., Counsel Fees *re* Lanctot Investigation: in Com. of Sup., 6486 (iv).
See 'Lanctot.'
McEachren, Mr. Charles, Dismissal from Tatamagouche Post Office: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2243 (ii).
McFarlane, J. D., Postmaster at Southwest Margaree, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 3756 (ii).
McGrath, James, Postmaster at Aspen, N.S.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 2587 (ii).
McIssac, Colin, Preventive Officer at Port Hood, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 5956 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 5816 (iv).
McLean, Donald E., Dismissal, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 4980 (iii).
McLean, W. D., Dismissal from Customs at L'Etang: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 4780 (iii).
McLennan, Mr., Dismissal from Inverness Public Building: Remarks (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 2017 (ii).
McLeod, John, Dismissal as Postmaster at Denmark, N.S.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Macdonald) 4460 (iii).
McLeod, Dr. J. R., Dismissal from Port Hawkesbury, Charges *re*: M. for Papers* (Mr. Kyte) 3945 (ii).
McPhee, James, Customs Officer, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 3757 (ii).
McPherson, John H., Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4259 (iii).
McRae, Mr. F. D., Pets. *re* Clemency: Ques. (Mr. McMillan) 713 (i).
Madeleine de Verchères Monument, Erection of: in Com. of Sup., 2824 (ii).
Mader, Mr. D., Dismissal from Mahone Bay P.O.: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 722 (i).
Madore, Alphonse, Claims for Damages in I. C. Ry.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 3055 (ii).
Magdalen Island Dredging, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 3277 (ii).
Magdalen Island Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 4730 (iii).
Magdalen Islands Marconi News Service, Copy of Instructions: M. for Papers* (Mr. Lemieux) 4459 (iii).
——— Par. in Toronto 'News' *re*: Read (Mr. Lemieux) 4159 (iii).
——— Remarks, 3833 (ii).
——— Salary of Correspondent: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4262 (iii).
——— Statement (Mr. Hazen) 4041 (iii).
Magdalen Island Telegraph and Telephone: in Com. of Sup., 3302 (ii).
Mahone Bay and Tancook Island Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 4733 (iii).
Mail Bags Repairs, Names of Firms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4777 (iii).
Mail Carriers, Como to Oka, Compensation to Family: Remarks (Mr. Ethier) in Com. of Sup., 6282 (iv).
Mail Clerks, Salary Increases: *See* 'B. No. 105.'
Mail Contracts, Cancellation of: in Com. of Sup., 6620 (iv).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lemieux) 2460 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lemieux) 5693 (iv).
Mail Service: in Com. of Sup., 6281 (iv).
Mail Service between G.B. and Canada, Letter of Board of Trade, Quebec: Read (Mr. Lemieux) 1843 (i).
See 'Can. and G.B.,' 'Fast Atlantic,' 'Post Office,' &c.
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 640 (i), 4714 (iii), 5934 (iv).
Maisonneuve Postal Station, Erection of: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 550 (i).
Maisonneuve Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1347 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries, Discussion *re* Man. School Question: Ques. (Mr. Nesbitt) 534 (i).
——— Conference *re* Separate Schools: Ques. (Mr. Molloy) 715 (i).
——— Cor., &c., *re* Settlement with Provs. of Man. and Ont.: M. for Papers (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 774, 789 (i).
——— Eastern and Western Line: Ques. (Mr. Molloy) 971 (i).
Man. Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) Res. prop., 3538; in Com. on Res., 3835, 3886; 1°* of B., 3898 (ii); 2° m., 4263, 4353; Amt. (Sir W. Laurier) 6 m. h., 4375, Neg. (Y. 65; N. 103) 4395; 2°, rsmd., 4397, 4461; agreed to (Y. 114; N. 76) 4495; in Com., 4496, 4584, 4656, 4701, 4836; 3° m., 4838; Amt. (Mr. Mondou) Separate Schools, 4839, Neg. (Y. 24; N. 160) 4925; Amt. (Mr. Béland) 4934, Neg. (Y. 52; N. 108) 4973; 3° agreed to, 4974 (iii).

Manitoba Boundaries, Eastern Extension: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) *re* Form of Ques., 3936; Ans. (Mr. Borden) 3936-7 (ii).
——— Answer to Question: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 3755 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Cor. with Ont. Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Meighen) 2459 (ii).
——— Extension of, Par. in 'Montreal Star': Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 489 (i).
——— Financial Terms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Oliver) 558 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Oliver) 3448, 3834 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Turriff) 1820 (i).
——— Swamp Lands, Acreage, &c.: Inquiry for Stmnt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3751 (ii).
——— Terms *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 716 (i).
Man. Grain Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 96.'
See 'Grain B. 32.'
Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 92.'
Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6314 (iv).
Man. and N.S. Federal Subsidies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4258 (iii).
Manitoba Questions: Remarks *re* Answers (Mr. Nesbitt) 581 (i).
See 'Man. Boundaries B. 115.'
Man. Separate School Bill: Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Monk) 226, 231 (i).
Maple Sugar, Cancellation of O. C. *re* Standards: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 716 (i).
Marcil, Mr. Tancrède, Application *re* Govt. Position: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 2069 (ii).
Marconi Co., Negotiations *re* Wireless Messages to all Dominions: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2585 (ii).
See 'Magdalen.'
Marieville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1348 (i).
MARINE:
'Aboukir' Cruiser, Paying off of Crew: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 408 (i).
——— Stmnt. (Mr. Hazen) 489 (i).
Adams, Mr., Resignation as Examiner of Pilots: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 5227 (iii).
Aids to Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 5236 (iii).
'Arctic' Steamship, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5398 (iii).
Atlantic Coast Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 5399 (iii).
Biological Board, Names, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4257 (iii).
Bird Rocks Lighthouse, Drowning of Keeper: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 5258 (iii).
Coal for Govt. Steamers, Average Cost per Ton, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pardee) 1203 (i).
Coasting Trade, O.C., Extending Time: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1814 (i).
——— Foreign Shipping, Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Kyte) 2861 (ii).
'Earl Grey' and 'Minto' Govt. Steamers, Names of Employees: M. for Ret.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1816 (i).
Fisheries Contracts with Stewards on Cruisers: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 681 (i).
Gaspé Basin Marine Agency, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 878 (i).
——— Deptl. Inquiry, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1358 (i).
Govt. Dredges and Tugs, Instructions *re* Appointments: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 5952 (iv).
Govt. Steamers, B.C., Use for Political Purposes: Ques. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5262 (iii).
Govt. Steamers, Building, &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 1964 (i).
——— Repairs, Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5186, 5207 (iii).
Ice-breaker at St. Gerard, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2451 (ii).
Insurance of Canadian Marine, Govt. Co-operation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1582 (i).
Kidson's Island Lighthouse, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. McKenzie) 3054 (ii).
L'Achigan Ice Breaker, Tenders *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2294 (ii).
Life Saving Awards: in Com. of Sup., 5228 (iii).
Lighthouses, Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5237 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service, Inspectors Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5232 (iii).
Lighthouse Keepers, Pensions to: in Com. of Sup., 5236 (iii).
Live Stock Inspection *re* Shipping: in Com. of Sup., 5229 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1041 (i), 6651 (iv).
Marine Hospitals: in Com. of Sup., 5238 (iii).
——— Ships for Fishermen: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) 6787 (iv).
Marine Workshops at Quebec, Instructions *re* Closing: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 579 (i).
'Minto,' Apptmt. of Pilot, Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 876 (i).
Montreal Harbour, National and Free Port: Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 554 (i).

Naval Ships, Construction of, Rep. of Admiral Kingsmill: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lemieux) 2459 (ii).
See 'Navy.'
Ocean and River Service: in Com. of Sup., 5186, 5207 (iii).
Patrol Vessels in Northern Waters: in Com. of Sup., 5231 (iii).
Pictou Winter Steamers, Amounts paid to: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 5949 (iv).
Radiotelegraphic Service, Wireless Stations: in Com. of Sup., 5399 (ii).
Registration of Shipping: in Com. of Sup., 5229 (iii).
Repentigny Lighthouse Keepers, Charges *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 3752 (ii), 5949 (iv).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Seguin) 6784 (iv).
St. Lawrence Channel, Ice-breaker: Ques. (Mr. Bellemare) 5680 (iv).
St. Patrick's Channel Lighthouse: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 5238 (iii).
Schools of Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 5229 (iii).
Sorel Marine Yards, Inquiry *re* Administration: Ques. (Mr. Barrette) 974 (i).
Steamboat Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 5238 (iii).
Steamboat Inspection Report: Presented (Mr. Hazen) 1571 (i).
Tidal Service, Surveying Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 5400 (iii).
Vickers-Maxim Co.'s Contract *re* Construction of Montreal Dry Dock: Ques. (Mr. Sevigny) 2450 (ii).
Wireless Stations: in Com. of Sup., 5399 (iii).
Wrecks Investigations: in Com. of Sup., 5229 (iii).
Maritime Law International Conference, Invitation to Govt. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 2586 (ii).
Mar. Provs. Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 2816 (ii).
Mar. Provs. Immigration Policy: Prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2072 (ii).
Maritime Telephone Co. and P. E. I. Connection: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 3303 (ii).
'Market Tickets' to I. C. R. Employees: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 5809 (iv).
Marlin, Mrs. A. S., Postmistress, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 3753 (ii).
Marriage Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 3.'
Marriage Act Amt., Decision of Privy Council: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 2855 (ii).
——— Ref. to Privy Council, Provl. Representation: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 3755 (ii).
Marriage Act Amt., Ref. to Supreme Court, 3332 (ii).
——— Correction in Speech (Mr. Pelletier) 3532 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lennox) *re* Order for 2°, 582 (i).
Marriages in Canada, Power of Dom. Govt. *re* Legalization: Ques. (Mr. Boivin) 575 (i).
Marriage Law, Cor. with Federal Govt. *re* Legislation: M. for copies* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3341 (ii).
——— Cor. with Prime Minister *re* Legislation: M. for copy* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2861 (ii).
——— Par. in Toronto 'Star': Ques. (Mr. Burnham): Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3942 (ii).
——— Pet. *re* Dom. Legislation: Ques. (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 528 (i).
——— Ref. to Supreme Court: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 3332 (ii).
Marriage Question *re* Catholic Hierarchy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 573 (i).
See 'Ne Temere.'
Maskinonge Election Expenses, Settlement of: Ques. (Mr. Bellemare) 4776 (iii).
Masters and Mates Certificates: *See* 'B. No. 143.'
Matapedia to Gaspe Basin Line, I. C. Ry., Inspection *re* Subsidy: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 4194 (iii).
Matapedia Water Works Co., Claims against I. C. Ry.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boulay) 4263 (iii).
Matheson, Jas. W., Charges *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 5263 (iii).
Matte, Arthur J., Postmaster at Montauban, Dismissal of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Delisle) 5957 (iii).
Medical Attendance, Free for Fishermen: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 680 (i).
Medical Director General, Apptmt., &c., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bellemare) 2667 (ii).
Melford Wharf Construction: in Com. of Sup., 2056 (ii).
——— Notice to suspend work: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 549 (i).
Members Indemnity: *See* 'B. No. 75.'
Members Travelling Allowances during Adjournments: Remarks (Mr. Knowles) 1848 (i).
Meredith, Hon. Sir William, Application *re* Leave of Absence: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 5954 (iv).
See 'Farmers Bank.'
Mess. from His Royal Highness, Estimates 1911-12: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 525, 971 (i), 4974 (iii), 6154 (iv).
Methodist Church: *See* 'B. No. 133.'
Methot, D., Apptmt. on Soulanges Canal: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4255 (iii).

Mexican Interurban Electric Ry. Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 132.'
Mexico Northwestern Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 159.'
Michaud, Mr. E., Dismissal from P. O. at St. Germain: M. for Cor. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 1592 (i).
Michaud, Mr. J., Postmaster at St. Moise Station, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 1864 (i).
Midland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1855 (i).
Militia Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 171.'
MILITIA:
Airships for Military Purposes, Purchases by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 533 (i).
Aldershot Rifle Range, Caretaker, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 3536 (ii).
Allowances in Com. of Sup., 5447 (iii).
Annual Drill: in Com. of Sup., 5452 (iii).
Armouries: in Com. of Sup., 5541 (iii).
Armouries and Public Buildings, Militia: in Com. of Sup., 620 (i).
Arsenal at Quebec, Payment to Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 579 (i).
Automobiles purchased for Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5492 (iii).
Bands, and Association Grants, *re* Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5528 (iii); 6653 (iv).
Battlefields Commission: M. (Mr. White) to strike out vote, 5299 (iii).
Cadet Corps, Drill: in Com. of Sup., 5452 (iii).
Camps for Militia Training: in Com. of Sup., 5521 (iii).
Caretakers for Militia, Wages, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5546 (iii).
Civil Engineers, Recall from Quebec: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 580 (i).
Clothing for Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5521 (iii).
Customs Dues *re* Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5522 (iii).
Drill Halls in the West, Donation of Lands *re* Sites: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 1815 (i).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Land Grant, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boivin) 3334 (ii).
See main heading.
Headquarters Staff: in Com. of Sup., 5536 (iii).
Kingston, R.M.C. Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1855 (i).
Lavergne, Capt. Armand, Apptmt. *re* Capt. of 61st Regiment: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 723 (i).
Military Conference, Invitations *re* Canon Dauth, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 552 (i).
Militia Council Rep. (presented) 2668 (ii).
MILITIA—*Con.*
Militia, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1037 (i).
Military Stores Building, Contract *re* Racks: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 532 (i).
Military Touring Cars, Order to Ford Motor Co.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 4040 (iii).
See 'Automobiles.'
Montreal Military School, Site *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4040 (iii).
National Battlefields Report: Presented (Mr. W. T. White) 565 (i).
National Rifle Association, Rules *re* Competition at Bisley: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3730 (ii).
Ordnances: in Com. of Sup., 6653 (iv).
Papal Zouaves, Investigation *re* Reception to Papal Legate: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 578 (i).
Properties: in Com. of Sup., 5539 (iii).
Regiments of Foreign born Citizens, Organization of: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 534 (i).
Rifle Associations and Bands: in Com. of Sup., 5528 (iii); 6653 (iv).
Rockliffe Rifle Ranges: in Com. of Sup., 6654 (iv).
—— Acquisition of Additional Land: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 533 (i).
Rosignol, Major J. E., Qualifications *re* Commandant of 61st Regiment: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 723 (i).
Schools of Instruction for Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5546 (iii).
S.A. Bounty Scrip, Delay in Distribution, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Knowles) 3153 (ii).
Veterans of 1866-7, Bounties to: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1202 (i).
Mines, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1066 (i).
—— Ore Deposits, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6490, 6602 (iv).
—— Reports, French Translation: in Com. of Sup., 6490 (iv).
Mining Rights Administration, O.C. Resolution: Remarks (Mr. Rogers) 6792 (iv).
Ministers from Quebec, Statements at St. Eustache Election Campaign: Ques. (Mr. M. Martin) 553 (i).
See 'Cabinet.'
'Minto,' Apptmt. of Pilot, Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 876 (i).
Molson, Kenneth, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 110.'
Moncton Ry. Office, Fittings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6604 (iv).
—— Shops, I.C.R., Contract for Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5611 (iv).
See 'I.C.R.'
—— Tenders *re*: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Emmerson) 5762 (iv).

Moncton Shop, I.C.R., Operation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5604 (iv).
—— Shops, Transfer to Fraserville: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 544 (i).
Monday Sittings, Precedence of Govt. Business: M. (Mr. Borden) 2376 (ii).
Montcalm Postmaster, Pets. *re* Removal: Ques. (Mr. Lafortune) 575 (i).
Montpetit, Dr. E., Pet. sent to P.M.G. *re* Dismissal of William Brown: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4977 (iii).
See 'Dismissals.'
Montreal Athletic Association at Nancy, Pet. *re* Govt. Aid: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 1722 (i).
Montreal Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 1350 (i).
Montreal Circuit Court Judges, Additional: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2855 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 3907 (ii).
Montreal Circuit Court Judges, Additional Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6597 (iv).
See 'Justice.'
Montreal Customs Appraiser Building: in Com. of Sup., 1351 (i).
Montreal Customs House, Dismissals: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4040 (iii).
Montreal Dry Dock, Contract *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 3301 (ii); 6652 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Commission: *See* 'B. Nos. 97 and 150.'
Montreal Central Terminal Co.: *See* 'B. Nos. 49 and 191.'
Montreal Harbour Commission, Apptmt. of Accountants *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 6661 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Delegations *re* from Corn Exchange, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2069 (ii).
—— Dismissal of Mr. J. A. Masse: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3943 (ii).
—— Dismissals, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 1708, 1960 (i), 2057 (ii), 6551 (iv).
Montreal Harbour, National and Free Port: Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 554 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Res. from Board of Trade *re* Dismissals: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1812 (i).
—— Retention of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2062 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Total Debt, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1357 (i).
Montreal Harbour Officials, Apptmt. of, Promotions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 3944 (ii).
Montreal Judiciary, *re* Increase of Judges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 545 (i).
See 'Justice.'
Montreal Longshoremen's Strike, Settlement of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 572 (i).
Montreal Military School, Site *re* &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4040 (iii).
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal: *See* 'B. No. 30.'
Montreal Postal Station F.: in Com. of Sup., 1352 (i).
Montreal Post Office Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 1348 (i).
Montreal Terminal Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. Nos. 24 and 194.'
Montreal Transcl. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 128.'
See 'Can. Northern.'
Moose to Drulingville Loop Tel. Line: in Com. of Sup., 2820 (ii).
Moosejaw Armoury Site, Cor., &c.: Read (Mr. Knowles) 3972 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Knowles) in Com. of Sup., 2040, 2206 (ii).
Moosejaw Post Office, Names and Locations: Ques. (Mr. Knowles) 976 (i).
Moosejaw District, Proposed Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Knowles) 3342 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Knowles) 4237 (iii).
Moosejaw P.O. Inspector, Pets. *re* Apptmt.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Knowles) 1590 (i).
Moosejaw Post Office Inspector: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Knowles) 4981 (iii).
—— Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 4982 (iii).
Moosejaw Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Knowles) in Com. of Sup., 2439 (ii).
—— Tender of McDiarmid Co., Limited: M. for Copy* (Mr. Knowles) 562 (i).
Moose, Loyal Order of: *See* 'B. No. 158.'
Monuments, Erection of, Sites, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2823 (ii).
Moreau, Mr. Jos., Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 1818 (i).
Morice, Théophile, Dismissal from I.C.R.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Gauvreau) 4262 (iii).
Morine, Mr. A. B., Charges *re* as Public Commissioner: Remarks (Mr. Carvell) on M. for Sup., 6528 (iv).
—— Letter to Prime Minister *re*: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 6185 (iii).
—— Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 6185 (iv).
—— Correction *re* Ruling on Question (Mr. Speaker) 6335 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 6335 (iv).
See 'Dismissals.'
Morin, Mr. Theo., Reinstatement of: Remarks (Mr. Gauvreau) in Com. of Sup., 5654 (iv).
Mosher, Mr. G. A., Preventive Officer at Ship Harbour, Dismissal, &c.: Ques (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4039 (iii).
Mounted Police, Annuities to Families of Messrs. Fitzgerald, &c.: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 5176 (iii).
—— Pay of Force: in Com. of Sup., 5175 (iii).

Mounted Police, Pensions: in Com. of Sup., 6485 (iv).
See 'N. W. Mounted Police.'
Mount Oscar Postmaster, Dismissal of I. Chevrier: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4780 (iii).
Mulgrave Highway Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 4225 (iii).
Mullaly, Mr., Emplymt. in P. O. Dept., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Power) 1583 (i).
Mundle, D. I., Dismissal as sub-Collector at Richibucto, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 4780 (iii).
Municipal Elections and Civil Servants: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 1813 (i).
Murray Canal, Levelling High Spots: in Com. of Sup., 5798 (iv).
Murray, J. P., Carpet Co., Breach of Immigration Regulations: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 550 (i).
Murray, Dr., Poaching for Salmon on East River, N.S.: Remarks (Mr. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 5242 (iii).
Musicians Holiday on Sunday: *See* 'B. No. 85.'

Naas and Skeena River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6321 (iv).
Napierville Post Office Site, Agreement, Instructions, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lanctot) 3153; Members remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 3153 (ii).
——— Payment to Mr. Bourgeois: Remarks Mr. Lanctot) on M. for Sup., 2373 (ii).
Napierville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1354 (i).
——— Purchase of Site: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lanctot) 5263 (iii).
National Art Gallery, Ownership of Painting: Ques. (Mr. Burnham) 6337 (iv).
——— Paintings, &c., purchased since 1891: Ques. (Mr. Burnham) 6184 (iii).
——— Presentation of Oil Painting by H. R. H. Princess Louise: Announcement (Mr. Monk) 5056 (iii).
See 'Art Gallery.'
National Battlefields Report: Presented (Mr. W. T. White) 565 (i).
National Ports: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 2837 (ii).
National Rifle Association, Rules *re* Competition at Bisley: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3730 (ii).
Natl. Transcl. Ry., Implementing Privy Council Judgment: *See* 'B. No. 95.'
Natl. Transcl. Ry. Time Extension: *See* "B. No. 21.'
N. T. Ry. Bill 95, Factums *re*: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2589 (ii).
Natl. Transcl. Ry. Commissioners, Reduction of Number: *See* 'B. No. 76.'

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY:
Claims for Damages in Dorchester County, Amounts paid: Ques. (Mr. Sevigny) 6184 (iv).
Commission, Apptmt. of Mr. R. W. Leonard: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. Emmerson) 2246 (ii).
——— Duties assigned to New Chairman: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 533 (i).
——— Notification of Dismissal: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 1196 (i).
——— Resignation of: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 1199 (i).
Commission, Payments to Mr. E. Taschereau: Ques. (Mr. Sevigny) 2244 (ii).
Commission, Payments to Taschereau, Cannon & Co.: Ques. (Mr. Sevigny) 2245 (ii).
Construction: in Com. of Sup., 5765 (iv).
Doucet, Mr. A. E., Cor. *re* Ry. Station Sites: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lavallee) 2460 (ii).
——— Position on N. T. Ry.: Ques. (Mr. Lavalee) 2245 (ii).
Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Graham) 6732 (iv).
——— Stmnt. re: Ans. (Mr. Cochrane) 6733 (iv).
Goulet, Mr., Apptmt. as Station Inspector, Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 3935 (ii).
Gutelius, Mr. F. P., Apptmt. to N. T. Ry. Board, British Subject, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 4038 (iii).
——— Naturalization of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 4978 (iii).
———Improper form of Question: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3934 (ii).
Investigation Commission, Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2157 (ii).
——— Apptmt., Salaries of Messrs. Gutelius and Lynch Staunton: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 4242 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2060 (ii).
Moncton to Levis, Portion uncompleted: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 932 (i).
——— Completion &c., Operation by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 723 (i).
Montreal Branch Lines, Cor., O. Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. L. A. Lapointe) 582 (i).
——— Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 554 (i).
——— Pet. *re* Subsidy to: Ques. (Mr. L. A. Lapointe) 573 (i).
Montreal Branch Subsidy: in Com., 5896, 6215 (iv).
N. T. Ry. (implementing) Bill 95, Factums *re*: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2589 (ii)

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

Parent, Hon. S. N., Resignation of: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 578 (i).

Repair Shops, Erection at Quebec and Winnipeg: Ques. (Mr. Burnham) 4977 (iii).

St. Damien Station, Change in Plans: Ques. (Mr. Lavallee) 3532 (ii).

Station at Quebec, Contract *re* Building: M. for Cor. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 755 (i).

——— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6786 (iv).

Naturalization Legislation, Uniformity in: M. for Cor. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 765 (i).

Naturalization: *See* 'Imperial.'

Natural Resources: *See* 'Provl. Control.'

Naval Bill Repeal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Mondou) 4242 (iii).

——— Discussion *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lamarche) 4239 (iii).

Naval Cadets, Employmt. by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Gauvreau) 6786 (iv).

Naval Defence of the Pacific Coast, Res. from B. C. Legislature, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 559 (i), 4458 (iii).

Naval Defences: Remark on debate on Address (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 42 (i).

Naval Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1062 (i).

Naval Discipline Act, Application to Canada: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1203 (i).

Naval Policy, Interview with Hon. G. H. Perley in London: Remarks (Mr. Murphy) 1576 (i).

Naval Policy of Govt.: Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Borden) 58; (Mr. Monk) 234 (i); (Mr. Lemieux) 250; (Mr. Mondou) 270; (Mr. Northrup) 357; (Mr. Sinclair) 331; (Mr. Stevens) 291.

——— Promise *re* Referendum: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 526 (i).

——— Speech of Hon. Mr. Monk at Hull: Ques. (Mr. Devlin) 551 (i).

——— Repeal of: Ques. (Mr. Mondou) 3942; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3943 (ii).

Naval Service, Cor. between Can. and G. B.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lemieux) 562 (i).

Naval Service in Canada, Report: Presented (Mr. Hazen) 970 (i).

——— Maintenance, Purchase of Ships, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5303 (iii).

——— Minister's Visit to England *re*: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 938 (i).

——— O. C. *re* Instructions, Circulars issued &c.: Ques. (Mr. Devlin) 2065 (ii).

——— Tenders *re* Shipbuilding, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carroll) 558 (i).

Naval Ships, Construction of, Rep. of Admiral Kingsmill: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lemieux) 2459 (i).

See 'Can. Navy.'

——— Ref. of Min. of Marine *re* Completion: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 1206 (i).

See 'Niobe.'

Navigable Waters, Pollution of: *See* 'B. No. 107.'

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 64.'

New Glasgow to Thorburn Ry. Co.'s Lease, &c., Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 933 (i).

Negro Immigration: Remarks on Immigration Question (Mr. Thoburn) 608 (i).

Ne Temere Decree, Powers of Parlt.: Remarks *re* Answer to Question (Mr. Pugsley) 797 (i).

Ne Temere Decree, Questions asked by the late Govt. Concurrence by present Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 719 (i).

——— Members remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 720 (i).

——— Stmnt. by Member for Peterborough: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 731 (i).

Ne Temere Decree: *See* 'B. No. 3,' 'Marriage,' &c.

Neuville and C.N.Ry. Station Mail Contract, Cancellation of: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 2067 (ii).

Newcombe, Mr., Expenses &c.: *See* 'Justice—Dep. Min.'

New Harbour Breakwater: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 2044 (ii).

Newmarket Canal, Commission *re* Investigation: Remarks (Mr. J. A. M. Armstrong) 1319 (i).

——— Meeting at Newmarket: Par. in Press (Mr. Emmerson) 3057 (ii).

Newspaper Articles, Reading *re* Questions: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3059 (ii).

Newspapers, Postage *re* Dom. Elections Campaign: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 1589 (i).

New Waterford Mail Service, Change *re*: Remarks (Mr. Carroll) in Com. of Sup., 6294, 6630 (iv).

Nicolet and St. Monique Mail Contract, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 724 (i).

'Niobe' and 'Rainbow,' Contract *re* Provisioning: Ques. (Mr. Devlin) 2859 (ii).

——— Sale of: Ques. (Mr. Devlin) 2859 (ii).

——— Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 577 (i).

See 'Naval.'

North Arm Bridge and Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 14.'

North Atlantic Trading Co.: Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Verville) 279 (i).

North Battleford Tel. Lines: in Com. of Sup., 2822 (ii).
North Battleford to Isle la Crosse Tel. Line: in Com. of Sup., 2822 (ii).
Northern, N.B. and Seaboard Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6229 (iv).
Northern Colonization Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 45.'
Northern Territorial Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 82.'
North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6234 (iv).
North Sydney, I.C.R., Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 5610 (iv).
North Sydney Harbour Improvements: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 5223 (iii).
North Sydney Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 678 (i).
N.W. Mounted Police, Increase *re* Pay: Remarks (Mr. W. M. Martin) 4743 (iii).
—— Police Report: Presented (Mr. Borden) 971 (i).
See 'Mounted Police.'
Northwest Territories, Administration of Justice: in Com. of Sup., 6565 (iv).
Northumberland County Mail Service, Contract *re*: Ques. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6186 (iv).
Notes, Printing of Govt.: *See* 'Dom. Notes.'
Notre Dame des Anges Postmaster, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 554 (i).
Nursery Stock, Purchase of for Experimental Farm, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3333 (ii).
Oaths of Office: *See* 'B. No. 1.'
O'Brien, A. J., Dismissal from Immigration Office at Halifax: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 717 (i).
Ocean and River Service: in Com. of Sup., 5186, 5207 (iii).
'Ocean Limited,' Instructions *re* Transportation of Private Cars: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 2241 (ii).
—— on conc., 6774 (iv).
Old Age Pensions: on M. (Mr. Burnham) 1362, 1822 (i).
Old Age Pensions: M. for Special Com., (Mr. Borden) 2217 (ii).
O'Leary to West Point, Ry. Branch Lines, Construction *re*: Ques. (Mr. Richards) 721 (i).
Olympic Games, Aid to: in Com. of Sup., 6486 (iv).
Ont. Boundaries Extension: *See* 'B. No. 152.'
Ontario Boundaries, Extension: M. for Cor.* (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1590 (i).
See 'Boundaries.'
Ont., Grant to *re* T. & N. O. Ry.: *See* 'B. No. 186.'
Ontario and Minnesota Pulp and Paper Co. Grinding Machines: Remarks (Mr. Turriff) 2060 (ii).
Ont. and Ottawa Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 50.'
Orangedale to Cheticamp Ry., Construction: Remarks (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 4226 (iii).
Ore Deposits, Investigation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6490, 6602 (iv).
Oriental Immigration, Total Number: Ques. (Mr. Stevens) 4779 (iii).
See 'Immigration.'
Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 161.'
Ottawa Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1321 (i).
—— Caretakers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3293
—— Electric Power, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3286 (ii).
—— Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3278 (ii).
—— Plumbing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1855 (i).
—— Rentals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1324 (i); 3290 (ii).
—— Water Supply: in Com. of Sup., 3294 (ii).
See 'Pub. Works.'
Ottawa City Estimates: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 3235 (ii).
Ottawa County Superior Court, Additional Judge: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 4121 (iii).
Ottawa Dismissals, Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 3262 (ii).
Ottawa Examining Warehouse, Site, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1949 (i).
Ottawa Exhibition Grant, 6479 (iv).
Ottawa Federal District, Referendum *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1356 (i).
Ottawa Grounds: in Com. of Sup., 3239 (ii).
Ottawa Improvement Commission and Architects Association *re*: M. for Papers (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 977 (i).
Ottawa Improvement Commission, Minutes of Meetings, Amounts expended: M. for Ret.* (Mr. W. H. Bennett) 1588 (i).
—— Report: Presented (Mr. W. T. White) 565 (i).
Ottawa and Lake McGregor Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. Nos. 139 and 192.'
Ottawa, Montreal and Eastern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 99.'
Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 25.'
Ottawa Observatory: in Com. of Sup., 1321 (i).
Ottawa, Plaza, Fences and Posters, Responsibility *re*: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 876 (i).

Ottawa, Site for new Deptl. Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3242 (ii).
—— Snow Cleaning, Rideau Hall, &c.; in Com. of Sup., 3279 (ii).
Ottawa River Bridges: Conc., 6806 (iv).
Ottawa and Ungava Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 61.'
Oyster Culture: *See* 'B. No. 140.'
Oyster Culture: in Com. of Sup.. 5255 (iii).
Oyster Pond Preventive Officer, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1207 (i).
Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 51.'
Pacific Trans. Can. and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 52.'
Panama Canal, Tolls, &c., Reps. of U.S. Papers: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) 2446 (ii).
Papal Zouaves, Investigation *re* Reception to Papal Legate: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 578 (i).
Parcel Post Convention between Canada and France, Signature *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 569 (i).
—— M. (Mr. Lemieux) for Papers, 1396 (i).
Parcel Post Extension of System: Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 2329 (ii).
Parcel Post Rates to European Countries: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4776 (iii).
Parcel Post and Rural Mail System, on M. for Sup. (Mr. J. E. Armstrong) 4082 (iii).
See 'Rural,' 'Post Office.'
Parent, Hon. S. N., Resignation of: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 578 (i).
Paris Agency, Compensation to Mrs. Fabre: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 6614 (iv).
Paris Exposition, Payments for Space: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Paquet) 582 (i).
Pariseau, Mr. S. B., Emplymt. by Ry. Dept. and Cedar Rapids Co.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 973 (i).
Parliamentary Documents, Distribution: in Com. of Sup., 6613 (iv).
Parliament, Duration of Present and Redistribution Bill: Stmnt. by Hon. Mr. Taylor: Ques. (Mr. Molloy) 557, 715 (i).
See 'Taylor, Hon. Geo.'
Parliament, Opening of, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 6 (i).
Parliamentary Restaurant, Payments to Waiters: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 2861 (ii).
See 'House of Commons.'
Patent Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 59.'
Patent Relief: *See* 'B. Nos. 16, 53, 55, 70, 84 and 119.'
Patrol Vessels in Northern Waters: in Com. of Sup., 5231 (iii).
Patronage Committee, Montreal, Recommendations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 1866 (i).
See 'Montreal Harbour Commission.'
Payson, Mr. W. W., Dismissal from Deep Brook Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 2243 (ii).
Peace Memorial Monument in Queen's Park, Toronto, Action of Govt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. German) 2590 (ii).
Peace River Block, Water Rights: *See* 'B. No. 149.'
Peace River Tel. Line, Building, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2821 (ii).
Peat Industry: in Com. of Sup., 6491 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Graham) in Com. of Sup., 6602 (iv).
Pecuniary Claims: in Com. of Sup., 6579 (iv).
Pelagic Sealing, Compensation *re* Treaty: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 4776 (iii).
—— Remuneration to Commissioners: in Com. of Sup., 5810 (iv).
—— Treaty between G.B., U.S. and Japan: M. for Copy* (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1590 (i).
—— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4460 (iii).
Pelagic Sealing, Ratification of Agreement: Explanation (Mr. Borden) 4550 (iii).
Pelee Island Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 678 (i).
Peloquin, Mr. F., Postmaster at St. Joseph de Sorel, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 3753 (ii).
Penitentiaries in Canada, Report: Presented (Mr. Doherty) 970 (i).
Penitentiary Employees, Bonus: in Com. of Sup., 6600 (iv).
—— Salary Increases: in Com. of Sup., 6596 (iv).
—— Salaries, Increases *re*: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 1205 (i).
Pensions to Lighthouse Keepers: in Com. of Sup., 5236 (iii).
Personal Explanation (Mr. Best) *re* Par. in Toronto 'Globe' *re* Agriculture Com., 2155 (ii).
Petawawa Public Wharf, Tenders *re*, Contract awarded: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 532 (i).
Petit de Grat Breakwater: Remarks (Mr. Kyte) in Com. of Sup., 2050 (ii).
Petite Lameque Wharf, Construction *re*: Ques. (Mr. Turgeon) 1358 (i).
Petroleum, Crude and Refined, Quantity imported yearly since 1902: Ques. (Mr. Beattie) 730 (i).
Picotte, Mederic, Messenger H. of C., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2065 (ii).
Pictou Cattle Disease, Compensation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 6472 (iv).
Pictou and Cheticamp Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 4736 (iii).
Pictou-Georgetown Winter Mail Service, Contract *re* Supplies to Crews: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 876 (i).
Pictou Mail Service, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2580 (ii).

Pictou Winter Steamers, Amounts paid to: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 5949 (iv).
Pink Rock Wharf, N.B., Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 4257 (iii).
Piper, E. F., Patent Relief: *See* 'B. No. 53.'
Poaching in N.S.: *See* 'Murray.'
Point Aux Anglais, Drainage Works, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 4778 (iii).
Poirier, N. P., Investigation *re* Charges: Remarks (Mr. Gauvreau) in Com. of Sup., 5815 (iv).
Police Point Reserve Transfer: M. for Papers* (Mr. Buchanan) 5557 (iv).
Political Literature, Application *re* Free Postage: Ques. (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 1585 (i).
Political Literature *re* Race and Religious Prejudices, Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. Rhodes) 6516 (iv).
See 'Campaign.'
Pollution of Navigable Waters: *See* 'B. No. 107.'
Pollution of Red River: *See* 'B. No. 64.'
Population of Canada and Quebec Cities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lanctot) 731 (i).
Port Arthur Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 1951 (i).
Port Arthur and Fort William Ice Breaking and Dredging: Personal Explanation (Mr. W. H. Bennett) 3331 (ii).
Port Colborne Elevator: in Com. of Sup., 5796 (iv).
Port Dover Harbour Works: M. for Rep.* (Mr. Charlton) 3755 (ii).
Port Hawkesbury Public Building: Remarks 1345 (i), 2016 (ii).
Port Richmond Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2044 (ii).
——— Contract *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 1585 (i).
——— Reports, &c.:. M. for Copies* (Mr Kyte) 2460 (ii).
Porto Rico and Mar. Provs. Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 686 (i).
Postmasters and Assistant Postmasters, Salaries: *See* 'B. No. 124.'
Post Office Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 105.'
Post Office Dept., Grades of Clerks: *See* 'B. No. 106.'
POST OFFICE.
Bassano Post Office, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Buchanan) 5557 (iv).
Beaver Bank Station Mail Contract, Cancellation of: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 6286 (iv).
Bedford Mail Contract, Cancellation of: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 6616 (iv).
Binks, Mr., Promotion to Dead Letter Office: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Henderson) 3946 (ii).
POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Blind River Post Office, Change of Name: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 4262 (iii).
British Mails, Landing at North Sydney, Tests *re*: Ques. (Mr. McKenzie) 5948 (iv).
Broderick Post Office, Change of Name: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McCraney) 5263 (iii).
Brown, Wm., Postmaster at Point Fortune, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4779 (iii).
Cable Rates, Parcel Post, &c.: M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 4082; Amt. (Mr. Lemieux) 4097; Neg. (Y. 40; N. 70) 4120 (iii).
Canada and G. B. Mail Service, Renewal of Contract: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 547 (i).
——— Letter of Board of Trade, Quebec: Read (Mr. Lemieux) 1843 (i).
Cap Chat P.O., Pet. *re* Change of Name: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1204 (i).
Charlemagne Mail Contract, Name of Contractor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 1862 (i).
Coldbrook Postmaster, Name and Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 3148 (ii).
Douglas Road Post Office, Date of Opening, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Davidson) 3754 (ii).
Dunnville Customs Revenue for 1910-11, Postal Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 2066 (ii).
Gananoque Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1855 (i).
Gaspé, Magdeleine and Chlorydormes Mail Contracts, Annulment of: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1204 (i).
Glace Bay Mail Delivery, Delay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 804 (i).
Henry, Norbert, Contract *re* Mails between Scott Junction and Stations: Ques. (Mr. Béland) 975 (i).
Lachenaie Postmaster, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Séguin) 5949 (iv).
Magdalen Island News Service, Marconi Connections: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 3833 (ii).
——— Copy of Instructions: M. for Papers* (Mr. Lemieux) 4459 (iii).
——— Par. in Toronto 'News' *re*: Read (Mr. Lemieux) 4159 (iii).
——— Salary of Correspondent: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4262 (iii).
——— Statement (Mr. Hazen) 4041 (iii).
Mail Bags Repairs, Names of Firms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4777 (iii).
Mail Carriers, Como to Oka, Compensation to Family: Remarks (Mr. Ethier) in Com. of Sup., 6282 (iv).
Mail Contracts, Cancellation of: in Com. of Sup., 6620 (iv).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Mail Contracts, M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lemieux) 2460 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lemieux) 5693 (iv).
Mail Service: in Com. of Sup., 6281 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 640 (i).
Moosejaw Post Office, Names and Locations: Ques. (Mr. Knowles) 976 (i).
——— Inspector, Pet. *re* Apptmt.: M for Cor.* (Mr. Knowles) 1590 (i).
Neuville and C. N. Ry. Station Mail Contract, Cancellation of: Ques: (Mr. Delisle) 2067 (ii).
Newspapers, Postage *re* Dom. Elections Campaign: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 1589 (i).
New Waterford Mail Service, Change *re*: Remarks (Mr. Carroll) in Com. of Sup., 6294, 6630 (iv).
Nicolet and St. Monique Mail Contract, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 724 (i).
Northumberland County Mail Service, Contract *re*: Ques. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6186 (iv).
Parcel Post Convention between Canada and France, Signature *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 569 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Lemieux) for Papers, 935, 1396 (i).
Parcel Post, Extension of System: Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 2329 (ii).
Parcel Post and Rural Mail System, on M. for Sup. (Mr. J. E. Armstrong) 4082 (iii). *See* 'Postal Regulations.'
Parcel Post Rates to European Countries: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4776 (iii).
Pictou-Georgetown Winter Mail Service, Contract *re* Supplies to Crews: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 876 (i).
Pictou Mail Service, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2580 (ii).
Porto Rico and Mar. Provs. Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 686 (i).
Postage of Newspapers, Opinion of P.M.G. *re* Regulations: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2291 (ii).
Postal Convention between Canada and France: Request for Papers (Mr. Lemieux) 935 (i).
Postal Regulations, Commission *re* Investigation: Prop. Res. (Mr. Armstrong) 2251 (ii).
——— Remarks on M. to take in Mondays (Mr. Armstrong) 2376 (ii).
Postmasters and Town Councillors Regulations *re* Acceptance: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2587 (ii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Postmasters dismissed since Oct. 1911: List read (Mr. Lemieux) 6636 (iv).
Postmasters dismissed: Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 6617 (iv).
Postmasters in Kamouraska County, Names, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 6781 (iv).
Postmasters in Lotbiniere County, Dismissals: Remarks (Mr. Fortier) in Com. of Sup., 6294 (iv).
Postmasters in Temiscouata County, Dismissal, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 548 (i).
Post Offices, Change of Names: Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 3751 (ii).
Post Office Deptl. Block, Condition *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 1855 (i), 2010 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Pelletier) 2015 (ii).
Post Office Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1066 (i).
——— Outside Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6615 (iv).
——— Promotions: in Com. of Sup., 6278 (iv).
Post Office Dept., Stmnt. *re* Dismissals since Oct. 1911: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lemieux) 1589 (i).
Post Office Dismissals, Govt. Policy *re*: Remarks (Mr. Carvell) in Com. of Sup., 6299 (iv).
Post Office Dismissals since Oct. 1911, Pets. *re* &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Lemieux) 1395 (i).
Railway Mail Clerks, Answer to Question: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) 5561 (iv).
Rigaud Postmaster, Application *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2294 (ii).
River John Mail Carriers, Name, Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1579 (i).
River John Mail Service, Cancellation of M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2247 (ii).
Rural Mail Delivery, Extension: Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 2061 (ii).
——— Number of Boxes in Ont.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 6782 (iv).
——— Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4978 (iii).
——— Routes: Inquiry for (Mr. Lemieux) 5561 (iv).
——— Tenders *re* Mail Boxes &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1580 (i).
Rural Postmasters, Increase of Salaries: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) 3060 (ii).
St. Aldwyn Post Office, Change of Name from Broderick, Cor. &c.: Read (Mr. McCraney) 5922 (iv).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Ste. Anne de Bellevue, Non-delivery of Mail: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 5260 (iii).
Ste. Anne de Bellevue and L'Ile Perrot Mail Contract, Expiry of: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 5951 (iv).
St. Isidore de Prescott, Postmastership, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Proulx) 3055 (ii).
St. Monique Mail Contract, Annulment of: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1584 (i).
St. Pascal Mail Contract, Cancellation of: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 2294 (ii).
St. Patrick de Brandon, Population, Revenue, &c. P. O.: Ques. (Mr. Lafortune) 724 (i).
St. Paul L'Ermite, &c., Mail Carrier, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2583 (ii).
St. Paul L'Ermite, Repentigny Mail Service, Cancellation of Contracts: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 3341 (ii).
Ste Therese and Laurentides Post Offices, Revenues, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 3335 (ii).
Sayabec Postmistress, Apptmt. of Miss Boulay: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 2068 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 6295 (iv).
Seamen St., Annapolis Co., Post Office, Date of Opening: Ques. (Mr. Davidson) 3754 (ii).
Scott Junction Mail Contract, Cancellation *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Beland) 2459 (ii).
Small Pox in Ottawa Post Office: Explanation (Mr. Pelletier) 1242 (i).
——— Further Explanation (Mr. Pelletier) 1280 (i).
Sorel and St. Victoria Mail Service, Date of Tenders &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 4248 (iii).
——— M. for Papers* (Mr. Cardin) 4782 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Cardin) in Com. of Sup., 6643 (iv).
Spry Bay P. O., Request *re* Remo all of: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 577 (i).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 582 (i).
Stellarton Station Mail Service, Cancellation of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2247 (ii).
Sydney and Glace Bay Mail Service, Delay, &c.: Stmnt. (Mr. Pelletier) 934 (i).
Tracadie Road Post Office, Charges *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 4459 (iii).
Val des Eboulis and Rigaud Mail Service, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4249 (iii).
——— Date of Wm. Robert's Contract: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4778 (iii).
Verret, Mr. H. B., Promotion: in Com. of Sup., 6278 (iv).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Williamsville Post Office, Removal: Personal Explanation (Mr. Edwards) 6271 (iv).
Potatoes, Weight of Bag: *See* 'B. No. 78.'
Poulin, Mr. E., Dismissal from Customs, Quebec City: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 2071 (ii).
Pouliott, Louis, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4459 (iii).
Powassan Postmaster, Change *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Arthurs) 2459 (ii).
Powers, Laurence G., Supt. of Lobster Hatchery at Arichat, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 3752 (ii), 4781 (iii).
Preferential Tariff to G. B., Increase of: Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 553 (i).
——— Prop. Res. (Mr. Pugsley) M. to withdraw, 1390 (i).
Preferential Trade within the Empire: Remarks in debate on Address (Mr. Borden) 55 (i).
Premier Life Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 63.'
Prime Minister's Visit to Archbishop of Quebec, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 534 (i).
Prince Edward and Hastings Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 136.'
P. E. I., Additional Subsidy to: *See* 'B. No. 178.'
P. E. I. Better Terms: Remarks (Mr. J. J. Hughes) on M. for Sup., 5171 (iii).
P. E. I. Car Ferry, Construction &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 1206 (i).
——— Cor. with Govt. *re* Car Ferry System: M. for Copies* (Mr. Emmerson) 2072 (ii).
——— Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Graham) in Com. of Sup., 5663 (iv).
P.E.I. and Mainland Govt. Car Ferry, Tel. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 1580 (i).
——— Tel. sent to A. A. McLean: Ques. (Mr. Pardee) 1577 (i).
——— Tels. Letters, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Pardee) 2458 (ii).
——— Inquiry (Mr. Macdonald) for Return, 4232 (iii).
P.E.I. Estimates: Remarks (Mr. J. J. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 2439 (ii).
P.E.I. Ry., Claims for Compensation, Settlement of: Remarks (Mr. J. J. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 5659 (iv).
——— Increased Facilities: in Com. of Sup., 5661 (iv).
See 'Railways.'
P.E.I. Telegraph System: in Com. of Sup., 3303 (ii); Conc., 6794 (iv).
See 'Mar. Telephone Co.'
P.E.I. Winter Communication, Ry. Accommodation: Remarks (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 3830 (i).
P.E.I. Winter Service, Car Ferry System: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 5207 (iii).

Prince Rupert Dry Dock, Subsidy, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1811 (i).
Printing Bureau, Clocks, Number installed, Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. White, Alberta) 2859 (ii).
——— Dismissals and Apptmts.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 1809 (i).
——— Changes *re* Duties: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 2243 (ii).
——— Plant: in Com. of Sup., 6611 (iv).
——— Policy of Govt. *re* Erection of: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 546 (i).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1038 (i).
——— Salary Increases: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 2066 (ii).
——— Weekly Consultations: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 2243 (ii).
Printing Com., 1st Rep.: Presented, M. (Mr. Currie) to conc., 3330 (ii).
——— 3rd Rep.: M. (Mr. Currie) to conc., 6578 (iv).
Prisons and Reformatories: *See* 'B. No. 166.'
Private Bills, Consideration of: Remarks (Mr. Currie) 6578 (iv).
——— Extension of Time: M. (Mr. Borden) 930 (i).
——— Rep. of Examiner *re* Pets, Divergency of Rules: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 643 (i).
——— Suspension of Rules: M. (Mr. Ames) 5902 (iv).
See 'Senate Amts.'
Private Secretaries, Status of: *See* 'B. No. 60.'
Private Secretaries, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5808 (iv).
Privy Council Chamber, Improvements *re*: in Com. of Sup., 1340 (i).
Privy Council Implementing Judgment *re* G.T.P. Ry.: *See* 'B. No. 95.'
Privy Council Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6460 (iv).
Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 6780 (iv).
——— Mess. from Senate, 6824 (iv).
Provident Trust Co., Incorporation, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Lemieux) 3755 (ii).
Provincial Boundaries, Res. from Legre. of Saskatchewan, *re* Negotiations for Transfer of Natural Resources: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2577 (ii).
See 'Man. Extension Boundaries.'
Provincial Control of Western Natural Resources, Promise *re*: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 553 (i).
Provincial Railways and Public Buildings, Govt. Assistance: M. for Cor.* (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 562 (i).
Provl. Subsidies: *See* 'B. Nos. 77, 115, 151, 152, 178 and 186.'
See 'Man. and N.S.' 'P.E.I.'
Provincial Subsidies *re* Agriculture: *See* 'B. No. 100.'
Provost, Raoul, Dismissal from Marine and Fisheries: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 2453 (ii).
Public Accounts Com., Attendance of R. C. Miller, 3rd Rep.: M. to conc. (Mr. Middlebro) 6333 (iv).
——— 2nd Rep.: M. (Mr. Middlebro) to conc., 5832 (iv).
——— 4th Rep.: Presented (Mr. Middlebro) 6492 (iv).
——— 5th Rep.: Presented (Mr. Middlebro) 6732 (iv).
——— 6th Rep.: M. (Mr. Ames) to conc., 6062 (iii).
See 'Diamond Light.'
Public Accounts Report: Presented (Mr. W. T. White) 11 (i).
Public Buildings in Alberta and Sask., Purchase of Sites, Govt. Policy *re*: Ques. (Mr. White, Alberta) 2068 (ii).
Public Expenditures, Scandals, &c., by late Govt.: Remarks in debate on Address (Mr. Monk) 231 (i).
Public Health Assn.: *See* 'B. No. 127.'
Public Officials, Inquiries *re* Conduct, Apptmt. of Commissioners in Quebec: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 2063 (ii).
Public Ownership of Public Utilities: on M. for Sup. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 645 (i).
See 'Cable,' 'Freight Rates,' 'Parcel Post,' 'Railways,' &c.
Public Service Commission, Apptmt. of Messrs. Jackson and Schwitzer as Assistants: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 5954 (iv).
Public Service Commission, Charges *re* A. B. Morine: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Carvell) 6528 (iv).
See 'Dismissals,' &c.
PUBLIC WORKS:
Advertisements for Govt. Contracts, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 2449 (ii).
Anse au Canard Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 2785 (ii).
——— Breakwater, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 878 (i).
Arichat, Retaining Wall: in Com. of Sup., 2039 (ii).
Athabasca Landing to Grand Prairie Tel. Lines: in Com. of Sup., 2819 (ii).
Athabasca River Landing: in Com. of Sup., 2814 (ii).
Aurora Public Building, Papers, Reports, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Armstrong) 561 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Baddeck Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6658 (iv).
Bathurst Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2363 (ii).
Battleford Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2204 (ii).
Beaumont Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 2366 (ii).
Berthier en-Haut Post Office, Purchase, Repairs, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Barrette) 1409 (i).
Blue Rocks Island Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2041 (ii).
B.C. Public Buildings, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 2215 (ii).
Buildings leased by Govt., Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 1358 (i).
Calgary Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2204 (ii).
Canadian Coal used to heat Govt. Buildings: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 3286 (ii).
Cape Breton Tel. Lines: in Com. of Sup., 2817 (ii).
Causapscal Post Office, Pet. *re* Site: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1020 (i).
Chance Harbour, N.B., Improvements *re*: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 554 (i).
Chapel Cove Breakwater, Pet. *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 1585 (i).
Charles Forest's Cove Breakwater, Contract *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 1584 (i).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Kyte) 2460 (ii).
Charlos Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2040 (ii).
Chatham, N.B., Public Building: Conc., 6804 (iv).
Chester Canal, N.S., Discontinuance of Work: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 716 (i).
Cole Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2055 (ii).
Cow Bay Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 2055 (ii).
Creosoted Timber *re* Public Works: in Com. of Sup., 2440 (ii).
Devil's Island Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 2055 (ii).
Edmonton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2206 (ii).
Edmonton Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2816 (ii).
Eganville Post Office, Purchase of Site: Ques. (Mr. Low) 725 (i).
Faulkner, R. S., Emplymt. by Public Works as Contractor: Ques. (Mr. Davidson) 5261 (iii).
Fort McMurray and Athabasca Tel Lines: in Com. of Sup., 2819 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Fraserville Bridge Works, Interview with Messrs. LeBel and Riou: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 549 (i).
Fraserville Wharf, Cor. *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 3534 (ii).
Fraserville Wharf and Dredging, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 3150 (ii).
French River, Dredging, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6657 (iv).
Garthby, Lake Aylmer, Wharf Construction: M. for Papers* (Mr. Tobin) 4781 (iii).
Gaspé Landing Pier, Appropriation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 2785 (ii).
Gaspé Telegraph System: in Com. of Sup., 3305 (ii).
Gillis Point Wharf Construction: in Com. of Sup., 2056 (ii).
Gooseberry Cove, N.B., Improvements *re*: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 555 (i).
Goose Creek Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 2372 (ii).
Govt. Dredges, Contract *re* Boarding Employees: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 5953 (iv).
Hampton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1527 (i).
Harbours and Rivers, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 3235 (ii).
——— Man., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2814 (ii).
——— Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 2440 (ii).
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 623 (i), 2366 (ii).
——— Que.: in Com. of Sup., 2785 (ii).
Hillsboro Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1528 (i).
Hull City Hall Square, Improvements by Improvement Commission: Ques. (Mr. Kidd) 2293 (ii).
Humboldt Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2211 (ii).
Ile Bezard and Ste. Geneviève Wharfs, Completion of Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 557 (i).
Inverness Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2056 (ii).
Kelley's Cove Breakwater, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Law) 3340 (ii).
Lachine Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1346, 1952 (i).
Larry's River Dredging, Apptmt. of Inspector: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 5055 (iii).
L'Assomption Wharf, Appropriations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2451 (ii), 5951, 6781 (iv).
——— Continuation of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2579 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Laurentides Public Building, Acquisition of Property: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2451 (ii).
Lawlor's Island Quarantine Station: in Com. of Sup., 1341, 1531 (i).
—— Memorials, *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2460 (ii).
Lethbridge Armoury, Plans, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Buchanan) 729 (i).
Lethbridge Post Office, Plans, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Buchanan) 728 (i).
Lethbridge Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2212 (ii).
Levis Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 1346 (i).
Levis Graving Dock, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3295 (ii).
Lorneville Breakwater, N.B., Tests *re* Foundation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 555 (i).
Louiseville Public Buildings: Conc., 6794 (iv).
Lunenburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1343 (i).
Magdalen Island Telegraph and Telephone: in Com. of Sup., 3302 (ii).
Maisonneuve Postal Station, Erection of: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 550 (i).
Maisonneuve Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1347 (i).
Marieville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1348 (i).
Mar. Provs. Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 2816 (ii).
Melford Wharf Construction: in Com. of Sup., 2056 (ii).
—— Notice to suspend work: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 549 (i).
Midland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1855 (i).
Montreal Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 1350 (i).
Montreal Customs Appraiser Building: in Com. of Sup., 1351 (i).
Montreal Post Office Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 1348 (i).
Montreal Postal Station F.: in Com. of Sup., 1352 (i).
Moose to Drulingville Loop Tel. Line: in Com. of Sup., 2820 (ii).
Moosejaw Public Building, Tender of McDiarmid Co., Limited: M. for Copy* (Mr. Knowles) 562 (i).
Napierville Post Office Site, Payment to Mr. Bourgeois: Remarks (Mr. Lanctot) on M. for Sup., 2373 (ii).
Napierville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1354 (i).
—— Purchase of Site: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lanctot) 5263 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
National Ports: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 2837 (ii).
North Battleford Tel. Lines: in Com. of Sup., 2822 (ii).
North Battleford to Isle la Crosse Tel. Line: in Com. of Sup., 2822 (ii).
Ottawa City Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1321 (i).
—— Caretakers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3293 (ii).
—— Eastern Block Addition: in Com. of Sup., 1339 (i).
—— Electric Power, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3286 (ii).
—— Examining Warehouse, Site, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1949 (i).
—— Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3278 (ii).
—— Leases, Rentals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1324 (i), 3290 (ii).
—— Military Stores Building, Contract *re* Racks: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 532 (i).
—— Observatory: in Com. of Sup., 1321 (i).
—— Plumbing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1855 (i).
—— Post Office Deptl. Block, Condition *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 2010; Remarks (Mr. Pelletier) 2015 (ii).
—— Privy Council Chamber, Improvements *re*: in Com. of Sup., 1340 (i).
—— Site for new Deptl. Building: in Com. of Sup., 3242 (ii).
—— Sussex St. Property: in Com. of Sup., 1322 (i).
—— Sussex Street Property, Total Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 1359 (i).
—— Victoria Memorial Museum, Number of Employees, Dismissals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bellemare) 2294 (ii).
—— Water Supply: in Com. of Sup., 3294 (ii).
Ottawa City Grounds: in Com. of Sup., 3239 (ii).
Ottawa City, Rideau Hall, Furniture, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3279, 3285 (ii). (ii).
—— Improvements, Amount expended *re* H.R.H. Occupancy: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 547 (i).
—— Improvements, Amount expented from 1896 to 1911: Ques. (Mr. Currie) 876 (i).
—— Expenditure *re*: Ques. of Priv., *re* Par. in 'Mail and Empire,' (Mr. Pugsley) 799 (i).
—— Snow Cleaning, &c.: in Com of Sup., 3279 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Ottawa City, Rideau Hall, Stmnt. *re* Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 726 (i).

Ottawa River Bridges: Conc., 6806 (iv).

Peace River Tel. Line, Building, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2821 (ii).

Petawawa Public Wharf, Tenders *re*, Contract awarded: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 532 (i).

Petite Lameque Wharf, Construction *re*: Ques. (Mr. Turgeon) 1358 (i).

Pink Rock Wharf, N.B., Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 4257 (iii).

Plaza at Ottawa, Fences and Posters, Responsibility *re*: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 876 (i).

Point Aux Anglais, Drainage Works, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 4778 (iii).

Port Arthur Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 1951 (i).

Port Arthur and Fort William Dredging: Personal Explanation (Mr. W. H. Bennett) 3331 (ii).

Port Dover Harbour Works: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Charlton) 3755 (ii).

Port Richmond Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2044 (ii).

—— Contract *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 1585 (i).

—— Reports, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Kyte) 2460 (ii).

P. E. I. Telegraph System: in Com. of Sup., 3303 (ii).

Prince Rupert Dry Dock Subsidy, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1811 (i).

Provincial Railways and Public Buildings, Govt. Assistance: M. for Cor.* (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 562 (i).

Public Buildings in Alberta and Sask., Purchase of Sites, Govt. Policy *re*: Ques. (Mr. White, Alberta) 2068 (ii).

Public Works, Appropriations of Last Year: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 2436 (ii).

Public Works in Cape Breton, Tenders *re*: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) 805 (i).

Public Works, Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald 559 (i).

Public Works Contracts, Amounts given without tender: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 877 (i).

—— Montreal and Quebec, Without tender: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 877 (i).

Public Works, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1064 (i).

—— Private Sec's Allowance: Conc. 6779 (iv).

Public Works, Dismissal of Workmen: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2584 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Public Works Engineering Branch, Salaries: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 1058-9 (i).

Public Works Estimates, Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 3278 (ii).

Public Works Expenditure for last ten years in different Provs.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 2064 (ii).

Public Works, Govt. Policy *re*: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 1343 (i).

Public Works Omitted from Estimates: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 2794 (ii).

Public Works, Suspension of, Names and Locations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 530, 531 (i).

Public Works Votes of Last Year, Continuation &c.: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 1340 (i).

Purchase of Goods by Public Works Dept. since Oct. 1911, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 1204, 1578 (i).

—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2459 (ii).

Quebec, Customs House: in Com. of Sup., 1849 (i).

—— Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 1849 (i).

—— Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1851 (i).

Quebec Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2836 (ii).

Regina Armoury and Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 2212 (ii).

—— Erection of: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 580 (i).

Renfrew Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1953 (i).

Rigaud Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1852 (i).

Rivieres des Prairies Nav. Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 2441 (ii).

—— Drainage, Amount voted: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 714 (i).

St. Andrew Wharf, Discontinuance of Works, *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 724 (i).

Ste Anne de la Pocatiere, Experimental Farm, Tenders *re* Buildings: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 577 (i).

St. Charles River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2837 (ii).

St. Croix Wharf Construction: M. for Papers* (Mr. Fortier) 5557 (iv).

St. Jacques Post Office, Plans, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lafortune) 560 (i).

St. Johns and Iberville Bridge, Amount voted *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Demers) 551, 571 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
St. John, N.B., Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 1529 (i).
St. John Dry Dock, Contract, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3296 (ii).
St. John Harbour Improvements, Tel. *re* Terminal Facilities: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 566 (i).
——— Tugs employed, Amount paid per day: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 548 (i).
St. John Quarantine Station, Partridge Island: in Com. of Sup., 1530 (i).
St. John Wharf, Appropriation *re* Site: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 2370 (ii).
St. Lambert Public Building: in Com. of of Sup., 1853 (i).
St. Laurent Public Building, Conc., 6804 (iv).
St. Lawrence Channel: in Com. of Sup., 5231 (iii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Emplymt. of Govt. Dredges: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 4256 (iii).
St. Therese Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1854 (i).
St. Vallier Wharf, Award of Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 2068 (ii).
——— Contract of Alex. Duchesneau: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 4263 (iii).
Sackville, N.B., Harbour Improvements, Conc., 6805 (iv).
Sarnia Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 1952 (i).
——— Erection of: Ques. (Mr. Pardee) 555 (i).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Pardee) 1589 (i).
Seaforth Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1953 (i).
Shawinigan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1852 (i).
Shediac Public Buildings: Conc., 6793 (iv).
Sherbrooke Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1853 (i).
Sorel Workshops Investigations, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 1205 (i).
Sorel Deep Water Whafs, Contractors *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lavallée) 2859 (ii).
——— Claim of Mr. Larivière for Timber supplied: Ques. (Mr. Lavallée) 3535 (ii).
Strathcona Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2213 (ii).
Sudbury Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1953 (i).
Telegraphs, Working Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 3302 (ii).
——— Quebec, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2817 (ii).
Temiskaming Dam., Water Storage Dam: in Com. of Sup., 2827 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Temiskaming Dam, Construction, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boulay) 4262 (iii).
——— Tenders, Contracts, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Pugsley) 2459 (ii).
Three Rivers Harbour, Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2441 (ii).
Three Rivers Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1854 (i).
Toronto Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 1963 (i).
Toronto Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2445 (ii).
Weedon Public Building, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Tobin) 4550 (iii).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Tobin) 4781 (iii).
Weyburn Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2213 (ii).
Wharfs, Total Expenditure for last ten years: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1811 (i).
Wheatley Creek Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 640 (i).
Wolfville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1343 (i).
Wood Mountain Tel. Line: in Com. of Sup., 2821 (ii).
Yarmouth Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2056 (ii).
York Bridge over Grand River, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 2817 (ii).
Yukon Telegraph System: in Com. of Sup., 3303 (ii).
Quarantine Station Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1341 (i).
See 'Lawlor.'
Quebec Arsenal, Payment to Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 579 (i).
Quebec Boundaries Extension: *See* 'B. No. 151.'
Quebec Boundary Extension: M. for Cor.* (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1590 (i).
See 'Ungava.'
Quebec Bridge Construction Contract: Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) *re* English Criticism, on M. for Sup., 5415 (iii).
Quebec Bridge, Erection of Shops: Remarks (Mr. Graham) in Com. of Sup., 5810 (iv).
——— Reconstruction, Reps., Plans, Tenders, &c.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Papers, 1401 (i).
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6305 (iv).
Quebec Customs House: in Com. of Sup., 1849 (i).
——— Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 1849 (i).
Quebec Dry Dock, Construction *re*: Ques. (Mr. Béland) 4260 (iii).
——— Construction: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 6784 (iv).

Quebec Dry Dock, Site, &c.: M. for Reps.* (Mr. Béland) 4263 (iii).
——— Subsidy, Reps. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 6493 (iv).
Quebec and Gaspé Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 4738 (iii).
Quebec Harbour Commission: *See* 'B. No. 31.'
Quebec Harbour Commission, Names of Members in 1896 and after: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 579 (i).
——— Removal of Members, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 560 (i).
——— Reorganization *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 580 (i).
——— Resignation from Board of Members: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 579 (i).
——— Solicitor, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1814 (i).
Quebec Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2836 (ii).
Quebec Ministers of the Cabinet, Apptmt. by Min. of Public Works: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 545 (i).
See 'Cabinet.'
Quebec Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1851 (i).
Quebec and Saguenay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 5896, 6214 (iv).
Quebec Savings Bank Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 170.'
Quebec West Controverted Election, Certificate of Judge: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 407 (i).
Queen's Hotel Co., Limited, Litigation *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 3755 (ii).
Queen's Theological College: *See* 'B. No. 68.'
Queen's University at Kingston: *See* 'B. No. 68.'
——— Ref. to Minister of Justice *re* Provl. Jurisdiction: Remarks (Mr. Bickerdike) 3730 (ii).
Questions Improperly drafted: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 4983, 5054 (iii).
Questions not Answered: M. (Mr. Borden) 6732 (iv).
Questions *re* Mr. Lemieux ruled out (Mr. Speaker) 2580 (ii).
Questions and Notices of Motions, Rules *re* Standing: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 1015 (i).
Quinze River and Ottawa Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 54.'
Race Track Meets: *See* 'B. No. 165.'
Radiotelegraphic Service—Wireless Stations: in Com. of Sup., 5399 (iii).
Railway Act Amts.: *See* 'B. Nos. 5, 6, 7, 86.'
Ry. Belt and Peace River Block of Land: *See* 'B. No. 149.'
Ry. Bridges in N.B., Aid to: *See* 'B. No. 188.'
Ry. Cos., Incorporation of: *See* 'B. No. 191.'
Ry. Crossings: *See* 'B. No. 6.'
Ry. Mail Clerks, Salary Increases: *See* 'B. Nos. 105 and 106.'
Railway Sections and Section Men, Jurisdiction of Ry. Commission: *See* 'B. No. 86.'
Ry. Subsidies: *See* 'B. No. 183.'
Ry. Tariffs: *See* 'B. No. 6.'
RAILWAYS:
Alberta Great Waterways Ry., Disallowance of: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 1575 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. Bonds, Govt. Guarantees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. Martin) 4247 (iii).
Can. Northern Ry. Bridge at Morris, Representations *re* Objections: Ques. (Mr. Molloy) 2587 (ii).
Can. Northern Ont. Ry., Subsidy, Guarantee, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4781 (iii).
Can. Northern and Quebec Ry. Co.'s Maintenance of Road in L'Ile Bourdon: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 5261 (iii).
C.P.Ry., Irrigation, Complaint from Alberta Farmers: Ques. (Mr. Buchanan) 5262 (iii).
Car Shortage in the West: Remarks (Mr. Buchanan) 1709 (i).
——— Members remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 1709 (i).
——— Govtl. Action *re*: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Buchanan) 1714 (i).
Chatham and Newcastle Ry. Service, Pets. from Boards of Trade: Remarks (Mr. Loggie) 4190 (iii).
Clarkboro, Sask., C.N.R. Right of Way, Title *re*: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 934 (i).
Estmere to Baddeck Branch Ry., Tenders *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McKenzie) 1589 (i).
Freight Rates on Rys., Discrimination in the West: Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3194 (ii).
——— Transportation, Generally: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Sup., 645, 1902 (i).
G.T.Ry. Trainmen's Strike, Settlement by late Govt., Judge Barron's Rep.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2580 (ii).
——— Board of Conciliation: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. MacNutt) 3756 (ii).
G.T.P. Remuneration to Govt. Director: in Com. of Sup., 5801 (iv).
Guysborough Branch Ry. Appropriation: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) on M. for Sup., 1445 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 5621 (iv).
Hampton Spur Line, Construction *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 572 (i).
Harvey and Salisbury Ry., Contract *re* Rails: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 4171 (iii).
Hudson Bay Ry. Construction: in Com. of Sup., 622, 677 (i); 5762, 6605 (iv).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

Hudson Bay Ry., Contract: M. (Mr. Neely) for O.Cs., 732 (i).

——— Cor. *re*: M. (Mr. Aikins) for Papers, 1213 (i).

——— Ports, Nav., &c.: M. for Reps.* (Mr. Aikins) 3756 (ii).

——— Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. W. H. Bennett) 132 (i).

——— Surveys *re* Navigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Aikins) 3943 (ii).

Land Grants to Railways in Western Provs. prior to 1896: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 725 (i).

New Glasgow to Thorburn Ry. Co.'s Lease, &c., Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 933 (i).

Orangedale to Cheticamp Ry., Construction: Remarks (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 4226 (iii).

P.E.I. Ry., Claims for Compensation, Settlement of: Remarks (Mr. J. J. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 5659 (iv).

P.E.I. Car Ferry, Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 1206 (i).

——— Cor. with Govt. *re* Car Ferry System: M. for Copies* (Mr. Emmerson) 2072 (ii).

——— Tel. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 1580 (i).

——— Tel. sent to A. A. McLean: Ques. (Mr. Pardee) 1577 (i).

——— Tels., Letters, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Pardee) 2458 (ii).

——— Inquiry (Mr. Macdonald) for Return, 4232 (iii).

P.E.I. Ry., Harmony to Elmira Branch Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 5659 (iv).

——— Increased Facilities: in Com. of Sup., 5661 (iv).

——— O'Leary to West Point, Ry. Branch Lines, Construction *re*: Ques. (Mr. Richards) 721 (i).

——— Winter Communication, Ry. Accommodation: Remarks (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 3830 (ii).

Rys. and Canals, Annual Stmnt.: Remarks (Mr. Macdonald) 4122 (iii).

Railway Bridges, N.B., Aid: Prop. Res. (Mr. Borden) 5691 (iv).

Ry. Commissioners, Board of: in Com. of Sup., 5800 (iv).

Railway Committee, Apptmt. of Sub-Committee *re* G.T. Ry. Bill, Liberals Omitted: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. of Sup., 5616 (iv).

Railway Construction in the West, Shortage of Steel Rails: Remarks (Mr. Turriff) on M. for Sup., 6543 (iv).

Railways Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1064 (i).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

Railway Facilities in N.S.: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 4213 (iii).

——— Litigation Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 5800-1 (iv).

Railway Mail Clerks, Answer to Question: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) 5561 (iv).

Railway Question: Notice of Discussion (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1494 (i).
See 'Freight Rates.'

Railway Rates and Freight Charges: (Mr. Maclean) on M. for Sup., 645 (i).

——— Staff Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5801 (iv).

Railway Subsidies: Prop. Res., 5681 (iv).

Railway Ties, Contract with Dame Boulay: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Carvell) 5957 (iii).

Ry. Ties, Contract *re* at Sayabec: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4041 (iii).

St. John Valley Ry., Agreement *re* Construction: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 4233, 4461 (iii).

——— Contracts *re*: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 4743 (iii).

St. John Valley Ry., Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Michaud) 577 (i).

——— Contract to Grand Falls: Ques. (Mr. Michaud) 4977 (i).

——— M. for Copies* (Mr. Michaud) 2460 (ii).

St. John Valley Ry. Subsidy, Agreement *re*: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 3049 (ii).

Salisbury and Harvey Ry., Cor. *re* Opening of Hillsborough Ry.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Pugsley) 562 (i).

——— Negotiations *re* Supply of Rails: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 4125 (iii).

Students, Railway Fares, Reduction to: Remarks (Mr. Currie) 6277 (iv).

Subsidies to Railways in Man. and N.W., &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. McCraney) 562 (i).

Sunnybrae to Country Harbour Ry. Subsidy: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 6228 (iv).

Sunnybrae and Guysborough Branch Lines: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 4262 (iii).

Sunnybrae Branch Ry.: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 4213 (iii).

Transportation Question: *See* 'Freight Rates.'

Rambaut, Thomas D., Patent Relief: *See* 'B. Nos. 55 and 84.'

Rainy River Radial Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 121.'

Rainy River Radial Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6312 (iv).

Rathburn Post Office, Removal of Postmaster, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Pardee) 4262 (iii).

Rayne, R. W., Caretaker Truro Armoury, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 6184 (iii).

Reciprocity in Trade: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Sup., 645 (i).

Reciprocity Treaty with U.S., Cor. with British Ambassador: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bradbury) 1817 (i).

——— Cor. between Can. Govt. and U.S.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bradbury) 1817 (i).

——— Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Borden) 51; (Mr. Emmerson) 426; (Mr. Foster) 76; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 36; (Mr. Lemieux) 244; (Mr. W. M. Martin) 466; (Mr. Monk) 231; (Mr. Oliver) 449; (Mr. Pugsley) 142; (Mr. Sinclair) 323; (Mr. Verville) 277; (Mr. W. T. White) 447 (i).

Reciprocity with U.S., from 1890 to 1891: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 5263 (iii).

Red River, Pollution of: *See* 'B. No. 64.'

Red River Pollution: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Bradbury) 5166 (iii).

Refrigerator Cars on I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5603 (iv).

Regiments of Foreign born Citizens, Organization of: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 534 (i).

Regina Armoury and Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 2212 (ii).

——— Erection of: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 580 (i).

Regina Census: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Knowles) 1574 (i).
See 'Census.'

Registration of Shipping: in Com. of Sup., 5229 (iii).

Renfrew, N., Contracts Awarded, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Proulx) 2857 (ii).

Renfrew, S., Apptmts. to Public Service: Ques. (Mr. Proulx) 3334 (ii).

——— Contracts awarded, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Proulx) 2856 (ii).

——— Dismissal of Govt. Officials: Ques. (Mr. Proulx) 2856 (ii).

Renfrew, S., Election, Issue of Writ: M. (Mr. A. H. Clarke) to adjn. Hse., 2218 (ii).

——— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1576, 1707 (i), 1971, 2058, 2377 (ii).

——— Speech of Min. of Customs: Remarks *re* Georgian Bay Canal (Mr. Devlin) 1573 (i).

——— Vacancy: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 926 (i).

Renfrew Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1953 (i).

Repentigny Lightkeepers, Charges *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Seguin) 6784 (iv).
See 'Dismissals.'

Restaurant Com.: M. for Com. (Mr. Borden) 710 (i).
See 'House of Commons.'

Returns: Inquiry for (Mr. Kyte) 5939 (iv).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. E. Lapointe) 4744 (iii).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2056 (ii).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 6494 (iv).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Murphy) 4836 (iii).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Murphy) 5560 (iv).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Pugsley) 2377 (ii).

Revillon Frères Trading Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 114.'

Revised Statutes, French Version: *See* 'B. No. 65.'

Richards, Mr. Dismissal: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 5821, 6652 (iv).

Rideau Canal, Bank St. Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 5791 (iv).

Rideau Canal, New Dredging Plant: in Com. of Sup., 5798 (iv).

Rideau Hall, Expenditure *re*: Ques. of Priv., *re* Par. in 'Mail and Empire' (Mr. Pugsley) 799 (i).

——— Furniture, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3279, 3285 (ii).

——— Improvements, Amount expended *re* H.R.H. Occupancy: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 547 (i).

——— Improvements, Amount expended from 1896 to 1911: Ques. (Mr. Currie) 876 (i).

——— Lighting and Heating, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 3234 (ii).

——— Stmnt. *re* Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 726 (i).
See 'Pub. Works.'

Rifle Associations and Bands: in Com. of Sup., 5528 (iii), 6653 (iv).

Rigaud Postmaster, Application *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2294 (ii).

Rigaud Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1852 (i).

Ritchie, Hon. Mr. Justice, Apptmt. of: Remarks (Mr. Macdonald) 3331, 3449 (ii).

Rivière du Loup, I.C.R. Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5654 (iv).

——— Workshops, Removal to Fraserville: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 570 (i).

Rivières des Prairies, Nav. Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 621 (i), 2441 (ii).

——— Drainage, Amount voted: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 714 (i).

River John Mail Carriers, Name, Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1579 (i).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2247 (ii).

Rivers, Lachapelle and Dubois, Messrs., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 3752 (ii).

Roberts, Capt. Alex., Postmaster at Canso, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 3341 (ii).

Robert, Wm., Dismissal from Val des Eboulis Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 3537 (ii).

Robinson, Mr. Fred. P., Apptmt. as Preventive Officer for N.B.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 4241 (iii).

Robitaille, Mr. J. C., Charges *re* Political Partisanship: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2858 (ii).

Rockfield Bridge, Lachine Canal: in Com. of Sup., 1197 (i), 5790 (iv).

Rockliffe Rifle Ranges: in Com. of Sup., 6654 (iv).

—— Acquisition of Additional Land: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 533 (i).

Rogers, J. M., Dismissal from East Roman Valley P.O., N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 722 (i).

—— M. for Pets.* (Mr. Sinclair) 1409 (i).

Rolling Stock, IC.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5609, 5653, 6461 (iv).

Rooms allotted to Liberal Members, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 670, 1951 (i).

Rosignol, Major J. E., Qualifications *re* Commandant of 61st Regiment: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 723 (i).

Ross Rifle: *See* 'N.R.A.'

Royal Assent: *See* 'Bills.'

Royal Mint: in Com. of Sup., 6584 (iv).

Royal Society of Canada Report: Presented (Mr. W. T. White) 565 (i).

Roy, Wm., Rep. of H. Boulay *re* Charges on I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 934 (i).

—— M. for Papers (Mr. Boulay) 1391 (i).

Rural Mail Delivery, Prop. Res. (Mr. Pelletier) 5680 (iv).

Rural Mail Delivery, Establishment of: *See* 'B. No. 179.'

Rural Mail Delivery Extension: Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 2061 (ii).

—— Number of Boxes in Ont.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 6782 (iv).

—— Routes: Inquiry for (Mr. Lemieux) 5561 (iv).

—— Tenders *re* Mail Boxes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1580 (i).

—— Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4978 (iii).

See 'Post Office.'

Rural Telephone System, Placing in Post Offices: Prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 2247; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) Res. out of Order, 2250; Remarks (Mr. Speaker) *re* M. to restore to Order Paper, 2287 (ii).

—— M. (Mr. Blain) to stand, 2460 (ii).

Rutherford, Mr. John, Land Agent at Moosejaw, Dismissal, &c.: M. (Mr. Knowles) for Papers, 1395 (i).

St. Adelaide de Pabos Postmaster, Investigation *re* Charges: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2068 (ii).

Ste. Agathe des Monts, Dismissal of Postmistress: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 973 (i).

—— M. for Cor. (Mr. Lemieux) 1591 (i).

Ste. Agathe des Monts Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 5895 (iv).

St. Aldwyn Post Office, Change of Name from Broderick, Cor., &c.: Read (Mr. McCraney) 5922 (iv).

St. Amour Postmaster, Changes since Jan. 1912: Ques. (Mr. Proulx) 2666 (ii).

—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Proulx) 2861 (ii).

St. Ancilet Postmaster, Request for Dismissal: M. for Cor. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 2588 (ii).

St. Andrew Wharf, Discontinuance of Works *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 724 (i).

St. Angele de Laval, County of Nicolet, Postmaster, Charges *res* Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 3755 (ii), 4039 (iii).

Ste. Anne de Bellevue and L'Ile Perrot Mail Contraits, Expiry of: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 5951 (iv).

Ste. Anne de Bellevue, Non-delivery of Mail; (Mr. Boyer) 5260 (iii).

Ste. Anne de la Pocatiere, Experimental Farm, Tenders *re* Buildings: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 577 (i).

St. Charles and Huron River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6308 (iv).

St. Charles River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2837 (ii).

St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 172.'

St. Croix Wharf Construction: M. for Papers* (Mr. Fortier) 5557 (iv).

St. Germain Postmaster, Charges *re* Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. E. Papointe) 1579 (i).

St. Germain Postmaster, Mr. C. Michaud: M. for Cor. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 1592 (i).

St. Isidore de Prescott, Postmastership, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Proulx) 3055 (ii).

St. Jacques de l'Achigan Post Office Site: Remarks (Mr. Lafortune) in Com. of Sup., 2442 (ii).

St. Jacques Post Office, Plans, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lafortune) 560 (i).

St. John and Iberville Bridge, Amount voted *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Demers) 551, 571 (i).

St. John Ambulance Association, Aid to: in Com. of Sup., 6583 (iv).

St John and Courtenay Bay Contract: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 4743 (iii), 6187 (iv).

St. John and Cuba Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 678 (i).

St. John Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 1529 (i).
St. John Dry Dock, Contract, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3296 (ii).
St. John and Halifax Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 678 (i), 4739 (iii).
St. John Harbour, Dredging Tenders *re*: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 5694 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 623, 669 (i).
——— Contracts *re*: Remarks- (Mr. Emmerson) 4743 (iii).
——— Tel. *re* Terminal Facilities: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 566 (i).
St. John Harbour, Tugs employed, Amount paid per day: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 548 (i).
St. John Harbour Works, Contract: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 3295 (ii).
St. John Ry. Crossing at Haymarket Square: M. (Mr. Pugsley) for Cor., 402 (i).
St. John Quarantine Station, Partridge Island: in Com. of Sup., 1530 (i).
St. John Valley Ry., Aid to: *See* 'B. No. 188.'
St. John Valley Ry., Agreement *re* Construction: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 4233, 4461 (iii).
——— Contract *re*:Ques. (Mr. Michaud) 577 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 4743 (iii).
——— Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Michaud) 2460 (ii).
St. John Valley Ry. and Bridges, Subsidy: in Com. on Bill, 6211 (iv).
St. John Valley Ry. Subsidy, Agreement *re*: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 3049 (ii).
——— Contract to Grand Falls: Ques. (Mr. Michaud) 4977 (iii).
St. John Valley Ry.: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Carvell) 3946 (ii).
St. John Wharf, Appropriation *re* Site: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 2370 (ii).
St. John and W. Indies Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 640 (i), 4740 (iii).
St. Lambert Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1853 (i).
St. Laurent Public Building: Conc., 6804 (iv).
St. Laurent, Xavier, Claims for Loss of Horse Killed on I.C.Ry.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boulay) 4263 (iii).
St. Lawrence Channel: in Com. of Sup., 5231 (iii).
——— Ice-breaker: Ques. (Mr. Bellemare) 5680 (iv).
St. Lawrence River Power, Res., from Montreal Board of Trade: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2456 (ii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Average Depth of Water between Montreal and Quebec, Cap a la Roche at Low Tide: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 544 (i).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Emplymt. of Govt. Dredges: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 4256 (iii).
St. Lorette Lake, Man., Pier, Completion of: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 2813 (ii).
St. Martin, Madame, Dismissal from St. Louis de Bonsecours: M. for Papers* (Mr. Cardin) 4782 (iii).
St. Monique Mail Contract, Annulment of: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1584 (i).
St. Pascal Mail Contract, Cancellation of: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 2294 (ii).
St. Patrick de Brandon, Population, Revenue of P.O.: Ques. (Mr. Lafortune) 724 (i).
St. Patrick's Channel Lighthouse: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 5238 (iii).
St. Paul d'Abbottsford Postmaster, P. L.. St. Pierre, Investigation *re*: M. for Papers* (Mr. Lemieux) 1589 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 6290 (iv).
St. Paul L'Ermite, Mail Carrier, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2583 (ii).
——— Repentigny Mail Service, Cancellation of Contracts: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 3341 (ii). *See* 'Dismissals.'
St. Peters Canal Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5798 (iv).
St. Peter of Wakefield Postmaster, Dismissal: Remarks (Mr. Devlin) 6286 (iv).
Sainte Roche Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Cardin) in Com. of Sup., 6657 (iv).
Ste. Rosalie Branch Lines, I.C.R., Accommodation, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 4134 (iii).
Ste. Therese and Laurentide Post Offices, Revenues, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 3335 (ii).
Ste. Therese Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1854 (i).
St. Tite Postmaster, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Bureau) 1210 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bureau) in Com. of Sup., 6285 (iv).
St. Vallier Wharf, Award of Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 2068 (ii).
——— Contract of Alex. Duchesneau: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 4263 (iii).
Sainte Victor de Sorel Mail Contract: Remarks (Mr. Cardin) in Com. of Sup., 6643 (iv).
See 'Post Office.'
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 6586 (iv).
Sabbath Observance, *See* 'B. No. 85.'
Sackville, N. B., Harbour Improvements, Conc., 6805 (iv).
Salisbury and Harvey Ry. Co., Cor. *re* Opening of Hillsborough Ry.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Pugsley) 562 (i).

Salisbury and Harvey Ry. Co., Negotiations *re* Supply of Rails: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 4125 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Pugsley) 938 (i).

See 'Railways.'

Salmon Fisheries, B. C., Negotiations *re* Exportations, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3756 (ii).

Sarnia Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 1952 (i).

——— Erection of: Ques. (Mr. Pardee) 555 (i).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Pardee) 1589 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Pardee) in Com. of Sup., 2208 (ii).

Sarnia Winter Harbour: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Pardee) 1589 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., (Mr, Pardee) 3946 (ii).

Saskatchewan, Bank of: *See* 'B. No. 89.'

Saskatchewan Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 146.'

Saskatchewan Life Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 26.'

Saskatchewan Power Co.: *See* 'B. No. 83.'

Saturday Sittings: Stmnt. (Mr. Borden) 5830 (iv).

Sault Ste. Marie Canal Locks: in Com. of Sup., 5791 (iv).

Sauve, Mr. L. A., Dismissal from Soulanges Canal: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 575 (i).

Sayabec Station Postmistress, Apptmt. of Miss Boulay: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 2068 (ii).

——— Pet. *re* Dismissal, Apptmt. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 2585 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 6295 (iv).

Schools of Instruction for Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5546 (iii).

Schools of Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 5229 (iii).

Scotch Village Postmaster, Apptmt. in 1903, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2666 (ii).

Scott Junction Mail Contract, Cancellation *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Beland) 2459 (ii).

See 'Post Office.'

Seaforth Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1953 (i).

Seager Wheeler, Congratulations *re* Prize Wheat at N.Y. Exhibition: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 542 (i).

Seamen, St., Annapolis Co., Post Office, Date of Opening: Ques. (Mr. Davidson) 3754 (ii).

Sec. of State, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1038 (i).

——— Report: Presented (Mr. W. T. White) 565 (i).

Security Life Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 27.'

Seed Control Act: in Com. of Sup., 6469 (iv).

Seed Grain Distribution, Res. from Board of Trade of Wilcox: Remarks (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2299 (i).

Seeley Keitha, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 174.'

Sen. and H. of C. Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 75.'

Senate Amendments, Railway Bills: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 6493, 6577 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for Sup., 6544 (iv).

Senate, Sessional Indemnities: in Com. of Sup., 6460 (iv).

Senate Vacancy, Apptmt. of Acadian in N.B.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 541 (i).

——— Pet. *re* French Apptmt.: Remarks (Mr. Michaud) 2755 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) 1576 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 5161 (iii).

Separate Schools in Man. and Keewatin, Demand from Members: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4247 (iii).

——— Establishment of in Man.: M. for Pets.* (Mr. Lemieux) 4263 (iii).

See 'Man. Boundaries.'

Sessional Employees, Number dismissed, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 568 (i), 2064 (ii).

See 'Dismissals,' 'House of Commons.'

Sevigny, Mr. J. E., Apptmt. in Immigration Office, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 1205 (i); 1814 (i).

Shawinigan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1852 (i).

Shediac Island Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. of Sup., 2373 (ii).

Shediac Public Buildings: Conc., 6793 (iv).

Sheldon v. Rex.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Lemieux) 3756 (ii).

Sheltus, Anson, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Kay) 3757 (ii).

Sherbrooke Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1853 (i).

Shurtleff, Dr., Investigation *re* J. Clouthier: Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 6629 (iv).

Sikhs in B. C., Decision *re* bringing in their Wives: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2457 (ii).

Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 5911 (iv).

Small Pox in Ottawa Post Office: Explanation (Mr. Pelletier) 1242, 1280 (i).

Smith, Angus, Pilot of D.G.S. 'Earl Grey,' Suspension of: M. for Papers* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1590 (i).

Smith, Lyman, C., Customs Collector at Oshawa, Dismissal of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 2861 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. on Customs Bill, 4575 (iii).
Solicitor General, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 546 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1816 (i).
Solicitor General, Payment of Salary to Min. of Justice, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 725 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 1577 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 5162 (iii).
Sorel Deep Water Wharfs, Contractors *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lavallee) 2859 (ii).
Sorel Marine Yards, Inquiry *re* Administration: Ques. (Mr. Barrette) 974 (i).
Sorel and Ste. Victoria Mail Contracts, Tenders, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Cardin) 4782 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 4248 (iii).
See 'Post Office.'
Sorel Wharf, Claim of Mr. Lariviere for Timber supplied: Ques. (Mr. Lavallee) 3535 (ii).
See 'Public Works.'
Sorel Workshops Investigations, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 1205 (i).
Soulanges Canal, Charges *re* Damien Lalonde: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4249 (iii).
—— Claim of Denis Martin for Damages: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2292 (ii).
—— Employees, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4250 (iii).
—— Guard Pier: in Com. of Sup., 5798 (iv).
—— Patronage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 3536 (ii).
—— Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 5791 (iv).
S. A. Bounty Scrip, Delay in Distribution, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Knowles) 2061, 3153 (ii).
Southampton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6224 (iv).
South Ont. Pac. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 56.'
Speaker, Election of: M. (Mr. Borden) 2, 5 (i).
—— Congratulations *re* Reading Prayers in French (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1808 (i).
Speaker, Deputy: M. (Mr. Borden) 519; Reply, 523 (i).
Speech from Throne, 8 (i).
Spirella Co. of Can., Patent Relief: *See* 'B. No. 70.'
Spittal, C. D., at Bisley: *See* 'N.R.A.'
Spry Bay P.O., Request *re* Removal of: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 577 (i).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 582 (i).
Statistical Officers: in Com. of Sup., 5801 (iv).
Statue erected on Federal Land in Quebec City by Provl. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bellemare) 2667 (ii).
Statutes of Previous Sessions, Delay *re* Distribution: Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com. of Sup., 678 (i).
Steamboat Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 5238 (iii).
Steamboat Inspection Report: Presented (Mr. Hazen) 1571 (i).
Steamship Connections with I.C.R., Subsidies &c.: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 5597 (iv).
Steam Trawling on Canadian Coasts: M. for Papers (Mr. Sinclair) 2461 (ii).
Steam Trawlers and Fisheries Bounties: M. for Pets.* (Mr. Sinclair) 5957 (iv).
—— Protection against: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 5388 (iii).
Steel and Iron Bounties, Par. in Montreal 'Gazette': Remarks (Mr. Kyte) 2588 (ii).
Steel and Iron Bounties *re* Budget Speech: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4249 (iii).
See 'Bounties.'
Stellarton Postmaster, Mr. John Fraser, Dismissal: M. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) for Cor.* 1589 (i).
Stellarton Station Mail Service, Cancellation of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2247 (ii).
Stenographic Assistance for Members: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 1846 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 6461 (iv).
Sterling Life Ass. Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 72.'
Stewart, Ethel May, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 120.'
Storey, Wm., Dismissal, Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. Reid) 5054 (iii).
Stoves, Ranges, Incubators exported to Argentine Republic, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. H. V. White) 561 (i).
Strathcona Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2213 (ii).
Strikes and Strike Funds: *See* 'B. No. 87.'
Sudbury Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1953 (i).
—— Dismissals: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 2033 (ii).
Sunnybrae to Country Harbour Ry., Subsidy: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 6228 (iv).
Sunnybrae to Guysborough Branch Line, I. C.R., Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 542 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2289 (ii).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 4262 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 4213 (iii).
Supply Bills: *See* 'B. Nos. 18 and 193.'

Supply: M. for Com. (Mr. W. T. White) 525 (i).

SUPPLY—

Committee:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:
Archives, 6461 (iv).
Census and Statistics, 619 (i), 6462 (iv).
Destructive Pest Act, 6479 (iv).
Distribution of Bulletins, 6465 (iv).
Dom. Exhibition, Grant, 6479 (iv).
Experimental Farms, 6465, 6477, 6484 (iv).
Health of Animals, 6469 (iv).
International Institute, 6478 (iv).
Live Stock Industry, 6469 (iv).
Seed Control Act, 6469 (iv).
Tobacco Growing, 6478 (iv).
Toronto Exhibition, Grant, 6480 (iv).
Year Book, 6465 (iv).

Charges of Management:

Dom. Notes, Printing, 1033 (i).
Foreign Coin in Circulation, 1034 (i).
Public Debt, 619 (i).

Civil Government:

Agriculture, 1041 (i), 6485 (iv).
Archives, 6460 (iv).
Auditor General's Office, 1040, 1031 (i).
Civil Service Commission, 6615 (iv).
Conservation Commission, 1069 (i).
Customs, 1040 (i).
Depts., Generally, 1067 (i).
Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 1035 (i).
Indian Affairs, 1039 (i).
Inland Revenue, 1040, 1061 (i), 6490 (iv).
Interior, 1038 (i).
Justice, 1035, 1039 (i), 6584 (iv).
Labour, 6615 (iv).
Marine and Fisheries, 1041 (i), 6651 (iv).
Militia, 1037 (i).
Mines, 1066 (i).
Naval Service, 1062 (i).
Post Office, 1066 (i), 6278 (iv).
Privy Council, 1035 (i), 6460 (iv).
Public Printing and Stationery, 1038 (i).
Public Works, 1064 (i).
Railway and Canals, 1064 (i), 5808 (iv).
Secretary of State, 1038 (i).

Customs:

General Vote, 1195 (i).
Salaries, Contingencies, &c., 1073 (i).

Excise:

Provisional Allowances, 5827 (iv).
Salaries, &c., 5812 (iv).
Stamps, 5826 (iv).
Travelling Expenses, &c., 5826 (iv).

Weights and Measures:
Salaries, &c., 5828 (iv).

Fisheries:

Cold Storage for Bait, 6653 (iv).
General Vote, 680 (i).
International Fisheries Commission, 6646 (iv).
Protection Service, 5386 (iii).
Salaries of Inspectors, &c., 5242 (iii).

Immigration:

Agents' Salaries, &c.. 3305 (ii).
Contingencies, &c., 3911 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Committee—*Con.*

Justice, Administration of:
Judges Allowances, 6597, 6601 (iv).
Legal Expenses, 6561 (iv).
Miscellaneous, 6560 (iv).
Moving Allowances, 6596 (iv).
N.W.T., 6560 (iv).
Penitentiaries, 6561, 6583 (iv).
Bonuses, 6600 (iv).
U.S., Pecuniary Claims Convention, 6579 (iv).

Labour Dept.:
Accident Inspectors, 1525 (i).
Combines Investigation Act, 1500 (i).
Conciliation and Labour Act, Expenses, 1468 (i).
Contingencies, 6615 (iv)
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1498 (i), 6615 (iv).
Technical Education Commission, 1527 (i).

Legislation:
Members' Stenographers, 6461 (iv).
Senate, 6460 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service:
Aids to Navigation, 5236 (iii).
International Navigation Congress, 5237 (iii).
Lighthouse and Buoy Steamer, 5237 (iii).
Pensions to Pilots, 5236 (iii).
Salaries and Allowances to Keepers, 5232 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subsidies:
General Vote,, 640, 677-680 (i), 4714-4742, 5934-5938 (iv).
Marine Hospitals, 5238 (iii).

Militia:
Allowances, 5447 (iii).
Annual Drill, 5452, 5484 (iii).
Clothing and Necessaries, 5521 (iii).
Customs Dues, 5522 (iii).
Grants to Assns., 5528 (iii), 6653 (iv).
Headquarters and District Staff, 5536 (iii).
Military Camps, 5521 (iii).
Military Properties, 5539 (iii).
Ordnance, &c., 5541 (iii), 6653 (iv).
Quebec Arsenal, 6654 (iv).
Salaries, &c., 5546 (iii).
Schools of Instruction, 5546 (iii).

Mines Dept.:
Metallurgical Problems, Investigation, 6491 (iv).
Ore Deposits, Investigation, 6490, 6602 (iv).
Printing of Reports, 6490 (iv).
Salaries, &c., *re* Explosives Investigation, 6603 (iv).

Miscellaneous:
Champlain, Monument, 6485 (iv).
Conservation Commission, 6579 (iv).
Gymnastic Meet, Nancy, 5811 (iv).
Legal Expenses, Lanctot Charges, 6486 (iv).
Mint, Royal, 6584 (iv).
Olympic Games, Grant, 6486 (iv).
Paris Agency, 6614 (iv).
Parliamentary Documents, Distribution, 6613 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Committee—*Con.*

Miscellaneous—*Con.*

Pelagic Sealing Congress, 5810 (iv).
Printing Bureau, 6611 (iv).
Retiring Allowances, Sgt. Codd, 5811 (iv).
St. John Ambulance Assn., 6583 (iv).
Tuberculosis Assn., Grant, 6579 (iv).
Wiley, Mrs., Claim, 6489 (iv).

Mounted Police:

General Vote, 5175 (iii).
Gratuities, 6485 (iv).

Naval Service:

Construction and Maintenance, 5303 (iii).
Fisheries Protection Service, 5386 (iii).
Hydrographic Surveys, 5398 (iii).
Radiotelegraphic Service, 5399 (iii).

Ocean and River Service:

Cattle Inspection, 5229 (iii).
Maintenance and Repairs, &c., 5186, 5207 (iii).
Patrolling Northern Waters, 5231 (iii).
Registration of Shipping, 5229 (iii).
Rewards for Saving Life, 5228 (iii).
Schools of Navigation, 5229 (iii).
Wreck Investigations, 5229 (iii).
Wrecking Plant, 5231 (iii).

Post Office:

Mail Service, 6280 (iv).
Salaries and Allowances, &c., 6615 (iv).

Public Works—Capital:

Buildings:

Eastern Block, Addition, 1339 (i).
Halifax, Quarantine Buildings, 1341 (i).
London, Eng., Can. Office, 6655 (iv).
Ottawa, New Buildings, 1321 (i).

Harbours and Rivers:

French River Improvements, 6657 (iv).

Public Works—Income:

Buildings:

British Columbia, 2215 (ii).
Generally, 623 (i).
New Brunswick, 1527, 1530 (i).
Nova Scotia, 1343 (i), 2039-2056 (ii).
Ontario, 1855, 1949-1966 (i).
Quebec, 1346-1356, 1849-1854 (i).
Rents, Repairs, &c., 3239-3279, 3285-3294 (ii).
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 2204-2213 (ii).

Dredging:

Mar. Provs., 2816 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers:

Generally, 623 (i), 3235 (ii).
Manitoba, 2813 (ii).
Maritime Provinces, 2440 (ii).
New Brunswick, 2363-2372 (ii).
Nova Scotia, 639 (i).
Ontario, 640 (i), 2445 (ii).
Quebec, 2441, 2785, 2836 (ii).
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 2814 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Committee—*Con.*

Public Works—*Con.*

Miscellaneous:

Monuments to Distinguished Canadians, 2823 (ii).
National Art Gallery, 2825 (ii).
Upper Ottawa, Storage Dams, 2827 (ii).

Roads and Bridges:

Grand River Bridge, York, Ont., 2817 (ii).

Slides and Booms, &c.:

Levis Graving Dock, 3295 (ii).

Telegraph Lines:

Cape Breton, 2817 (ii).
Generally, 3303 (ii).
Lower St. Lawrence, &c., 3302 (ii).
Quebec, 2817 (ii).
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 2819-2822 (ii).
Yukon, 3303 (ii).

Railways and Canals:

Canals:

Cornwall, 5797 (iv).
Lachine, 5790, 6611 (iv).
Rideau, 5791, 5798 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie, 5791 (iv).
Soulanges, 5791, 5798 (iv).
Staff and Repairs, 5801 (iv).
Statistical Officers, 5801 (iv).
Trent, 5792, 5799 (iv).
Welland, 5786, 5796, 6607 (iv).

Miscellaneous:

Compassionate Allowances, 5678 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry. Director, 5801 (iv).
Litigation, 5800 (iv).
Railway Commission, 5800 (iv).

Railways:

Hudson's Bay Railway, 622, 677 (i), 5762, 6605 (iv).
Intercolonial Railway, 622, 670 (i), 4124-4137, 4162-4236 (iii), 5595-5658, 5809, 6461, 6604 (iv).
National Transcontinental Railway, 5765 (iv).
Prince Edward Island Railway, 5659-5677 (iv).

Steamboat Inspection:

General Vote, 5238 (iii).

Trade and Commerce:

Bounties, Expenses *re*, 5934 (iv).
Old Age Pension Fund, 688 (i).

Concurrence:

Doncaster Indian Reserve, Road, 6806 (iv).
French River Improvements, 6776 (iv).
Inland Revenue, Salaries, 6770 (iv).
Intercolonial Railway, 6774 (iv).
International Fishery Commission, 6778 (iv).
Louiseville, Public Building, 6794 (iv).
Mines Dept., Salaries, 6771 (iv).
Ottawa River Bridges, Clearing, 6806 (iv).
Public Works Dept., Private Secretary, 6779 (iv).
Sackville Wharf, 6805 (iv).
Shediac, Public Building, 6793 (iv).

Supreme Court of Canada, Division *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 547 (i).

Sussex St. Property, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 1322 (i).

—— Explanation (Mr. Pugsley) *re* abandonment, 2007 (ii).

—— Total Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 1359 (i).
See 'Public Works—Ottawa.'

Sutherland, George Mackay, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 153.'

Sutherland, Mr. Roderick, Dismissal of: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) 1274 (i),, 2018 (ii).

—— Cor. Read, 2022 (ii).
See 'Dismissals.'

Sutherland Rifle Sight: *See* 'N.R.A.'

Svaigher, A., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Knowles) 6186 (iv).

Swift Current Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Knowles) in Com. of Sup., 3263 (ii).

Sydney and Glace Bay Mail Service, Delay, &c.: Stmnt. (Mr. Pelletier) 934 (i).

Sydney Mines Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 5658 (iv).

Sydney and Wycocomagh Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 4740 (iii).

Syrian Immigration, Pet. *re* O.C.; Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 1209 (i).

Tableaux in H. of C., 1336 (i).

Tariff Commission, Apptmt. of: *See* 'B. No. 88.'

Tariff Commission, Apptmt. of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Neely) 529 (i).

—— Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 938 (i).

—— Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. W. M. Martin) 466 (i).

Taylor, Hon. Geo., Promise *re* Senate Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 545 (i).
See 'Parliament.'

Technical Education Commission, Report *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1202 (i).
See 'Industrial,' &c.

Telegraph Lines, Quebec, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2817 (ii).

Telegraph Working Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 3302 (ii).

Telegraph and Telephone Lines, Govt. Ownership: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 2007 (ii).
See 'Cable.'

Telephones, Long Distance, &c. in H. of C.: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 3243 (ii).

Telephone Wires, Permission of Govt. to place on Tel. Poles: Remarks (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 2822 (ii).

Temiscouata Election Expenses, Delays *re* Payment to Dep. Ret. Officer: Remarks 1707 (i).

Temiskaming Lake Dam Construction, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boulay) 4262 (iii).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Pugsley) 5928, 6661 (iv).
See 'Lake Temiskaming.'

Temiskaming Dam, Water Storage Dam: in Com. of Sup., 2827 (ii).

T. & N.O.Ry. and G.T.R., Running Rights: *See* 'B. No. 145.'

T. & N.O.Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 6080 (iii).

T. & N.O.Ry., Subsidy to: *See* 'B. No. 186.'

Therrien, F., Charges *re* Political Partisanship, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1413 (i), 3152 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 5823 (iv).

Thibault, Theophile, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 3339 (ii).

Thibodeau, George, Resignation, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Beland) in Com. of Sup., 6618 (iv).

Thompson, Dr., Dismissal from Mounted Police: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6784 (iv).

Three Rivers Harbour, Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2441 (ii).

Three Rivers Inland Revenue, Charges *re* Collector C. D. Hebert: Ques. (Mr. Bureau) 1209 (i).

Three Rivers Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1854 (i).

Tidal Service, Surveying Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 5400 (iii).

Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6217 (iv).

Timber Slides, Dues: *See* 'B. No. 103.'

Tobacco Growing, Aid to: in Com. of Sup., 6478 (iv).

Tobacco Growers of Yamaska, Govt. Aid to: M. for Cor. (Mr. Lemieux) 1591 (i).

Tobacco Stamps: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iv).

Toronto Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 1963 (i).

Toronto Exhibition Grant: in Com. of Sup., 6480 (iv).

Toronto, Govt. House, Sale of to Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 182.'

Toronto Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2445 (ii).

Toronto, Lindsay and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 5898, 6217 (iv).

Tory, Mr. H. L., Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 6784 (iv).

Tourigny, Mr. Justice, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 3147 (ii).

Tower Clock, Repairs to: Remarks (Mr. M. Clark) 1575 (i).

Tower Clock, Explanation (Mr. Monk) 1708 (i).
Tracadie Lazaretto: in Com. of Sup., 1530 (i).
Tracadie Road Post Office, Charges *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 4459 (iii).
Trade Agents: *See* 'Can. Agencies,' 'Commercial.'
Trade and Commerce Deptl. Report: Presented (Mr. Foster) 971 (i), 2591 (ii), 6780 (iv).
Trade Relations between Canada, Australia and W. Indies: (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Sup., 1971 (ii).
See 'British West Indies,' 'West Indies.'
Trade Relations with Japan, Stmnt. by Japanese Consul at Vancouver: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 559 (i).
Trade Relations: *See* 'Franco-Canadian.'
Trent Canal Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5799 (iv).
—— Newmarket: in Com. of Sup., 5792 (iv).
See 'Canals.'
Trent Canal Water Power, Claims of Prov. of Ont.: Remarks (Mr. Graham) in Com. of Sup., 5794 (iv).
Truro Station: in Com. of Sup., 4231 (iii).
Trust and Loan Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 108.'
Tuberculosis Association, Grant to: in Com. of Sup., 6579 (iv).
Tuberculosis in St. Jean and Iberville, Govt. Information *re*: Ques. (Mr. Demers) 3533 (ii).
Twine Materials Importations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3536 (ii).
See 'Fisheries.'
Typewriter Supplies, Names of Firms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 1809 (i).
'Tyrian' Telegraph Service Boat: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 3302 (ii).
Under Secretaries of State, Apptmt. of: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 3059 (ii).
Ungava Annexation, Cor. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 2060 (ii).
See 'Que. Boundaries.'
Ungava Territory, Legislation *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 577 (i).
Union Bank of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 57.'
Union Jack Flag, Use of: *See* 'B. No. 74.'
Union Labour Funds: *See* 'B. No. 87.'
United Gold Fields of B. C., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 93.'
United Shoe Machinery Co.'s Appeal: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 6783 (iv).
—— Investigation, Application to Min. of Jus.: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 3148 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Pardee) 572 (i).
—— Proceedings *re*: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 2455 (ii).
Universal Eyesight Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 126.'
Val des Eboulis and Rigaud Mail Service, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4249, 4778 (iii).
Vale Railroad, Operation by I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 5612 (iv).
—— Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 933 (ii).
Valois, J. B., Dismissal from Vaudreuil Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 3537 (ii).
Vanantwerp, C. B., Emplymt. by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Boivin) in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iv).
Vancouver, Fraser Valley and Southern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 135.'
Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 73.'
Vancouver Life Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 15.'
Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 5898, 6218, 6325 (iv).
Vegetables, Weight of Bag: *See* 'B. No. 78.'
Vegreville and Lloydminster Public Buildings: Remarks (Mr. W. H. White) in Com. of Sup., 2214 (ii).
Veitch Farm, Purchase of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Oliver) 933 (i).
Veit, Frederick, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 6783 (iv).
Venoit, J., Suspension: *See* 'Benoit.'
Verret, Mr. H. B., Promotion: in Com. of Sup., 6278 (iv).
Veterans, Bounties to: *See* 'B. Nos. 137 & 190.'
Veterans of 1866-7, Bounties to: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1202 (i).
See 'Bounties.'
Vickers-Maxim Co.'s Contract *re* Construction of Montreal Dry Dock: Ques. (Mr. Sevigny) 2450 (ii).
Victoria Memorial Museum, Number of Employees, Dismissals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bellemare) 2294 (ii).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 137 & 190.'
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt.: Remarks (Mr. Knowles) 1577 (i).
Voters Lists in Man., Distribution *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Staples) 3056 (ii).
Voters' Lists, Preparation of by Federal Govt., Stmnt. of Min. of the Int.: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 553 (i).
Wadge, Thomas, Patent Relief: *See* 'B. No. 16.'
Waiters, Holiday on Sunday: *See* 'B. No. 85.'
Waiters in Restaurants, Minimum Wages paid in Cities: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 3049 (ii).
See 'House of Commons.'
Wallace Harbour Spur Line, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 6604 (iv).

Water in Ry. Belt, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 149.'
Waterways Commission, Apptmt. of Commissioners: M. for O. C.'s, &c.: (Mr. Pugsley) 981 (i).
——— Dismissal, &c., and Appointments: M. (Mr. Pugsley) to Com. of Sup., 6680 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 966 (i).
——— Ratification of Apptmt. by late Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 533 (i).
See 'Boundary Waters.'
Watha Indian Reserve, Tenders *re* Timber: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 3055 (ii).
Ways and Means—Financial Statement (Mr. White) 4985 (iii).
——— M. for Com. (Mr. White) 702 (i).
See 'Budget.'
Webber, James, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 6783 (iv).
Webster, Dr. C. A., Dismissal of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Law) 6186 (iv).
Webster, Mr., Immigration Agent at Edmonton, Dismissal, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 3922 (ii).
Wednesday Sittings, Govt. Business: M. (Mr. Borden) *re* Precedence, 1969 (ii).
Weedon Public Building, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Tobin) 4550 (iii).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Tobin) 4781 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Tobin) 6492 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 6656 (iv).
Weights and Measures: in Com. of Sup., 5828 (iv).
Welland Canal, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 6607 (iv).
——— Quantity of American Freight passing through: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 3535 (ii).
——— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 5786 (iv).
——— Water Power, Diversion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 6747 (iv).
Wells, Edna, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 102.'
Western Dom. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 125.'
West. Ont. Pac. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 28.'
West Indies, Australia and Canada Trade Relations: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Sup., 1971 (ii).
West Indies and British Guiana Trade Returns: Inquiry for (Mr. Murphy) 1820 (i).
——— M. for Papers* (Mr. Murphy) 977 (i).
West Indies Mail Service, Establishment by Dom.: Remarks (Mr. McCurdy) in Com. of Sup., 685 (i).
Westville Public Building, Dismissal of Caretaker: Remarks (Mr. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 1531 (i).
Weyburn Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2213 (ii).
Wharfs, Total Expenditure for last ten years: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1811 (i).
Wheat Grades: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) 663 (i).
See 'Grain Bill.'
Wheatley Creek Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 640 (i).
Wheeler, Seager: *See* 'Seager.'
White Head Island Lighthouse, Dismissal of Patrick Conway, Investigation: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2857 (ii).
See 'Dismissals.'
Whitehead, N.S., Dismissal of Postmaster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2855 (ii).
See 'Harris.'
White, James, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 3338 (ii).
Wiley, Mrs., Claims *re* Yukon Property: in Com. of Sup., 6489 (iv).
Williams, Mr., Dismissal from H. of C.: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 3279 (ii).
Williamsville Post Office, Removal: Personal Explanation (Mr. Edwards) 6271 (iv).
Wills, Henry Greek, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 173.'
Windsor, Chatham and London Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 94.'
Winnipeg Ordnance Lands, Sale of: *See* 'B. No. 185.'
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Harbour Commission: *See* 'B. No. 138.'
Wireless Stations: in Com. of Sup., 5399 (iii).
Wolfville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1343 (i).
Wood Mountain Tel. Line: in Com. of Sup., 2821 (ii).
Woodstock, N.B., Apptmt. as Excise Officer: Remarks (Mr. Carvell) in Com. of Sup., 5812 (iv).
Wrecks Investigations: in Com. of Sup., 5229 (iii).
Wrecks Subsidies, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5231 (iii).
Wright County Public Works Employees, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Devlin) 550 (i).
See 'Dismissals.'
Yamaska Electoral Agent: Ques. (Mr. Mondou) 1584 (i).
Yarmouth Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2056 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 3273 (ii).
Yarmouth Post Office Building: Remarks (Mr. Law) in Com. of Sup., 3269 (ii).
Year Book: in Com. of Sup., 6465 (iv).
York Bridge over Grand River, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 2817 (ii).
Yukon Act (Judges) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 123.'
Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 181.'
Yukon Telegraph System: in Com. of Sup., 3303 (ii).
Yule,, Mr., Customs Officer at Aurora, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4779 (iii), 5950 (iv).